

THE SENSES AND SYNAESTHESIA IN HORACE'S *SATIRES*

BY

AMY LYNN NORGARD

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classical Philology
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2015

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Antonios Augoustakis, Chair
Associate Professor Ariana Traill
Assistant Professor Brian Walters
Professor Craig Williams

ABSTRACT

This study observes Horace's *Satires* (Book 1 published c. 36-35 BCE, and Book 2 c. 30 BCE) through a lens of the body's senses and organs involved in perception (eyes, ears, noses, mouths, hands, and tongues). Horace manipulates a multitude of bodies throughout his poetry, each contributing a different sensory experience, as a medium for representing and externalizing his poetic program. I seek to detect moments of synaesthesia within the text, by which I mean a literary crossing of the readable senses. Synaesthesia derives its name from the medical condition synaesthesia, which is a neurological conflation of the bodily senses: physical stimuli in the environment that trigger one mode of sense perception (like sight) also effect perception in a second sense (like hearing). By adopting synaesthesia as a literary interpretive model, I show how Horatian poetry, language, narrative, and themes emphasize integration and blending of the body's senses, through which the audience can experience the text more richly.

My research draws on scholarship of the Horatian body by Alessandro Barchiesi and Andrea Cucchiarelli, Emily Gowers, Joseph Farrell, Ellen Oliensis, and Amy Richlin, coupled with recent trends in studying the ancient senses by Shane Butler and Alex Purves, Helen Lovatt, and Mark Bradley. Despite rising interest in studies of the body, Bakhtinian perspectives, and gender in Classical scholarship, the Horatian body has not been recognized in a comprehensive manner on par with his fellow Roman satirists – a gap that my thesis aims to fill.

Chapter 1 (Sight) treats the sense of sight and eyes in Horace's satiric journey in *S.* 1.5 in tandem with Lucretian optic theory and Laura Mulvey's theory of the active and penetrating male gaze from film theory. *S.* 1.5 is replete with eye dysfunction, namely that of Horace's eponymous, "bleary-eyed" (*lippus*) persona. Through emphasizing eye and body dysfunction, we are led to question what Horace saw on his trip and what he allows the audience to see.

Chapter 2 (Taste) is concerned with the sense of taste and digestion in the culinary poems *S.* 2.2, 2.6, and 2.8. Through the sights and smells of the dinner table and the savory taste of the food that is served, this chapter follows the food from presentation to palate to digestion as it is transformed into a literary metaphor for Horatian satiric poetics. Chapter 3 (Hearing) observes the sense of hearing in the satiric dialogues (*S.* 1.9 and 2.7), along with the faulty ears that are burdened with the task of listening. When engaged in dialogue, Horace's persona is silenced or intentionally observes silence in preference to the spoken word, casting himself more as a member of the audience than satirist. However, his "leaky ear" (*auris rimosa*) and "floppy-eared nature" (*flaccus*) make listening into an onerous task. Finally, Chapter 4 (The Synaesthetic Garden) deconstructs *S.* 1.8 into a synaesthetic test case for Horatian satire by observing all the senses in tandem throughout the poem. From the smells of decaying bodies on the Esquiline hill, to the grotesque appearance of the witches, to the loud thunderous fart that chases them away, Priapus' garden is truly a nexus of sensory stimuli.

All of the chapters in this study seek to find the place where the bodily senses and sensing bodies collide, creating a full-bodied and engaging reading experience for the audience. By observing the bodies and senses throughout Horace's own body of satires, it is my goal to identify Horace's literary program relative to Lucilian satiric tradition.

To my husband

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many individuals I would like to thank for their support and continued assistance throughout my writing process. First and foremost, my deepest gratitude goes to my advisor, Antony Augoustakis. My dissertation topic was conceived in a seminar on Roman Satire taught by Antony in 2011. This course gave me an appreciation for the beauty, versatility, and nuance of Horace's poetry, and for Antony's profound talents as an instructor and advisor. Antony has guided me in countless discussions about satire, Horace, bodies, and the senses, and has been my most supportive reading audience member throughout the arduous drafting process. Additional and prolific thanks must be given to the members of my committee, Ariana Traill, Brian Walters, and Craig Williams. Their feedback and suggestions for revisions have been invaluable in the ongoing evolution of my interpretations and writing. The careful attention of these readers has saved me from many mistakes. The ones that remain are solely my own.

I must also acknowledge my undergraduate Classics professors at Marquette University, Stephen Beall and Patricia Marquardt, who introduced me to Classics, urged me to continue my studies, and with whom I took my first class on Horace. Thanks to all of my professors and fellow graduate students at the University of Illinois for listening to all of the practice talks and class presentations, reading abstracts, and providing feedback on the early incarnations of this study. My gratitude is also owed to the Latin students at the University of Illinois Laboratory High School, who were a willing and enthusiastic audience on whom I was able to test some of my body- and food-centric readings of Latin texts. To my parents, Mom, Dad, and Jane, thank you for your continued support throughout the long eight years of my graduate studies. And finally to my husband, Chris, thank you for your love and support throughout our years together.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: READING THE SENSES, READING THE BODY.....	1
CHAPTER 1: SIGHT.....	25
CHAPTER 2: TASTE.....	74
CHAPTER 3: HEARING.....	127
CHAPTER 4: THE SYNAESTHETIC GARDEN.....	157
CONCLUSION: SENSING THE <i>SATIRES</i>	201
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	204

INTRODUCTION

READING THE SENSES, READING THE BODY

In *Satire* 2.8, Horace narrates a dinner feast in terms of the physical body and the bodily senses. For the entirety of the poem, the dinner guests are served unappetizing food whose origins and preparations are narrated *ad nauseam* by the host, Nasidienus. The foods served first are fairly innocuous – Lucanian boar and flat fish – but the fare quickly devolves once a pregnant eel is brought out, followed by a mass of deconstructed, severed animal parts thrown together seemingly at whim. A feast that aspired to impress its dinner guests – counted among whom is a silent Maecenas – falls flat, much like the curtain that falls on the food which is the first signpost of disaster. At the end of the poem, Horace narrates the imagined appearance of the witch-hag Canidia to mark the end of both Nasidienus' disastrous feast, and Horace's final foray into writing satiric verse. The narrative describes Canidia figuratively releasing her poisonous breath, "as if [she] had breathed upon the food, worse than African serpents" (*velut illis / Canidia afflasset peior serpentibus Afris*, *S.* 2.8.94-5),¹ prompting the guests suddenly to depart (*fugimus*, 93) rather than partake in the inedible meal.

This poem can be read within a larger literary tradition of dining scenes, both preceding and following Horace, that contain extended narration of food that is staged and served, and upon which the bodies around the table feast their eyes and bellies – the most prominent example of which is Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis*. Like Petronius' text, Horace's *Cena Nasidieni* affords the audience a multi-sensory experience of the failed feast, as though we were present to

¹ A note on the text: I follow Gowers 2012 for Horace's *Satires* 1, and Shackleton Bailey 2008 for Horace's other works, including *Satires* 2. All translations are my own unless stated.

experience the smells, tastes, sights, and sounds along with the dinner guests. Canidia's sudden afflatus at the feast represents a pivotal moment of collision between bodily sense and literary text. The primary sense at work here is that of smell suggested by the rank breath emanating from Canidia's mouth. Her breath is so potent that it figuratively ruins the meal as though it had been poisoned by *venenum*, implied by the presence of *serpentibus Afris* (95). Canidia's putrid breath stands in for the food's foul smell and foreshadows its foul taste, thus functioning as an appetite suppressant.

Although taste is the primary sense experience one would expect at a banquet, the narration focuses on the *absence* of taste at Nasidienus' feast, marked by the phrase "no one tasted anything at all" (*ut nihil omnino gustaremus*, 94). Consumption and gustation likely occurred at the feast, suggested earlier in the poem by the evocation of taste in the phrase "bitter turnips" (*acria ... rapula*, 7-8), the list of foods that "appeased an angry stomach" (*iratum ventrem ... placaverit*, 5), and the fact that servants cleared the table of what could have been empty plates ("when these things were taken away," *his ut sublatis*, 10). By claiming there was no tasting, however, the narrative draws the audience's attention to the *other* senses the feast has to offer. Sight plays a pivotal role throughout the poem in the food's ornate arrangement and plating; and the guests are beckoned to listen to the long descriptions of the food's origins, as though the presentation and narration act as an appetizer. But the more the guests are invited gaze upon the food, it becomes more deconstructed and grotesque (and less appetizing) as the meal progresses.

The body is overloaded by the preponderance of smells, sights, and sounds of Nasidienus' feast with the result that tasting the food is not only unnecessary, but completely undesired. Just as the guests abandon the unappetizing feast, the audience comes to the end of the poem. Essentially, the audience's experiences of the text are closely tied to the characters' experiences,

mirrored in the physical body's dissatisfaction. Guests and readers alike leave Horace's satiric table with their fill of sensory stimuli, but ultimately are unsatisfied – either because of the ill-tasting food that did not fill their bellies, or because of the abrupt ending to the poem and to Horace's *Satires*.

The primary objective of the current study is to observe Horace's *Satires* from a perspective of bodies, senses, and the organs involved in sense perception (eyes, ears, noses, mouths, hands, and even stomach's role in digestion). In daily life, the senses act as the pathway through which we perceive and experience the external world. As an internal process, our brains use the sensory information collected from the environment to aid in the construction of our memory of events, our emotions, and understanding of the world. Daniel Tammet, author, autistic-savant, and synaesthete, describes "how different kinds of perceiving create different kinds of knowing and understanding" in a TED Talk entitled "Different Ways of Knowing."² Tammet elaborates by noting the following:

Our personal perceptions, you see, are at the heart of how we acquire knowledge. Aesthetic judgments rather than abstract reasoning guide and shape the process by which we all come to know what we know.

The varying degree of sensory potency across individuals, and their often varied sensory preferences, creates the possibility (and even the necessity) for a polyvalent experience and interpretation of a single event – or interpretation of a single text. Much in the same way that individuals have a favorite flavor of ice cream (or *several* favorite flavors), they too have literary

² Tammet 2011. TED is a non-profit organization that publishes digital recordings and videos of speakers giving short "Talks" on inspirational topics across disciplines and cultures that bring together aspects from "Technology, Entertainment, and Design" (abbreviated TED) to achieve a deeper understanding of the world. For more information, see: www.TED.com.

preferences, from genre, to style, to characters, that makes textual interpretation partially owing to individualized experiences, and thus allows for nuanced and variant readings of the same text.

No doubt reading the senses in literature is starkly different from direct sensation. It is the difference between verbal and experiential perception.³ The sensory context and the impact of the senses are transmitted to the audience indirectly by the author rather than experienced directly through the senses. There is, therefore, a sort of sensory triangulation at play in the literary description of the senses. When the characters in a text are described tasting food and seeing sights, it is all done for the benefit of the audience, making us an integral – if not the most important – part of the literary sensory experience. In essence, Horace makes his characters see, smell, taste, touch, and hear so that we the audience can be engaged more closely in the text. Emotions are tied closely to the bodily senses, and Horace manufactures a sensory experience through the characters for the benefit of the audience as another way to elicit an emotional reaction (e.g., sympathy, friendship, disgust, laughter).

As I will explore in the present study, the audience is the recipient of an indirect, satiric sensory experience fabricated by Horace: the audience sees with the bleary eyes of the persona in *S.* 1.5; the audience tastes the disparity between the country and city meals in *S.* 2.6; the audience hears the pest's blathering in *S.* 1.9; and the audience smells (and hears!) the thunderous fart in *S.* 1.8. Horace's narration of the senses is a way for him to transmit his own literary perspective while still allowing space for the audience to glean their own individualized interpretations from the text. In sum, I view the senses in Horace's *Satires* as the intersection between text, experience of the text, and interpretation.

³ van Campen 2008: 91-2 discusses some of the verbal synaesthetic metaphors that already exist in the English language, such as "sharp cheese," "bitter cold," and "loud colors."

The Aesthetics of Synaesthesia

The neurological condition synaesthesia is a conflation of the bodily senses, thought to be a result of anomalous neural pathways in the brain. In synaesthesia, physical stimuli in the environment that trigger one mode of sense perception (like sight) also effect perception in a second sense (like hearing). Daniel Tammet calls this “an unusual cross-talk between the senses,”⁴ and it creates a full, multi-modal perceptive experience for the synaesthete.

Synaesthesia can manifest itself in several ways across the senses. The most common type of synaesthesia is the association of colors with written or spoken letters, words, or numbers, called color-graphemic synaesthesia; in this type of synaesthesia, a person might associate the letter C with the color blue. In other types of synaesthesia, sounds like a door opening or musical instrument can induce a person to see colors, called colored-hearing synaesthesia. And rarer still is gustatory-audition, in which a particular sound, like music, triggers the sense of taste, so that a certain musical note or tone might very literally “taste” sweet to the synaesthete.⁵

Vladimir Nabokov (1899-1977), author and self-proclaimed synaesthete, elaborates on his unique associations between words, sounds, and color – his *audition colorée* – in his memoir *Speak, Memory*:

I present a fine case of colored hearing. Perhaps “hearing” is not quite accurate, since the color sensation seems to be produced by the very act of my orally forming a given letter while I imagine its outline. The long *a* of the English alphabet (and it is this alphabet I have in mind farther on unless otherwise stated) has for me the tint of weathered wood, but a French *a* evokes polished ebony. This black group also includes hard *g* (vulcanized rubber) and *r* (a sooty rag being ripped). Oatmeal *n*, noodle-limp *l*, and the ivory-backed hand mirror of *o* take care of the whites. I am puzzled by my French *on* which I see as the brimming tension-surface of alcohol in a small glass. Passing on to the blue group, there is steely *x*, thundercloud *z*, and huckleberry *k*.

⁴ Tammet 2011.

⁵ Rich and Mattingley 2002: 43-5. On the condition synaesthesia, see also van Campen 2008.

Since a subtle interaction exists between sound and shape, I see *q* as browner than *k*, while *s* is not the light blue of *c*, but a curious mixture of azure and mother-of-pearl.⁶

For Nabokov, the sounds and even shapes of letters conjure reminders of colors of varying shades, differentiated as much as “steely,” “thundercloud,” and “huckleberry” blues. There seems to be a tactile component to his sensation of letters as well between the “weathered wood,” conjuring images of a grainy, cracked, and faded piece of wood, and the smooth and bulbous “brimming tension-surface of alcohol in a small glass.” This lengthy description, which Nabokov calls his “confessions of a synesthete,” continues for several pages and even by his own estimations may seem “tedious and pretentious.”⁷ If words have colors, sounds, and textures for Nabokov, there must be some residual impact on his unique perception of language as the author of his own writing. Daniel Tammet cites the opening line of Nabokov’s *Lolita* – “Lolita, light of my life” – as having a particularly synaesthetic quality in the alliteration and flow of the thought.⁸ Nabokov transmits his own synaesthesia through vivid descriptions, affectation, and ability to engage the audience’s emotions and imagination through his painting of words.

Influenced by authors like Nabokov, who use language to play with the readable senses, the current study seeks to detect moments of synaesthesia within literary text. I use synaesthesia to mean a literary crossing of the readable senses, through which the reader can experience and

⁶ Nabokov 1966: 34-5. I see similarities between Nabokov’s description of sensation and the way in which the Romans perceived color according to Mark Bradley’s study on ancient conceptions of color as “object-centred experience” rather than objectively-identified hues and shades (2014: 132; generally 2009; see also the current study, Chapter 4 (The Synaesthetic Garden): 180-1.

⁷ Nabokov 1966: 35.

⁸ Tammet 2011. *Contra* van Campen 2008, who notes that Nabokov’s characters exhibit synaesthetic tendencies, but that he does not often translate synaesthesia into a figure of speech, metaphor, or his worldview (92-5; see generally the chapter entitled “Poetic Synesthesia,” 91-114).

interpret text more richly by seeking out “sensory blending.”⁹ Enriched by recent studies on the senses in cultural history and sociology – such as the large corpus of Constance Classen,¹⁰ Diane Ackerman’s *A Natural History of the Senses* (1990), and the multi-volume project *A Cultural History of the Senses* (2014)¹¹ – there has been a growing trend in Classical scholarship toward reading the senses in ancient texts. Shane Butler has recently spearheaded a series published by Routledge titled “The Senses in Antiquity,” which endeavors to publish an edited volume dedicated to each of the five bodily senses. The introductory volume, *Synaesthesia and the Ancient Senses* (2014), traces a plethora of senses beyond the opticentric model across ancient literature – from comic smells (Mario Telò), haptic historiography (Alex Purves), ancient color theory (Mark Bradley),¹² to the absence of the senses in death (Brian Walters) – in order to detect “the complex relationship between sensation and language.”¹³ *Smell and the Ancient Senses* (2015) is the first volume in the series dedicated to a singular sense analyzed from different perspectives: the role of smell in dining (David Potter), the urban smells of unburied bodies and sewage (Ann Olga Koloski-Ostrow, Neville Morley), and the poetic application of smell and noses (Shane Butler, Mark Bradley and Eric Varner).

⁹ To adopt the phrase from Shane Butler’s and Alex Purves’s 2014 volume on *Synaesthesia and the Ancient Senses*, who call the literary application of synaesthesia “the sensory blending experienced by all readers, synaesthetes or not” (1). They attribute the introduction of synaesthesia in Classical scholarship to W. B. Stanford’s *Greek Metaphor* (1936) and the chapter titled “On Synaesthesia or Intersensual Metaphor.”

¹⁰ *Worlds of Sense: Exploring the Senses in History Across Cultures* (1993), *Aroma: The Cultural History of Smell* (1994, with David Howes and Anthony Synnott); *The Deepest Sense: A Cultural History on Touch* (2012); *Ways of Sensing: Understanding the Senses in Society* (2013, with David Howes).

¹¹ Edited by Classen; the volume on Antiquity is edited by J. P. Toner.

¹² Bradley 2014 draws heavily from Bradley 2009.

¹³ Butler and Purves 2014: 2.

Although none of the contributions in either of these volumes exclusively discuss Horace or the Roman genre of satire specifically, many ideas have been integral in the formation of the current study and provides references that will appear throughout. The individual studies within “The Senses in Antiquity” series work in concert to create a roadmap for how to read the senses in ancient literature; they have also provided the language with which to discuss the senses and the scholarly context for this study. One of the most important observations gleaned is that the senses should not be considered in isolation nor in a hierarchical structure as Aristotle would have it.¹⁴ When reading the senses in literature, it is apparent that they bleed into one another to enhance our reading of the text. The following study, while divided into chapters on the individual senses of sight (Chapter 1), taste (Chapter 2), and hearing (Chapter 3), invariably discusses the literary integration of all the senses from the Greco-Roman sensorium within Horace’s *Satires*. Additionally, the following chapters also seek to find the place where the bodily senses and sensing bodies collide, creating a full-bodied and engaging reading/listening experience for the audience.

Bodies and Corporeality in the *Satires*

A study on the senses should not undervalue the centrality of the physical body. The body is, after all, the medium through which the senses are made possible. Horace’s *Satires* is full of bodies that are ailing, disfigured, (de)sexualized, overly-sated with food, and bestial; in sum, they are “beset by labour, pain, disease, and want,” in the words of Joseph Farrell.¹⁵ Despite

¹⁴ Arist. *de An.* 424b1-2. Butler and Purves 2014: 2-3; Bradley 2015: 8. See Chapter 1 (Sight) 28-9.

¹⁵ Farrell 2007: 180.

rising interest in studies of the body,¹⁶ Bakhtinian perspectives,¹⁷ and gender in Classical scholarship on satire and in Roman literature in general,¹⁸ the Horatian body has not been recognized in a comprehensive manner on par with his fellow Roman satirists – a gap that my study aims to fill. After W. S. Anderson’s *Essays on Roman Satire* (1982), in which he broaches the topic of the satirist’s persona, it seems long overdue to observe the entire body that wears the satirist’s mask (to use Braund’s and Gold’s metaphor).¹⁹ But I must mention the contribution of scholars whose works have become fundamental in the development of studying the body in Horace and satire, and have proved central for my project.²⁰

Emily Gowers’ large body of scholarship contains analyses of *S.* 1.5 as a whole and Horace’s ailing persona therein (“Horace, *Satires* 1.5: An Inconsequential Journey,” 1993a and

¹⁶ Henderson 1975; Braund and Gold 1998; Porter 1999; Corbeill 2004.

¹⁷ Miller 1998 (2009); Branham 2002 and 2005; Behr 2009; Sharland 2009. Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1979) is renowned for his philosophical treatises on communication and language (“dialogism” and “heteroglossia”), literary criticism, human behavior, the “carnavalesque,” and the human body (particularly the “classical” and “grotesque” bodies); see, e.g., Bakhtin’s *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* (1981), *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics* (1984a), and *Rabelais and His World* (1984b). Castle 2007 s.v. Mikhail Bakhtin; Schmitz 2007: 63-76. Although the theory of the “grotesque” body has relevance to this study (1984) and I refer to it occasionally, I do not use Bakhtin as a unifying framework. Rather, I am more influenced by the classicists who have adopted Bakhtin into their analyses of the body and how they have stretched their ideas beyond Bakhtin.

¹⁸ Adams 1982; Henderson 1989; Richlin 1992a and b, 1997, 2009; Hallett and Skinner 1997; Hope and Marshall 2000; Lloyd 2003; Williams 2010; Paule 2012; Stratton 2014.

¹⁹ Braund and Gold 1998: 249.

²⁰ For studies in Horatian satire in general, the following are indispensable: Fiske 1920; Fraenkel 1957; Rudd 1966; Anderson 1982; Brown 1993; Freudenburg 1993, 2001 and 2005; Muecke 1993; Braund 1996; Oliensis 1998; Henderson 1999; Schlegel 2005; Keane 2006; Gowers 2012.

“Fragments of Autobiography in Horace, *Satires* 1,” 2003). In her monograph *The Loaded Table* (1993b), Gowers also examines bodies through the food that nourishes (and gluts) them in satire (in addition to comedy, epigram, and iambics), taking literal inspiration from the genre’s name that puns on *lanx satura*, a “mixed dish.”²¹ Moreover, Gowers’ commentary on *Satires* 1 (2012) treats individual instances of body references but does not connect them into a narrative of literary analysis. Furthermore, Andrea Cucchiarelli stresses the literary function of the body adopted from Greek and Roman comedy, especially the relationship of *S.* 1.5 to Aristophanes’ *Frogs* (*La Satira e il Poeta*, 2001). Additionally, Amy Richlin observes sex, violence, and sexualized bodies in satire, epigram, iambics, and the novel as a vehicle for male and phallic dominance (*The Garden of Priapus*, 1992b).

Although these aforementioned scholarly works have not produced a unifying narrative on the body in Horace, all have had profound influence on Horatian studies, and their ideas figure prominently in my own analysis. There are a few publications that directly address the body in Horace and create a foundation from which I build my own ideas. Joseph Farrell’s contribution to *Classical Constructions*, “Horace’s Bodies, Horace’s Books” (2007), identifies the Bakhtinian character of Horace’s satirical body by comparing the body lexicon in *Satires* 1 to *Odes* 1-3.²² Based on a lexical survey, Farrell concludes that Horace’s satirical body corresponds to Bakhtin’s “grotesque” body, but that the lyric body is not “classical” as has been argued by

²¹ Cf. Bartsch 2015, who conducts a similar study on food (and thereby bodies) in Persius.

²² Farrell 2007: 177. Farrell concludes that the poems contain “about 7,000 words of which about 140 refer to the body,” a frequency of 2% (176). But Farrell never defines what constitutes a body word, but provides the following examples: *inguina*, *lumbi*, *venter*, *cunus*, *clunes*, *vesica*. What about less “satiric” body parts, like *caput* and *manus*, or animal body parts? And do action verbs that are particularly physical count in his number? Because of the difficult nature of cataloguing broadly defined “body words,” I do not engage in this activity for this study.

modern scholars; rather it “owes something to both of Bakhtin’s bodily categories,” meaning the “grotesque,” “classical,” and the “new bodily cannon.”²³ Another chapter-length treatment on satiric bodies is Alessandro Barchiesi’s and Andrea Cucchiarelli’s “Satire and the Poet: Body as Self-referential Symbol” (2005), where the authors discuss the satiric “body’s potential as an index of moral values,”²⁴ that is, how abstract morality is reduced to a corporeal element. The authors briefly look at Horace’s *Satires* (especially *S.* 1.5), and identify Lucilius’ extant satires as containing a disproportionate amount of references to the physical body, disease, and physicians.²⁵ The authors, however, more completely treat Persius and Juvenal as the paradigmatic examples of moral and satiric discourse transmitted through the body.

Rob Freeman’s article “Bleary Eyes and Drooping Ears: Images of the Body and Self-Representation in Horace *Sermones* Book One” (2014) is the best example of Horatian scholarship that attempts to read the body within a continuous narrative as opposed to studying select examples in isolation (as many studies on *S.* 1.5 do, for example). Freeman takes the observation made by Barchiesi and Cucchiarelli (that “the Roman satirist is an expert at reading the body’s signs”)²⁶ and does just that: he “reads the signs” of the body with a focus on Horace’s persona. Freeman follows the persona’s body in nearly all of the poems in *Satires* 1, paying particular attention to *S.* 1.3, 4, 5, 8 and 9. While he is interested in the literary metaphor of the body, Freeman limits his conclusions to the socio-political message being conveyed through the body,²⁷ namely that the emphasis on the body (especially bad eyesight) creates a “blind spot”

²³ *Ibid.*: 175 n. 4.

²⁴ Barchiesi and Cucchiarelli 2005: 207.

²⁵ *Ibid.*: 210-11. On illness in Lucilius, see further Classen 1996: 14-15.

²⁶ Barchiesi and Cucchiarelli: 207.

²⁷ Freeman 2014: 86-92.

with regard to “the central trauma of the poet’s own life, his fighting on the side of the Republican cause at Philippi in 42 BC.”²⁸ The stress of supporting and appearing grateful to a government that defeated the cause Horace fought for, Freeman argues, manifests itself in his poetry that never truly commits to one viewpoint of Rome or his patron.²⁹

It is evident from this brief overview of scholarship on the body that there has been no comprehensive scholarly treatment of the bodies throughout Horace’s entire satirical corpus. Freeman’s article comes the closest in scope and theme, but his analysis is truncated and primarily focuses on reading the persona’s body as “a satiric substitute for Rome, the body politic,” in the words of Catherine Schlegel.³⁰ My goal is to forge a connection between the disparate scholarship on Horace, the body, and senses to reveal the corporeality of Horace’s poetics in the *Satires*. But first let us take a brief look at what is meant by “bodies” or “the body” in the *Satires*, and some different approaches to interpretation.

Some Horatian Bodies

Quintus Horatius Flaccus (65 BCE-8 CE) published his first Book of *Satires* c. 36-35 BCE as his first literary production under the patronage of Maecenas.³¹ This was followed c. 30 BCE by *Satires* 2 and the *Epodes*, Horace’s only foray into writing iambic poetry modeled on Archilochus, which will be treated occasionally in this study as part of the collection of Horace’s

²⁸ *Ibid.*: 89.

²⁹ *Ibid.*: 96.

³⁰ Schlegel 2005: 76.

³¹ Anderson 1982: viii; DuQuesnay 1984: 19; Gowers 2012: 1-3.

early publications.³² Both the *Satires* and *Epodes*, written during a time of political turmoil and civil war, transmit the anxieties of a city and poet engulfed in war, and showcase the difficulty in rejuvenating a nearly defunct literary genre within a new socio-political context.

Horace renews the tradition of writing *Satires* from the genre's inventor, Lucilius (d. 102 BCE), who published thirty books of *Satires* c. 130 BCE, nearly a century before Horace, and of which only 1400 lines (and partial lines) survive. Horace names his satires *Sermones*, "conversations," to emphasize the genre's prosaic aesthetic (although composed in verse) modeled on every day conversation. Themes featured in the *Satires* include friendship, philosophy (Epicureanism), and moral inquiry in the style of traditional diatribe. Horace's *Satires*, like those of Lucilius, provide social commentary and discourse on these themes narrated in the first person, leading some scholars to believe them to be the words and opinions of the poet and historical figure, Quintus Horatius Flaccus. However, following William Anderson, I differentiate the historical poet Horace from the narrative voice, which is more like another character within the *Satires*. Like Anderson, I reference this narrating character as the "persona" (the Latin word for mask) throughout this study, who from poem to poem can shift from being a semi-autobiographical portrait of Horace, or an entirely different, fully fictional character (like a Priapic garden statue, for example).³³ Horace the poet speaks through his various personae to express different opinions and characteristics that are not necessarily his

³² The composition dates of *Satires* 1 and 2 and the *Epodes* similarly span the triumviral civil wars and Battle of Actium, approximately 41-30 BCE (Zetzel 1980: 63; Gowers 2012: 1-3).

³³ Anderson 1982: viii, 5-6. Anderson's mask theory allows readers to reconcile the vastly different perspectives across poems (and genres) by the same author. He writes that "Horace could don almost any mask at will, in order to show us ... the attitude which he chose to manifest," whether it is his serious moralizing persona in the *Satires* or the "lyric lover, drinker, and advocate of *carpe diem*" from the *Odes* (5).

own, but that further his own satiric and poetic agenda. And, in truth, we only have the words of Horace's personae – not of Horace himself.

The physical body stands out in the *Satires* as a locus of interest for the satirist. Horatian satire features a variety of bodies in different states of being, like sick bodies suffering from bleary-eyes and stomachaches (*lippus* and *crudus* in *S.* 1.5); bodies that are stuffed with food (*S.* 2.2, 2.4, 2.6) or “unlunched” (*impransi*, *S.* 2.2.7); and bodies that take on bestial characteristics, as when the Horatian persona is likened to a flop-eared ass (*S.* 1.9), or the grotesque female body likened to canines (Canidia in *S.* 1.8) and harpies (*S.* 2.8). Elsewhere, the Horatian persona himself is described in corporeal terms as having a “pure heart” (*pectore puro*, *S.* 1.6.64) with which he earns a place in Maecenas' circle for himself, despite the fact that he considers himself like a body covered in moles (*inspersos ... corpore naevos*, *S.* 1.6.67) to express his ostensible imperfections (i.e., “born from a freedman father,” *libertino patre natum*, *S.* 1.6.45, 46).³⁴ In fact, bodies occur so frequently in Horatian satire and the fragments of his satiric predecessor, Lucilius, that it has been conjectured that bodies signal a generic marker for satire.³⁵

Bodies themselves are boundaries. Things can cross these boundaries by being put inside the body (like food, or in the act of penetrative intercourse) or by coming back out again (as excrement, vomit, or leaking fluid from the eyes), reflecting Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of the

³⁴ Suet. *Vit. Hor.* records Augustus referring to Horace as *purissimum penem*, the “most pure cock” (35-6), an oxymoron to express Horace's tendency to exhibit nobility and vulgarity simultaneous (text from Rostagni 1979). In Roman society, people were commonly referred to in reference to their physical bodies or physical traits, a tradition that is preserved in naming conventions (Corbeill 1996 and 2004; Parker 2000).

³⁵ Barchiesi and Cucchiarelli 2005: 210-11. The emphasis on bodies, particularly the grotesque, is far more prominent in Horace's successors, Persius and Juvenal (Bramble 1974; Richlin 1992b and 2009; Braund and Gold 1998; Miller 1998 [2009]; Behr 2009; Plaza 2009; Keane 2012; Bartsch 2015).

grotesque body riddled with gaping holes.³⁶ Horace, however, emphasizes where the body revolts from its established boundaries to demonstrate where its limits are. With repetition of his satire's catch phrase, *iam satis est* ("that's enough" or "it's satire now"),³⁷ Horace emphasizes the limitations of bodies, bodily function, and even his own poetics. Horace's bodies are integral in the construction of his satire. He often utilizes the body as a metaphor for his construction of character and satiric worldview. And when the references are fleshed out, Horace's bodies can provide insights into Horace's own poetics.

As an illustration of this, let us observe one recurring body metaphor throughout the *Satires*: the nose. Horace often describes his literary predecessor, Lucilius, with reference to the physical body, like standing on one foot (*stans pede in uno*, *S.* 1.4.10) while composing verses. This is both a statement of the ease with which he can compose such lengthy poetry, and draws attention to his metrical "feet" (also *pedes*) and the verbosity that can be found therein. Later, Lucilius "rubs the city with much salt" (*sale multo / urbem defricuit*, *S.* 1.10.3-4), where *sal* stands for abrasive wit. The metaphor also suggests that the city is an open flesh wound undergoing a medical regimen conducted by the satirist playing a perverted sort of doctor. Furthermore, Lucilius is described as physically fast moving to reflect his lack of verbal restraint: he "**flows** muddy" (*cum flueret lutulentus*, *S.* 1.4.11), and "his verses **run**," albeit "on a clumsy [or badly-composed] **foot**" (*incomposito ... pede currere versus*, *S.* 1.10.1).

In addition to this, Horace ascribes to Lucilius a "well-blown nose" (*emunctae naris*, *S.* 1.4.8). The nose as a body part and locus of olfaction does not receive an independent treatment

³⁶ Bakhtin 1984b: 303-67 elaborates on the grotesque body, which occupies the world of the bodily lower stratum (18-29), physically represented by the genitalia, and other aspects of the incomplete body full of holes (e.g., the open mouth and anus). Bakhtin calls the grotesque body "the epitome of incompleteness" (26-7).

³⁷ *S.* 1.1.120, 1.5.13; Freudenburg 1993: 193. See Chapter 2 (Taste): 88-9.

in this particular study because there is not one singular chapter dedicated to the sense of smell.³⁸ Nevertheless, the nose manifests itself as a literary metaphor for Horace's morality and satiric poetics. Emily Gowers observes that Lucilius' "well-blown nose" implies both satirical disdain and social snobbery, representing Lucilius' reputation as a critical satirist "flushing out" society's vices (as though it were his snot), and his upper-class status.³⁹ There is a similar nasal metaphor in *S.* 1.6 as a way to express contempt and disgust – a sin of which Maecenas is not guilty:

*non quod avus tibi maternus fuit atque paternus
olim qui magnis legionibus imperitarent,
ut plerique solent, **naso suspendis aduncto** 5
ignotos, ut me libertino patre natum. (Hor. *S.* 1.6.3-6)*

Although your paternal and maternal grandfathers once commanded great legions, you do not, as many usually do, **suspend from your hooked nose** nobodies like me who was born from a freedman father.

Horace holds Maecenas' actions separate from the vulgar crowd (*ut plerique solent*, 5) who tend to criticize lowly backgrounds like his own. Emily Gowers, however, points out the irony of the situation: "Maecenas agrees to exempt H., while H. continues to be quietly satirical under his nose."⁴⁰ Here, in a metaphor that is "unique to Horace,"⁴¹ the nose can be a visual indication of

³⁸ The nose and sense of smell appear in connection to taste in Chapter 2: 79, 84-6, and in reference to the apparent smell and sound of Priapus' crepitation in Chapter 4: 193-5.

³⁹ Gowers 2012: 155-6; Bradley 2015: 3. Unlike Horace, Lucilius was born an equestrian and owned property. His social status and powerful friends allowed him to exhibit verbal *libertas* when it came to criticizing his enemies and Roman society. Cf. *S.* 1.3.29-30 in a passage that warns against scrutinizing the faults of others: "the man who is a bit prone to anger is less suited to the **sharp noses** of these people" (*iracundior est paulo, minus aptus acutis / naribus horum hominum*). Suet. *Vit. Hor.* records that someone once taunted Horace by saying he saw his father "wipe his nose with his arm" (*patrem tuum brachio se emungentem*, 4-5), perhaps as a metaphor for his low class, freedman standing (text from Rostagni 1979).

⁴⁰ Gowers 2012: 221.

expressing scorn, but also a medium for identifying a person's character based on the shape of their nose (long, hooked, short, fat).⁴² Maecenas' hooked, aquiline nose (*naso ... aduncto*, 5) implies his upper class status and descent from a line of great men and women; but his refusal to look down on Horace from his snobby, aristocratic nose trumps his nasal physiognomy and reveals his true, noble character.

Drawing attention to Lucilius' haughty nose in *S.* 1.4, and Maecenas' refusal to use it in *S.* 1.6, sets the stage for another nasal reference in *S.* 2.8 and a return to the feast of Nasidienus that began this introductory chapter. The curtain has just fallen onto the meal (*suspensa gravis aulaea ruinas / in patinam fecere*, *S.* 2.8.54-5) and Nasidienus, the "father of the feast" (*cenae pater*, 7) mourns for the tragic early demise of his feast as though it were his child (*ut si / filius immaturus obisset*, 58-9). The parasite Balatro makes a lengthy speech of ten lines, perhaps in an attempt to lighten the mood and appease his host:⁴³

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>'Balatro suspendens omnia naso</i> <i>"haec est condicio vivendi" aiebat "eoque</i> <i>responsura tuo numquam est par fama labori.</i> <i>tene, ut ego accipiar laute, torquerier omni</i> <i>sollicitudine districtum, ne panis adustus,</i> <i>ne male conditum ius apponatur, ut omnes</i> <i>praecincti recte pueri comptique ministrent?</i> <i>adde hos praeterea casus, aulaea ruant si,</i> <i>ut modo, si patinam pede lapsus frangat agaso.</i> <i>sed convivatoris, uti ducis, ingenium res</i> <i>adversae nudare solent, celare secundae."</i> (Hor. <i>S.</i> 2.8.64-74)</p>	<p>65</p> <p>70</p>
--	---------------------

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² Bradley 2015: 3-6 and 173-5, and whose article on "Roman noses" is forthcoming.

⁴³ This is the second longest (reported) speech in the poem, second to Nasidienus' at 43-53, which spans eleven lines. The word *balatro* means "jester" or "buffoon" (Muecke 1993: 233). Cf. Hor. *S.* 1.2.2 which lumps *balatrones* with other occupations considered lowly: "O beggars, actors, buffoons" (*mendici, mimae, balatrones*). For more on Balatro, see O'Connor 1990: 28-30 and Freudenburg 2001: 120-1.

“Balatro, **who hangs everything from his nose**, said, ‘This is the condition of life: reputation will never respond equally to your labor. And do you, pulled in different directions, torment yourself with every concern, so that I can be received graciously, and the bread doesn’t burn, a badly made sauce is not served, and every slave is done up right and takes care correctly? Moreover add to these problems that a canopy falls just as it did now, or a serving boy falls over his feet and breaks a plate. But adverse events usually reveal the genius of the host, like a leader; favorable events hide this.’”

Balatro plays off of Nasidienus’ previous speech where he dramatically mourns the feast’s failure, saying, “Alas! Fortune! What god is more cruel to us than you?” (*heu, Fortuna, quis est crudelior in nos / te deus?* 61-2). Balatro exhibits a false sympathy for Nasidienus’ hard work in vain, calling being unrecognized for one’s efforts simply a “condition of life” (*condicio vivendi*, 65). He simulates Nasidienus’ concern for the feast’s trivialities, such as serving well-cooked bread and sauce, and ensuring the slaves are dressed properly, his words dripping with irony. Nasidienus, however, takes Balatro’s words at face value and does not comprehend their meaning. Believing that Balatro truly sympathizes with his perceived plight, Nasidienus thanks him genuinely as “a good man, dinner guest, and friend” (*vir bonus es convivaque comis*, 76). Nasidienus leaves in preparation to rise to the occasion as a great leader to save the dinner in the face of adversity.

At first glance it seems that Balatro is a character of little import. He accompanies Maecenas to the feast as his “shadow,” along with Varius and Vibidius (*Varius, cum Servilio Balatrone / Vibidius, quas Maecenas adduxerat umbras*, 21-2), occupying the status of a hanger-on. However, Balatro is mentioned by name five times,⁴⁴ which is the most of any name in the poem, including the host Nasidienus who is named four times,⁴⁵ and certainly more than Maecenas who

⁴⁴ S. 2.8.21 (along with his cognomen, Servilius), 33, 40, 64, 83.

⁴⁵ S. 2.8.1, 58 (as Rufus), 75, 84. He is also referred to throughout by various titles: *cenae pater* (7), *erus* (16), *parochi* (36), *erus* (43), *convivatoris ... ducis* (73), *dominus* (93) – all of which suggest ownership and patronage.

is named only twice and does not speak.⁴⁶ Horace calls Balatro a person who “hangs everything from his nose” (*suspendens omnia naso*, 64), echoing the phrase from *S.* 1.6.5: *naso suspendis aduncto*. As mentioned, this nasal metaphor can suggest snobbery or looking down one’s nose at others. Kirk Freudenburg argues that the metaphor also “warns us to wary of this man’s speech.”⁴⁷ I also believe it casts the owner of the nose as a sort of puppet master who can control those around him or her. In the case of Balatro, he takes the lead in exhorting his friends to “drink ruinously” (*damnose bibimus*, 34): “Vibidius and Balatro emptied all the wine-flasks into Allifan goblets, as everyone follows suit” (*invertunt Allifanis vinaria tota / Vibidius Balatroque; secutis omnibus*, 39-40). Later, Balatro is the source of humor at the party, truly embodying his namesake, “buffoon”: “all the while we were laughing as Balatro egged us on with fabricated stories” (*dumque / ridetur fictis rerum Balatrone secundo*, 82-3). When the curtain fell, Balatro assessed the situation – the care taken to prepare the meal, the pride of the host – and said the right thing simultaneously to appease Nasidienus and poke fun at him unwittingly.⁴⁸ Everything that he does is aimed to get a laugh from his “audience,” his friends and other dinner guests: “Varius could scarcely suppress a smile with his napkin” (*Varius mappa compescere risum / vix poterat*, 63-4) and “we laughed” (*ridetur*, 83).

Balatro’s frequent occurrences, lengthy ironic speech, and general hilarity make him stand out among all of Nasidienus’ dinner guests. We can turn to the Roman satirist Persius who

⁴⁶ *S.* 2.8.16, 22.

⁴⁷ Freudenburg 2001: 121. He suggests *suspendere naso* refers to the Greek μυκτηρισμός or “turning up the nose,” “sneering,” a characteristic of Socrates.

⁴⁸ In a way, Balatro gets the best of the man who rivals him in snobbery – and has another big nose: Nasidienus (*Ibid.*: 122).

seems to have a theory about this seemingly unimportant character in terms of nasal metaphor.⁴⁹

About the poet Horace Persius writes:

*omne vafer vitium ridenti Flaccus amico
tangit et admissus circum praecordia ludit,
callidus excusso populum suspendere naso.* (Pers. 1.116-18)

While his friend is laughing, crafty Flaccus touches every fault and having been let in he plays around his innards, clever at **suspending people from his blown nose**.

Persius integrates two metaphors from Horace's *Satires* related to noses. He references the blown nose (*excusso ... naso*, 118), which echoes the nasal imagery Horace applied to Lucilius (*emunctae naris*, *S.* 1.4.8); and Persius adopts the idea of suspending people from the nose (*suspendere naso*, 118), just as we saw of Maecenas (*S.* 1.4) and Balatro (*S.* 2.8). Persius, however, applies both of these nasal metaphors to Horace the poet.

Emily Gowers observes that this line accuses Horace of being “hypocritically snobbish himself.”⁵⁰ But I think Persius recognizes in the poet Horace the same traits that we see in Balatro, whom we can read as Horace's literary doppelganger. Horace, like Balatro, is a “shadow” (i.e., client) of Maecenas along with his known friend, Varius.⁵¹ He fulfills this role by accompanying Maecenas to dinner and on journeys (*S.* 1.5), presumably to play the jester and be jolly. Most importantly, however, Horace manipulates people with his jokes (*ridenti ... amico*, Pers. 115), much like Balatro does with the dinner guests and host. Furthermore, Balatro's lengthy speech at 64-74 recapitulates the nature of satire: the true meaning is concealed

⁴⁹ Freudenburg 2001: 121-2.

⁵⁰ Gowers 2012: 221.

⁵¹ *umbra* (shadow) was the Latin name for the uninvited guests that invited guests would bring to parties and banquets (Muecke 1993: 233). Cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.5.28, in an invitation to a dinner party Horace writes, “There is also room for several **shadows**” (*locus est et pluribus umbris*).

in irony, and addresses multiple audiences who may have different interpretations.⁵² Through laughter Horace the satirist and poet lowers his audience's guard and gains admittance into their hearts and minds where he can safely reveal his message to an engaged audience. In playing the role of a satiric puppet master, Horace exhibits manipulation and control of his audience's emotions, which is the meaning behind *suspendens omnia naso* (S. 2.8.64). And just as Balatro puts on a show for the dining audience, Horace does the same for his own audience.

The narrative of the feast in S. 2.8 is told in a dialogue between Horace's persona and Fundanius, a friend who was present at the dinner. Fundanius takes on the role of the primary narrative speaker, leaving the persona to contribute very little, making him virtually non-existent in this final satire. Rather, Balatro embodies characteristics typically attributed to the persona and gets the last laugh in the end. Interestingly, this particular body metaphor seems to be divorced from its associated sense of smell. The presence of body parts, then, does not always require a relationship to sensation. This example demonstrates how Horace's bodies can be multi-dimensional and refract thematic issues beyond the physical. Bodies become a medium to express Horace's stance on poetics and, as we will see throughout the chapters that follow, Horace's removal from politics and society, glimpses into his autobiography, and clarification of his narrative voice.

⁵² O'Connor 1990: 32 observes the various audiences for the speech: Nasidienus and the dinner guests who hear it directly from Balatro; Horace who hears it from Fundanius; and we (the readers) who read about it from Horace. O'Connor elaborates: "This layering of voices traces how satire arises from real life through irony and comedy. Thus it parallels what Horace has told us is satire's historical genealogy from life through Lucilius and the comic poets to his own reshaping of the material as *sermo*" (32-3).

Disiecti membra poetae

As a final thought, let us jump forward to one of Horace's later poems in his oeuvre, the *Ars Poetica*. Here, Horace famously draws a comparison between a well-ordered poem and a balanced body in visual artwork:

*Humano capiti cervicem pictor equinam
iungere si velit et varias inducere plumas
undique collatis membris, ut turpiter atrum
desinat in piscem mulier formosa superne,
spectatum admissi risum teneatis, amici?
credite, Pisones, isti tabulae fore librum
persimilem cuius, velut aegri somnia, vanae
fingentur species, ut nec pes nec caput uni
reddatur formae. (Hor. Ars. 1-9)*

If a painter should choose to join a horse's neck to a human head and put multi-colored feathers on limbs that have been gathered from everywhere, so that a woman, beautiful on top, should disgracefully turn into a black fish below; admitted to this spectacle, friends, could you hold back a laugh? Believe, Pisos, that a book would be very similar to that painting, whose incomplete images take shape like the dreams of a sick man, so that neither foot nor head may be restored to a single form.

Body parts, even disfigured ones, should not be scrutinized separately from the whole. By likening well-ordered poetry to the physical body, Horace engages with Aristotle's doctrine of unity that the distinct parts of a poem (like limbs) are integral and inseparable from the whole.⁵³ Kirk Freudenburg observes that this argument from Aristotle "graphically confirm[s] the creative power of arrangement" in poetry by connecting poetry and the physical form.⁵⁴ A poem's arrangement is subject to the order of its individual parts in the most sensible way – but ultimately the poet is the arbiter of this organization.

⁵³ Arist. *Poe.* 8.145a30-5.

⁵⁴ Freudenburg 1993: 149-50.

Horace makes a parallel argument in *S.* 1.4 where he connects the body and body parts with poetry: *non ... invenias etiam disiecti membra poetae* (62).⁵⁵ The poet's arrangement of his verses is intentional; rearranging his words or meaning is akin to butchering his body – the physical manifestation of his poetry. The poet or artist has gone to great lengths to order his art in such a way as to elicit the desired and appropriate reaction from the audience. Surely a poet would not want the audience to laugh at the unusual arrangement of his verses, just like in the *Ars* they would laugh at a painting that is half-woman half-fish – a “gratuitous collection of limbs” that is not even a traditional hybrid creature.⁵⁶ Horace, rather, manipulates poetic arrangement by balancing the individual parts with the whole, and hence signaling to his audience when they should laugh. The image of laughter is especially relevant for his *Satires*, a hybrid genre that exists by transgressing the boundaries of genre.

The passages above demonstrate that Horace was concerned with the interplay between physical *corpus* and literary *corpus*, a theme that is constant throughout the *Satires*. The current study will show how Horace incorporates a plethora of bodies in his *Satires*, each engaged with a different sensory experience. I recognize that my own methods for this particular project operate against Horace's own dictates for his poetry. I will be pulling apart Horace's poetry to uncover his treatment of the senses and the physical body, and rearranging the poetry thematically by the senses. In Chapter 1 (Sight), Horace makes his literary persona's eyes suffer from physical ailment as *lippus*, “bleary-eyed,” in *S.* 1.5 as a reflection of the limits of his own satiric perspective, and thereby the audience's. In Chapter 2 (Taste), Horace plays with the imagery of

⁵⁵ See Most 1992, who uses this line to discuss the many dismembered and mangled limbs throughout Roman literature, particularly whether one's (literary) identity can be retained after (poetic) dismemberment.

⁵⁶ Brink 1971: 85.

satiety (*satis*) as it relates to his own poetic sensibilities and conscription for eating so that one's belly is satiated and not stuffed. Chapter 3 (Hearing) follows the persona's silence in the one-sided dialogue in *S.* 1.9 where he resorts to communicating through body language to the audience. And finally, Chapter 4 presents a case study on a single poem, *S.* 1.8, and therein applies the methods of reading the senses from the previous chapters.

I hope to impart onto the reader a new way to analyze Horace's *Satires* from a perspective of the senses during her own reading of the entire text. Horace's bodies touch, taste, hear, see, and smell their way through the *Satires* which forms a body of literature that is living, constantly perceiving and being perceived by its readers. I will show where Horace manipulates the senses of his personae and characters through suppression and amplification, and thereby manipulates the experience of reading for the audience.

CHAPTER 1

SIGHT

I looked at what Dhatt showed me. Unseeing, of course, but I could not fail to be aware of all the familiar places I passed ... the streets at home I regularly walked, now a whole city away, particular cafes I frequented that we passed, but in another country. I had them in the background now, hardly any more present than Ul Qoma when I was at home. I held my breath. I was unseeing Beszel. I had forgotten what that was like; I had tried and failed to imagine it. I was seeing Ul Qoma.
(China Miéville, *The City & The City*, 2010: 134)

Introduction

In his science fantasy novel, *The City & The City*, China Miéville paints a paradox of extreme segregation. Two distinct cities, Ul Qoma and Beszel, with two distinct cultures, occupy the same physical space. The residents of each city, however, are under legal obligation to ignore the other to enforce the segregation, disregarding even the most basic sensory input. The result is “unseeing,” or intentionally not looking at, the other city and its inhabitants on a daily basis, despite nearly colliding in space. The residents have been well trained in the social cues of their foreign neighbors precisely in order to “unsee” their homes, cars, and people, or even “unsmell” their food. The result is two isolated groups, neither engaging in the act of seeing nor being seen. The concept of “unseeing” resonates with cultures that experience racial and class segregation, marginalization of those who hold non-status quo viewpoints, and objectification of the Other.

“Unseeing” inverts the traditional features of the gaze, whereby a seeing subject can wield power over a seen object simply by the action of looking. With the eyes, the voyeur can scrutinize, marginalize, and debase the object. So, if a voyeur exhibits power through seeing, what happens when the voyeur intentionally opts out of seeing altogether? The conflict between

gazing and “unseeing” shares common features with the relationship between the satirist and literary persona in Horace’s *Satires*. Throughout *S.* 1.5, Horace’s eponymous literary persona has faulty vision because of his bleary eyes (*lippus*, *lippitudo*) that renders him isolated and marginalized. Essentially, Horace intentionally makes his bleary-eyed persona “unsee” his traveling companions, his patron, and the important political event that serves as the poem’s backdrop. The persona’s “unseeing” is a starting point for analyzing how Horace plays with the conventions of gazing and the limits of sight as a medium for his poetic program. It suggests that Horace the poet has opted out of utilizing his own critical gaze, contrary to expectations for a writer of satire.

The scope of this chapter comprises the role of sight, vision, eyes, and the gaze on Horace’s satiric journey in *S.* 1.5 (from Rome to Brundisium). Seeing plays a pivotal role during traveling, which provides the context for *S.* 1.5. When on a journey, one is removed from his or her usual environment where the everyday sights have become commonplace. Traveling creates an opportunity for the traveler to engage with a new environment in which novel sights impress upon him or her and initiates new ways of thinking. The importance of vision in traveling is reflected in the lexicography where the verb “to visit” (*visere*) is derived from “to see” (*videre*).¹ On the road to Brundisium, Horace’s literary persona suffers from impaired vision due to *lippitudo*, which generates questions about his poetics, engagement with politics, and whether he actually “saw” / “visited” (*visere*) anything. By observing *S.* 1.5 in conjunction with Lucretian optical theory and modern theoretical approaches to the gaze, we can read new meaning into Horace’s emphasis on seeing (and “unseeing”) in *S.* 1.5.

¹ OLD s.v. *viso*, *visere*, “to go and look,” or simply just “to look at” or “to view” (2); also “to visit a person” (3b).

E.g., Hor. *S.* 1.9.17: “I intend **to visit** someone you do not know” (*volo visere non tibi notum*).

Theories of Vision and Literary Theory

Horace's treatment of sight in *S.* 1.5 draws influence from the technical theory of optics by his Epicurean predecessor, Lucretius. In Book 4 of *De Rerum Natura*, Lucretius begins his discourse on the body senses by addressing the nature of optics: "among the visible objects, many cast off bodies" (*mittunt in rebus apertis / corpora res multae*," 54-5). The "visible objects" (*res apertae*, 54) emit perceptible bodies (*corpora*, 55), later called a "slender image" (*tenuis ... imago*, 64) or simply "images" (*simulacra*, 35). These images retain the shape of the visible object, likened to the sloughing off of a serpent's skin ("when a slippery serpent sheds his skin in the thorns," *cum lubrica serpens / exuit in spinis vestem*, 60-1). They project out from the visible object to come into contact with, literally "strike" (*ferio*), the eye: "the bodies **strike** the eyes and activate vision" (*corpora quae **feriant** oculos visumque lacessant*, 217).² This theory of optics – wherein particles emanate from the visible object and interact with the eye to effect vision – is called intromission³ and, like its companion theory extramission,⁴ is a tactile experience of seeing. In intromission, the eyes are passive observers as the recipients of perceptible emanations from the visible object that physically penetrate the eye.

² Similarly, Lucretius interprets the senses as animated, continuously moving, and actively engaging the body: smells flow ("and smells **flow** continually from certain objects," *perpetuoque **fluunt** certis ab rebus odores*, 218); voices fly ("many voices do not cease **flying** through the air," *nec variae cessant voces **volitare** per auras*, 221); and even taste touches us ("bitterness **touches**," *tangit amaror*, 224).

³ Intromission theory is associated with atomists Leucippe of Miletus and Democritus, and Epicurus (Bartsch 2006: 58-62).

⁴ Extramission occurs when emanations, or rays, come from the eyes themselves, rendering the observer an active participant in seeing. The theory stems from Empedocles and the Pythagoreans, and the Stoics (Bartsch 2006: 62-7).

The passivity inherent in the role of the observer in Lucretius' optical theory is mirrored in the construction of the poetic ego in Horace's *Satires*. Horace and his satiric personae often play the role of the passive observers, like the impotent garden statue, Priapus, who can only watch the destructive witches transgress into his garden (*S.* 1.8);⁵ or the poetic persona who is helpless to shake the relentless pest using him to gain access to Maecenas (*S.* 1.9).⁶ Additionally, on the road to Brundisium, the persona is isolated from his companions through ailment and, at the poem's climax, he is rendered passive: lying supine after a missed encounter with a prostitute (*S.* 1.5). In all of these examples, Horace's personae silently take in stimuli from their chaotic surroundings while maintaining separation from it. They avoid engagement with the external world, preferring to watch from a distance.

The persona in *S.* 1.5 is the most interesting incarnation of the poet Horace from a standpoint of optical theory, as he suffers from a condition that renders him visually impaired: conjunctivitis, known commonly as bleary eyes (*lippitudo*). The persona still relays his observations to the audience, but what he sees is subject to a self-imposed filter. When the audience sees through the eyes of the satirist, we ultimately find that we are not seeing the full picture. We can only see what the persona could see (or "unsee") which is only what the satirist allows us to see (or "unsee").

Lucretius belongs to a long line of thinkers who expounded upon the importance of eyes and vision. Aristotle, recognizing the power of optics, places sight at the top of his hierarchy of senses.⁷ The English language (along with many other languages) exhibits opticentric tendencies

⁵ See Chapter 4: 171-2, 193.

⁶ See Chapter 3 (Hearing): 141-9.

⁷ In order: "vision, hearing, smell, taste, and touch" (ὄψιν, ἀκοήν, ὄσφρησιν, γεῦσιν, ἀφήν, Arist. *de An.* 424b1-2).

Vision is afforded the first treatment (418a27-419a25). Even from the time of Homer, the Greeks exhibit an

by aligning sight with intellectual faculty so that seeing is synonymous with understanding. The expression “I see” can also mean “I understand,” and certain English words related to knowledge acquisition, like “theory” (Gk. θεωρία, “beholding, viewing”), “speculation” (Lat. *specular*, “to look at”), “enlightenment” (Gk. λευκός, “white, bright,” λευκόω “to whiten,” λεύσσω, “to see”) and “lucid” (Lat. *lux*, “light”) derive from words related to sight, light, and brightness.⁸ Even in the Greek language, the verb “to know” (οἶδα, εἰδέναι) is a perfect tense form of “to see” (ὁράω, ὁρᾶν) with a present meaning; the idea is that “to know” something is “to have seen with the mind’s eye.”⁹ The “seeing” / “knowing” pun is integral to reading nuance, for example, in Oedipus’ journey to enlightenment through physical blindness in Sophocles’ *Oedipus the King*. Additionally, Plato’s allegory of the cave in the *Republic*¹⁰ also plays with the connection between vision and awareness by employing many different words for “to see.”¹¹ Philosophical understanding is analogized as a cave dweller turning from the darkness of the cave to view the

“affinity for the visible,” (Jay 1993: 21), evident in *Odyssey* 19 when Eurykleia recognizes Odysseus by his visible scar, a physical marker that triggers her memory (Auerbach 1953: 2).

⁸ Bartsch 2006: 15.

⁹ *LSJ* s.v. εἶδω A.c. and B.a.

¹⁰ Pl. *R.* 7.514a-517c. This passage is discussed in relation to vision by Bartsch 2006: 43-4.

¹¹ Pl. *R.* 515d: “Whenever someone should be freed and suddenly stood up and walked around and **looked** up toward the light, he would be in pain doing all these things because, on account of the glare, he would be unable **to see** the objects whose shadows he **saw** before. [...] Don’t you think he would be at a loss and think that what he **had seen** before was more real than what **was shown** to him now?” (ὁπότε τις λυθείη καὶ ἀναγκάζοιτο ἐξαίφνης ἀνίστασθαι τε καὶ περιάγειν τὸν ἀγχένα καὶ βαδίζειν καὶ πρὸς τὸ φῶς **ἀναβλέπειν**, πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ποιῶν ἀλγοῖ τε καὶ διὰ τὰς μαρμαρυγὰς ἀδυνατοῖ **καθορᾶν** ἐνεῖνα ὃν τότε τὰς σκιάς **έώρα**. [...] οὐκ οἶε αὐτὸν ἀπορεῖν τε ἂν καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι τὰ τότε **ὁρώμενα** ἀληθέστερα ἢ τὰ νῦν δεικνύμενα).

true forms of objects in the light. These are merely two examples of many more instances in Greek literature that play on the relationship between “seeing” and “knowing.”

Classical scholarship that applies theoretical frameworks of vision and the gaze to ancient literature has been on the rise.¹² David Fredrick’s *The Roman Gaze* (2002) offers a collection of independent studies that situate perspectives of the body and gaze within Roman literature, art, and archaeology. Relevant contributions include Pamela Gordon’s “Some Unseen Monster: Rereading Lucretius on Sex,” which discusses the “intimate connection between image and erotic desire” in Lucretius’ treatment of sex and the body (4.1030-287);¹³ and Carlin Barton’s “Being in the Eyes: Shame and Sight in Ancient Rome” discusses the value of being overlooked in Ancient Rome, and the associated danger of being visible as a test of Roman concepts of honor and shame.¹⁴ Barton writes that “*pudor* was the guilt, the anguish of the person who could not bear the trial of either one’s own or another’s eyes” and that Romans were constantly “at the

¹² Llewellyn-Jones 2003 is a sartorial analysis of the vocabulary, literary evidence, iconography, and symbolism of veiling of women in Ancient Greece, which rendered the women both chaste and invisible; Morales 2004 applies a framework of psychoanalysis and feminism to observe the what the characters in Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Clitophon* see and how language and vision construct concepts of gender; Salzman-Mitchell 2005 reads Ovid through a lens of feminist film theory (especially Mulvey 1999) to treat the fixed gaze of men in scenes of rape as a source of narrative pleasure, and in the punished gaze employed by women; and Lovatt 2013 in a recent monograph conducts a study across language and time of the ancient epic poets’ approaches to vision and the gaze, particularly the gaze of the gods, mortals, heroes, women, in visions, dreams, prophecies, and ecphrasis.

¹³ Gordon 2002: 87.

¹⁴ Barton 2002: 220-3. This draws heavily from Barton 1993, a book-length treatment that observes audience perception of the gladiator in a context of spectacle and entertainment (especially within a model of *devotio*, 11-46), the *pudenda/veneranda* paradox (98-9), and the evil eye, *fascinum* (91-106).

mercy of the gaze of others.”¹⁵ Shadi Bartsch’s monograph *The Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-Knowledge, and the Gaze in the Early Roman Empire* (2006) provides an overview of the theories of ancient optics in philosophy¹⁶ and observes the relationship between vision, introspection, and philosophy. Bartsch points to the mirror as the symbol for introspection and self-knowledge, but also vanity and emasculation.¹⁷

My study adopts the methodologies employed in Riggs Alden Smith’s *The Primacy of Vision in Virgil’s Aeneid* (2005), which analyzes language related to eyes and vision, visual imagery, characters’ communication through visual symbols, and narrative focalization in the Augustan epic. Smith argues that the *Aeneid* encompasses a “shift from rhetoric to vision as the paramount form of communication in the narrative.”¹⁸ This observation is derived from the works of Karl Galinsky and Paul Zanker, which ties the decline of Republican rhetoric in the Age of Augustus to a cultural adoption of visual imperial identity and achievement through erection of monuments, buildings, sculptures, and interest in the visual arts, like theater.¹⁹ Furthermore, Smith applies the phenomenology of French theorist Maurice Merleau-Ponty²⁰ to the *Aeneid*, in

¹⁵ Barton 2002: 226-7.

¹⁶ Bartsch 2006: 58-67.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*: 55.

¹⁸ Smith 2005: 7.

¹⁹ Galinsky 1996 and Zanker 1990.

²⁰ Merleau-Ponty 1968 and 1964; see Smith 2005: 5-7 for an overview of Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology.

particular drawing connections between aspects of the *voyant-visible* (or an individual motivated to action by vision) to the character Aeneas.²¹

Following Smith, the scope of my study observes the emphasis Horace places on vision and the body parts associated with vision, and its impact on narrative voice vis-à-vis the satiric mask and persona theory. My observations are not confined to a specific theoretical framework like that of Merleau-Ponty, Sigmund Freud,²² Jacques Lacan, or Jean-Paul Sartre.²³ These theories inform my reading of ancient text, but my approach to theory remains “consciously eclectic,” to use the words of Helen Lovatt.²⁴ I draw inspiration from the application of modern thought in the aforementioned scholarly treatments to theories of sight and the gaze in Classical literature.

One particular theoretical model that informs my reading is Laura Mulvey’s “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema” (1999). Mulvey uses Freud’s theory of scopophilia as an interpretive model for the masculine voyeuristic gaze in contemporary cinema.²⁵ The visual presence of women on film is characterized by a “pleasure in looking,” and thus female bodies are displayed and exhibited for a strong erotic impact, connoting what Mulvey calls “to-be-looked-at-ness.”²⁶

²¹ This interpretive model is particularly applicable in the final scene of the *Aeneid* in which Aeneas, moved by the visual relic of Pallas’ belt rather than a verbal appeal for mercy, kills Turnus, thereby founding Rome on a symbolic preference for the visible over rhetoric (Smith 2005: 167-75).

²² Freud discusses scopophilia as “taking other people as objects, subjecting them to a controlling and curious gaze,” most evident in the voyeurism of small children and later connected to auto-eroticism (Mulvey 1999: 835).

²³ See Jay 1993: 329-80 on Lacan, and 263-328 on Sartre and Merleau-Ponty. Fredrick 2002: 5-6 criticizes Jay 1993 for overlooking Rome in his critique of the Western gaze.

²⁴ Lovatt 2013: 22. She elaborates, writing, “I use modern ideas as ways to think about things, to start a dialogue with ancient material, as heuristic tools.”

²⁵ Mulvey 1999: 835.

²⁶ *Ibid.*: 837.

Camera perspectives are filmed from the viewpoint of the male gaze, which exerts a fetishist and even sadistic power over the passive, objectified female on screen, thereby interrupting “the development of a story line, to freeze the flow of action in moments of erotic contemplation.”²⁷ Film theory in particular provides a nice framework for reading satire because of the diverse perspectives created by the poet/satirist who controls the actions and gaze of his personae – much like the relationship between a film director and actors; and this is done for the benefit of and with the reading audience in mind – much like an audience viewing a film. Horace’s *Satires* in particular is consciously aware of visual aesthetics and similarly employ the gaze, which also validates a side-by-side reading with film theory.

This chapter concerns the sights (and impaired sight) on Horace’s journey to Brundisium. Horace manipulates words for sight, expectation, ocular ailment, and dysfunction to express aspects of his literary program – namely his engagement with politics, integration of other genres, and primarily his use of the satiric gaze. My study converts Mulvey’s gendered voyeuristic and active male gaze into a satiric context. Horace’s satire inverts Mulvey’s conventional gaze so that the satiric persona who ought to utilize his gaze rejects it (in an act of consciously “unseeing”), rendering him passive and powerless. Horace the poet and satirist, on the other hand, is made powerful by his manipulation of the character’s gaze, even when that gaze is blunted, and exhibits control over both characters and audience. I do not necessarily locate a gendered element in Horace’s use/rejection of the satiric gaze, but I am rather focusing on how the gaze establishes and breaks down satiric power structures. Horace plays with the

²⁷ *Ibid.* Fredrick 2002 recognizes the impact of Mulvey on theories of the gaze, but also criticizes her contradictory treatment of the scopophilic gaze that simultaneously initiates and prevents separation between the gazing subject and gazed-at object. He then enumerates the responses to Mulvey from film studies (14-6). See also Lovatt 2013: 7-9.

aesthetics of sight as one means to differentiate himself from his literary predecessor, Lucilius, in a battle between their two *itineraria*.

Traveling Bodies, Sick Bodies

Vision, sight, the gaze, and eyes play a significant role in *S.* 1.5, a travelogue in which Horace bemoans the physical difficulties of travel on the road from Rome to Brundisium. *S.* 1.5 is a reworking of satiric predecessor Lucilius' fragmentary *Iter Siculum*,²⁸ originally a lengthy account of a journey from Rome to Sicily through Capua.²⁹ In these fragments, Lucilius portrays his persona as a wealthy landowner on a journey to attend personal business, perhaps to survey his land holdings.³⁰ Even based on what little we know about Lucilius' *iter*, the motivation for Lucilius' travel starkly contrasts the impetus for Horace's journey. In *S.* 1.5, Horace

²⁸ Thirty-five fragments from Lucilius' *Satires* Book 3 are attributed to his *iter* in Charpin's 1978 edition; not included are fr. 96M and 148M (Marx 1904-5; unattributed in Warmington 1938 and Charpin 1978) because they contain only a single word of Lucilius, which Horace's scholiast Porphyrio preserves in the introduction to *S.* 1.5: "Horace emulates Lucilius in this satire describing his journey from Rome to Brundisium, which Lucilius put in his third book, describing his journey first from Rome all the way to Capua and from there to the Strait of Sicily" (*Lucilio ha[e]c satyra aemulatur Horatius iter suum a Roma Brundisium usque describens, quod et ille in tertio libro fecit, primo a Roma Capuam usque et inde fretum Siciliense*, Holder 1979 *ad Hor. S.* 1.5.1).

²⁹ Other poets authored travelogues in the style of Lucilius, like Cicero (no longer extant) and Valgius, whose fragments describe a journey up the Po: "[My ship] sails where the mouth of the canal joins the quiet Padua with the large river of the Alpine Po" (*et placidam fossae qua iungunt ora Padusam / navigat Alpini flumina magni Padi*, fr. 3); "Here my prow, advancing with a long tow-rope, brought me happily into a welcome inn" (*hic mea longo succedens prora remulco / laetantem gratis sistit in hospitibus*, fr. 4; Courtney 1993: 289-90). Cf. Catul. 4; Cinna *poet.* fr. 4.

³⁰ Barchiesi and Cucchiarelli 2005: 213.

accompanies his new patron, Maecenas, to reconcile estranged allies, Marc Antony and Caesar Octavian, in the midst of the *Bellum Siculum*.³¹ The meeting is considered by scholars to be a delegation sent to help negotiate the historical Treaty of Tarentum (37 BCE),³² taking place not long after Horace was first invited into Maecenas' social network of poets.³³ Despite the connection to a highly politicized event, Horace's persona does not play a large role in the reconciliation; rather, he is relegated to the background and turns his bleary-eyed gaze to more trifling matters, like his ailing body.

Horace's *iter* immediately follows *S.* 1.4 in which he lays out his satiric poetic program. He compares his own slender satire to that of Lucilius, who left a heaping thirty books of *Satires*, of which only fragments survive. Horace writes:

facetus
emunctae naris, durus componere versus,
nam fuit hoc vitiosus: in hora saepe ducentos,
ut magnum, versus dictabat stans pede in uno. 10
cum flueret lutulentus, erat quod tollere velles,
garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem,
scribendi recte. (Hor. S. 1.4.7-13)

³¹ The two *ultores* sought to unite against Sextus Pompey, son of Pompey Magnus (DuQuesnay 1984: 21-3).

³² Or the peace talks in Athens of 38 BCE, or the Pact of Brundisium of 40 BCE (Musurillo 1954: 159-162; DuQuesnay 1984: 20-1; Freudenburg 2001: 56-7; Schlegel 2010: 263).

³³ Being invited on such an important mission, Reckford 1999: 528 notes, "must have signaled [Horace's] further belonging, not long after his first acceptance by Maecenas." White 1993: 36-7 remarks that we have little knowledge about the companions that might have filled out Maecenas' literary group (certainly Vergil and Varius Rufus, as evident from *S.* 1.5), and furthermore calls into question its common designation as a "circle." More accurately, Maecenas' friends and poet-clients were part of a complicated web of social relationships. The men within this network may have belonged to different economic classes and additional social circles themselves; they may not know one other intimately, and certainly did not socialize exclusively around one central figure (Maecenas), as the shape of a circle suggests.

(Lucilius is) witty, with a well-blown nose, and a tireless composer of verses. For he was flawed in this way: he often dictated 200 verses per hour while standing on one foot, as though it were a big thing. When he flowed muddy, you'd want to take away whatever there was. He was loquacious and too lazy to take up the task of writing – (or rather) writing well.

Horace enumerates Lucilius' compositional and aesthetic flaws (*vitiosus*, 8). Because of his enormous poetic production, Horace accuses Lucilius of being a tireless composer, or "rough" (*durus*, 8), "verbose" (*garrulus*, 12), and a "lazy writer" (*piger scribendi*, 12). The iconic image in this passage is Lucilius standing on one foot dictating verses (*versus dictabat stans pede in uno*, 10). Horace conveys this comical image of Lucilius within one line, underscoring their aesthetic difference, and Lucilius' sense of carelessness and preference for quantity over quality. Hence, Lucilian verse "flows muddy" (*flueret lutulentus*, 11) like an abundant, thick, and dark stream that floods its own banks, beyond its natural boundaries. Horace's overflowing muddy river is thought to be based on Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* in a narrative that similarly criticizes the prolific flow of writers of epic and the grand style.³⁴ Lucilius' lazy writing, then, is equated with bad writing, as Horace states: he was "lazy to take up the task of writing ... or rather, writing well" (*piger scribendi ... scribendi recte*, 12-13).³⁵ Lucilius' flow is "muddy" in particular because it contains invective, or *libertas*, like the writers of comedy who wrote "with much freedom of speech" (*multa cum libertate*, 5). As Ian DuQuesnay writes, Lucilius' very name "was virtually synonymous with personal abuse and invective,"³⁶ which enabled him to write biting, abrasive satire and metaphorically "rub down the entire city with much salt" (*sale*

³⁴ Freudenburg 1993: 158, 2001: 45-6.

³⁵ Freudenburg 2001: 2 writes that the transition from Lucilian to Horatian satire might have been "equally abrupt and disorienting," hence Horace saw a need to justify or explain his departure from the expected conventions of the genre.

³⁶ DuQuesnay 1984: 29.

multo / urbem defricuit, S. 1.10.3-4). Horace, exhibiting what Catherine Schlegel calls a “moderating persona,” consciously rejects Lucilian *libertas* and has different goals for his satire.³⁷

The successive placement of programmatic S. 1.4 and travelogue S. 1.5 affords the opportunity to immediately juxtapose Horatian and Lucilian satiric styles within a similar poetic structure and theme. Although the satirists’ *itineraria* differ in tone, both curiously focus on the bodily discomforts of travel – as best as can be gleaned from the fragmentary nature of Lucilius’ verses.³⁸ On Lucilius’ journey, he famously describes a bout of indigestion: “then you puff out putrid belching from your chest” (*exhalas tum acidos ex pectore ructus*, 136M = 130W = 3.28C).³⁹ An analogue for this passage can be found in Horace’s stomach troubles due to a bad experience with water: “I wage war on my stomach” (*ventri / indico bellum*, S. 1.5.7-8).⁴⁰ In general, Horace resists addressing the diplomatic aspect of travel and instead highlights the trivialities of the trip, especially bodily dysfunction. The corporeal focus of Horace’s *iter*, along

³⁷ Schlegel 2010: 6.

³⁸ *Ibid.*: 263. Scholars have extensively compared the *itineraria*, like Fiske 1920: 306-16; Cucchiarelli 2001: 33-43; Cucchiarelli 2002: 851 argues for Horace’s borrowings from Old Comedy, especially its tendency to being terse and smooth; and Sommerstein 2011 draws on Cucchiarelli 2002 (especially 847-50) to argue parallels between S. 1.5, Lucil. Book 3, and Ar. *Ran.* to show that Lucilius read and imitated Old Comedy (30-4). As a caveat in this exercise of using fragments as comparanda, Schlegel 2010: 253 warns that “Horace’s powerful voice has tended to dictate what we think of Lucilius. The problem is exacerbated by the drastic incompleteness of Lucilius’ work as it is left to us.”

³⁹ I utilize the conventional numeration of Lucilian fragment in Marx 1904-5 (M) and Warmington 1938 (W); the Latin text is from Charpin (C) 1978, so I have also included his fragment numbers in the following format: (book number.fragment numberC).

⁴⁰ This passage is addressed at length along with other forms of digestive dysfunction in Chapter 2: 121-6.

with the fragmentary evidence from Lucilius, has led scholars to believe that bodies were important for satire from its inception.⁴¹

In addition to waging war on his stomach, the persona's body primarily suffers from eye inflammation (*lippus*, *S.* 1.5.30; *lippis*, 49). *Lippitudo* is a condition in which the eyes are inflamed and leak viscous fluid. Watery eyes obscure vision, exacerbate light sensitivity, and limit the body's normal activity. Imposing *lippitudo* onto his literary persona allows Horace to isolate the persona from his patron and political reality, emphasize aspects of his poetic program, and play with the conventions of the satiric gaze.⁴² "like a data-gathering probe, the traveling satirist observes, registers, and selects. His satire is the result of his observation, and of his own subjectivity in relation to a specific social reality."⁴³ Horace fashions a reality for his persona in which *lippitudo* impairs the persona's ability to see, and therefore invites the audience to question what he saw and how he saw it. The audience's own experience of the Appian Way is colored by how Horace perceives it – or in some cases, fails to perceive.

Maecenas' first appearance in the poem also marks the first symptoms of the persona's *lippitudo*:

*huc venturus erat Maecenas optimus atque
Cocceius, missi magnis de rebus uterque
legati, aversos soliti componere amicos.
hic oculis ego nigra meis collyria lippus
illinere. interea Maecenas advenit atque
Cocceius Capitoque simul Fonteius, ad unguem
factus homo, Antoni non ut magis alter amicus.* (Hor. *S.* 1.5.27-33)

30

⁴¹ Barchiesi and Cucchiarelli 2005: 210; Freeman 2014: 72-9.

⁴² *Lippus* appears at *S.* 1.5.30 and 48. Outside of *S.* 1.5, *lippus* also appears at *S.* 1.1.120, 3.25, 7.3; *Ep.* 1.1.28 and 1.2.51. I will analyze only a few of these instances as they pertain to the aesthetics of *S.* 1.5.

⁴³ Barchiesi and Cucchiarelli 2005: 213.

Noble Maecenas was to come to this place and Cocceius, each sent as envoys regarding important matters, accustomed to reconcile feuding friends. Here I, suffering from inflamed eyes, smear black ointment on my eyes. Meanwhile Maecenas arrived along with Cocceius and Fonteius Capito, a gentleman to his fingertips, so that Antony has no other greater friend.

The text in this passage uses discourse of exclusion to place Horace outside the boundaries of the group and beyond Maecenas' gaze. Maecenas and the others who have come to aid the reconciliation of Octavian and Antony are described in terms that confer status and importance: *optimus* (27), *missi magnis de rebus* (28), *ad unguem / factus homo* (32-3), *non ut magis alter amicus* (33). Additionally, the active periphrastic *venturus erat* casts Maecenas' presence in an official capacity as a *legatus* (29). In contrast to his notable traveling companions, the literary Horace is *lippus*, "bleary-eyed," whose very mention – succinctly stated as *hic oculis ego* (30) – appears abruptly between two references to Maecenas by name. The persona's activities have nothing to do with the political mission at hand (*aversos ... componere amicos*, 29). Instead, he has his own issues to tend to – namely, smearing ointment on his sick eyes (*illinere*, 31). The proximity of *oculis ego* underscores that the focus of the narrative *ego* is on his own body. Frequently throughout this poem, Horace shifts the dominant storyline to something seemingly irrelevant, and often centralized in the poet's body. And so, in interrupting the continuity of the lines, the persona also interrupts the mission itself.⁴⁴

The persona's obscured vision emphasizes his exclusion from Maecenas. The two men are engaged in different activities in the narrative that do not allow them to integrate: Maecenas' attention is focused on the peace talks, while Horace's persona is preoccupied with his own bodily dysfunction. Exclusionary measures continue when Horace's ailment compels him to sleep while his patron plays: "Maecenas goes to play a game, but Vergil and I go to sleep. Playing ball is distasteful to the bleary-eyed and dyspeptic" (*lulum it Maecenas, dormitum ego*

⁴⁴ Gowers 2012: 194.

Vergiliusque; / namque pila lippis inimicum et ludere crudis, 48-9). In what could be a time for camaraderie, Horace and Vergil have both succumb to ailment and are practically quarantined. Again, Maecenas's focus is locked on a lively activity of ball, separate from Horace whose vision is impaired through his bleary, salve-filled eyes. Of the three occurrences of Maecenas' name in *S. 1.5*,⁴⁵ all three accompany mention of the ailing persona. Calling Maecenas by name exclusively in a context of the persona's illness emphasizes the separation between patron and client, and juxtaposition in their bodily activity and health.

Horatius lippus

Whether Horace the poet actually suffered from *lippitudo* is not the topic of this study.⁴⁶ In fact, it is incorrect to assume that any of Horace's personae present a strict autobiographical portrait of the poet and satirist. Nevertheless, it is significant that Horace constructs an ailing persona to bear his name, not necessarily because he suffered from *lippitudo*, but to convey a message about his poetry, his times, a moralizing message, or to make a joke – the list could go on.⁴⁷ The

⁴⁵ *S. 1.5.27, 31, 48.*

⁴⁶ According to Suet. *Vit. Hor.*, Horace had a sickly disposition, alluded to in a letter of Augustus: "Just as if you are my companion, take any liberty at my house. For it is right and proper that you do so because I wanted you to make use of me in this way if it were allowed to happen **in spite of your health**" (*sume tibi aliquid iuris apud me, tamquam si convictor mihi fueris; recte enim et non temere feceris, quoniam id usus mihi tecum esse volui, si per valetudinem tuam fieri posset*, *Vit. Hor.* 26-9; text from Rostagni 1979). Horace's ailment nearly prevents him from arranging his last will and testament: "Augustus was made as heir only by oral agreement, since he could not sign his will's tablets due to the **force of an illness** overcoming him" (*herede Augusto palam nuncupato, cum urgente vi valetudinis non sufficeret ad obsignandas testamenti tabulas*, *Vit. Hor.* 76-7). Beyond issues of general wellness and health, there is no evidence Horace was known to suffer from *lippitudo* in particular.

⁴⁷ Freeman 2014: 76-8 gives a synopsis of the scholarship on the Horatian persona.

remainder of the chapter will attempt to parse the meaning of Horace's body ailment, *lippitudo*, and the other dysfunctional bodies that surround the sense of vision. The present section is dedicated to the function of *lippitudo* in technical literature, Roman comedy, and in connection with writers. Horace relies on the literary traditions of *lippus* to enhance his satiric manifestation.

The condition known as *lippitudo* to the ancients is most similar to modern day conjunctivitis: inflammation or infection of the conjunctiva (a thin layer of membrane on the eyelid).⁴⁸ However *lippitudo* is only one of many ocular ailments known from antiquity. In fact, when compared to other medical ailments, there is a disproportionately large amount of medical discourses on eye ailments that survive from antiquity: Galen references over 100 different types of eye conditions; and Celsus' *De Medicina* 6 and Herophilus' *On Eyes* (no longer extant) are treatises entirely dedicated to eyes. Close attention to the eyes in the medical literature suggests the ancients' obsession with ocular health.⁴⁹ In light of Aristotle placing sight at the top of his hierarchy of senses,⁵⁰ preoccupation with eye health is not surprising. Sight was and continues to be the primary sense by which people interact with the physical world, especially in modern

⁴⁸ Jackson 1996: 2229 writes that *lippitudo* can signify a number of different eye ailments, conjunctivitis being simply one: "As with all ancient descriptions of diseases those of the eye can seldom be equated unequivocally with a modern disease. Often the symptoms described are insufficiently diagnostic and might indicate one of a number of diseases. There is the possibility, too, that certain diseases of the past no longer exist or have since mutated. Nevertheless, it is possible to recognize in the ancient descriptions many defects, ailments and infections which still occur today or have occurred in recent times."

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ Arist. *de An.* 424b1-2.

ocularcentric Western culture.⁵¹ An ailment that impacts the eyes, then, endangers this primary mode of human perception and could leave the sufferer entirely cut off from the external world. Although there are many different types of ocular maladies discussed in the medical texts, the following word study focuses on *lippitudo* – the nominal type suffered by Horace.

Horace incorporates technical details from ancient medical practice in the construction of his ailing persona. According to Celsus in *De Medicina*, *lippitudo* is the equivalent of the Greek condition called *ophthalmia* by Hippocrates,⁵² and is characterized as “tearing, and swelling, and a thick mucous appear all at once” (*simul et lacrima et tumor et crassa pituita coeperunt*, Cels. 6.6.1A). In certain contexts, *lippitudo* is symptomatic of a worse ocular condition, like trachoma (*aspritudo*). Celsus goes on to describe a common remedy:

Nonnumquam etiam ex aspritudine lippitudo fit. [...] In hoc genere valetudinis quidam crassas durasque palpebras et ficulneo folio et asperato specillo et interdum scalpello eradunt, versasque cotidie medicamentis suffricant. (Cels. 6.6.27A)

Sometimes inflammation also occurs due to trachoma. [...] In this type of condition, some people scrape the inflamed and rough eyelids with a fig leaf, a sharp probe, or sometimes with a scalpel; and every day they rub ointments on the inside of their eyelids.

Celsus recommends scraping the inflamed eyelids with a coarse, sharp instrument, or smearing a medicinal ointment (*medicamentis*) onto and under the eyelids. Archaeological remains of *collyrium*-stamps survive today in large numbers. These containers of ocular medicament were labeled with the name of the medical ointment concealed inside, the patient’s name, and the ailment suffered.⁵³ Other remedies include taking frequent baths,⁵⁴ abstaining from food,⁵⁵

⁵¹ Jay 1993: 24, whose entire monograph is dedicated to demonstrating the departure from the ocularcentric model in Western thought by 21st century French thinkers.

⁵² ὀφθαλμία (Spencer 1935: 185; cf. Hp. *Coac.*, *Judic.*, *Prog.*).

⁵³ Jackson 1996: 2230, 2232-5.

⁵⁴ Cels. 6.6.27B: “We will make use of frequent bathing” (*utemur et balneo frequentiore*).

retreating to a dark room, and refraining from talking.⁵⁶ Clearly the sufferer would be stigmatized, not only because of the ailment itself, but also through performing the remedies that foster exclusion from normal activity. In *S.* 1.5, Horace's bleary-eyed persona takes on the characteristics of someone who has been quarantined as he tries to heal himself through application of medicine (*collyrium*, 30) and bed rest (*dormitum*, 38), further underscoring his exclusion from his healthy compatriots.

Horace's construction of the ailing persona in *S.* 1.5 also relies on the use of physical ailment as a stock invective tool and measure of exclusion. According to Cicero's *De Oratore*, deriding physical appearance was a common source of mockery and objectification across genres.⁵⁷ Many charges of this sort are conventional and "intended to cause pain or hilarity, not to be believed."⁵⁸ Horace's suffering persona is derided on account of his ailment, rendering him the abject object of a joke. In Plautus' *Bacchides*, the ailment *lippitudo* is similarly used in the debasement of a slave:

*lippi illic oculi servos et simillimus:
si non est, nolis esse nec desideres;*

⁵⁵ Cels. 6.6.1E: "Rest and abstinence" (*quies et abstentia*); 6.6.1F: "one ought ... to consume no food and not even water, if possible" (*debet ... nullum cibum adsumere, si fieri potest, ne aquam quidem*).

⁵⁶ Cels. 6.6.1F: "And so on the first day one should lay down in a dark place and also abstain from conversation" (*ergo primo die loco obscuro cubare debet, sic ut a sermone quoque abstineat*).

⁵⁷ Cic. *de Or.* 2.266: "But especially appearances are ridiculed, which are considered as deformity or as some blemish on the body, similar to something rather ugly" (*valde autem ridentur etiam imagines, quae fere in deformitatem aut in aliquod vitium corporis ducuntur cum similitudine turpioris*). Nisbet 1987: 194.

⁵⁸ Nisbet 1987: 196-7. Similarly, Martial's *Epigrams* utilize "bodily flaw as a source of wit" and thereby reflect "the typically Roman propensity to poke fun at the physical peculiarities of others, a characteristic attested both in literary sources and in the prevalence of derogatory surnames like Crassus, Naso, or Strabo" (Watson 1982: 71).

si est, apstinere quin attingas non queas. (Pl. *Bac.* 913-15)⁵⁹

That servant of mine is very much like an inflamed eye; if you don't have one, you don't want one nor miss it; if you have one, you can't stop touching it.

The objectification of the slave is heightened because the slave does not *suffer* from *lippitudo* – he *is* the bleary eye (*lippi ... oculi*, 913). The ‘slave-as-bleary-eye’ metaphor deconstructs a human being to a mere body part, which is lowered even further to an *ailing* body part. Slaves already occupied the lowest position in Roman social hierarchy, and the association with physical ailment only emphasizes the debasement. Just like Plautus, Horace’s bleary-eye metaphor applies measures of abjection to the persona in *S.* 1.5; but in this case, the persona, the object, is the satiric self. In her study on humor in satire, Maria Plaza calls this an example of “subject-oriented humor.” Subject-oriented humor occurs when the satirist debases a persona that can be perceived as a doublet of himself – perhaps they share the same name – and so, by extension, he debases himself. Yet, Plaza argues, this tactic is mild enough that it does not hinder the poet’s satiric message.⁶⁰ This is the case for Horace, whose message and program is not only unhindered, but underscored through debasing the persona.

Returning to Plautus, there is more beneath the surface of the ‘slave-as-bleary-eye’ metaphor that can flesh out the nuance in Horace’s own use of *lippitudo*. Likening slaves to bleary eyes is

⁵⁹ A similar sexual innuendo associated with slavery and *lippitudo* can be found in another Plautine play, relayed in the voice of a slave boy: “But yet, just as from a sore eye, my master can’t keep his hands off of me” (*sed quasi lippo oculo me erus meus manum apstinere hau quit tamen*, *Per.* 11).

⁶⁰ Plaza 2006: 167 argues that in cases of “‘self humour’ entirely on the part of the persona (he is shown to mock himself),” the author is still in full control of his persona’s presentation, and thus does not undermine his authority. Plaza, citing *S.* 1.5 as an exemplar, writes that “a person who is able to laugh at himself is felt to be in complete control of himself and of discourse, since he alone is both subject and object in the discursive game of humor” (169). I follow Plaza’s categories of satiric humor: object-oriented, subject-oriented, and non-aligned.

a troubling representation of slavery and the sexual subservience ingrained within the institution. In Rome, it was conventional for upper-class males to assume a visible position within public life (in the senate, the forum, etc.), such that being visible was associated with candor, honor, and therefore trustworthiness.⁶¹ Roman slaves, on the other hand, were not usually the object of the upper class' gaze and attention, perhaps because slaves ought not be seen.⁶² Furthermore, mastery over slaves was synonymous with mastery over the slave's bodies. Slaves and slaves bodies together with ailing eyes are simultaneously undesirable and desirable things, according to Plautus. When the undesirable slaves are seen, they become objects of sexual desire. They are eroticized as desirable to touch (*attingas*, 915), using a verb that means both "to scratch" and a euphemism for "to have intercourse."⁶³ Both "touching" the slave and "touching" the bleary eye are unavoidable pleasures that satisfy different physical compulsions: lust and itching.

Throughout this passage, the slaves take on the characteristics of bleary eyes – itself a source of blindness. Just as a bleary eye would cause distorted vision, so too does this passage imply

⁶¹ Barton 2002: 220-1. The opposite is true of Roman women, who were encouraged to wear veils in public. If a woman wore obvious makeup or dressed up, giving the impression she wished to be seen, she was associated with shamelessness and even prostitution (221-2; Richlin 1992b: 185-213).

⁶² duBois 2003: 6 argues that the "invisibility and ubiquity" of slaves in antiquity was at constantly at odds. I believe Plautus is addressing the inherent contradiction of overlooking slaves within the conspicuous institution of slavery. Furthermore, duBois remarks that a similar "blindness" to slaves is apparent in the modern readers of ancient text: "the slave is a sort of uncanny object, standing at a blind spot of modernity where the place of the subject and that of the object intersect" (29).

⁶³ Adams 1990: 186. Cf. Horace *S.* 1.2.28-9: "There are those who refuse **to touch** any women other than those whose border of a stitched garment **covers** her ankles" (*sunt qui nolint tetigisse nisi illas / quarum subsuta talos tegat instita veste*) which plays on two meanings of "to touch" (one innocent, another crude), and fetishizes the unseen covered body (*tegat*).

that Roman society turns a blind eye – or rather, a bleary eye – to slaves. Horace also blurs the imagery of bleary eyes and invisibility. His own bleary-eyed persona, like Plautus’ slave, has been relegated to the background of the poem. Yet it seems that Maecenas is the one who has lost sight of him, rather than the other way around. Maecenas focuses on the political mission (*aversos ... componere amicos*, 29) and playing games (*lusum it*, 48), whereas the persona is physically separated from him in order to tend to his ailment. By making his persona *lippus*, Horace not only limits his sight, but also renders him invisible to his patron and high-ranking friends.

Finally, Horace’s use of *lippitudo* plays on the reputation of writers who suffer from bleary-eyes due to long hours spent writing. It is no coincidence that the *lippus* persona is a poet. Outside of the *Satires*, *lippitudo* is a condition connected with voracious reading and writing, as Cicero attests in his letters. Owing to eye inflammation, Cicero was compelled to have a scribe dictate his letters (*sed dictavi propter lippitudinem*, *Att.* 7.13a.3.13-4). In another letter, he complains that his condition hinders his writing: “my eye inflammation frequently angers me, not because it is exceedingly bothersome, but because it is of the sort that prevents my writing” (*crebro refricat lippitudo, non illa quidem perodiosa sed tamen quae impediatur scriptionem meam*, *Att.* 10.17.2).⁶⁴ Similarly, Pliny the Younger writes of ocular dysfunction, making his another example of a private, literary lifestyle affected by the illness: “Although my eyes are still bleary, they were sharp enough; I saw the chicken was incredibly plump. Goodbye!” (*Gallinam ... quam satis acribus oculis, quamquam adhuc lippus pinguissimam vidi. vale*, *Ep.* 7.21.4.14).

⁶⁴ *Lippitudo* also appears in the following letters: *Att.* 14.1.1-2, 8.12.1-3, 8.13.1, 10.14.1, 10.17.2; and *Q. fr.* 2.2.1.

In *S.* 1.1, Horace derides the prolific Stoic writer, Crispinus, by calling him *lippus*:⁶⁵ “that’s enough now. I will not contribute another word so you do not think I stole bleary-eyed Crispinus’ rolls!” (*iam satis est. ne me Crispini scrinia lippi / compilasse putes, verbum non amplius addam*, *S.* 1.1.120-1). Horace fashions Crispinus into a metaphor for the moral blindness of Stoicism – just one of the many critiques Horace levels against philosophy and philosophers. In particular, Horace criticizes Crispinus’ prolific production of verses, implying that lengthy writing did irreparable harm to his eyes, leaving him *lippus*. Horace, drawing upon the reputation of bleary eyes as a condition of writers, indicates that it is caused by long hours spent writing verses.⁶⁶ For someone who is *lippus*, short poetry (i.e., less time spent in front of paper and pen) would be the ultimate goal and, moreover, adheres to Horatian aesthetics embodied by *iam satis est* (*S.* 1.1.120). As another prolific writer, the stoic Crispinus stands in for Lucilius, whose abundant (*garrulus*, *S.* 1.4.12) and turgid (*lutulentus*, 11) discourse Horace reviles.

⁶⁵ Brown 1993: 129 calls Crispinus “prolific but defective.” Porphyrio comments: “Plotius Crispinus studied philosophy. He also wrote poems, but was so wordy that he was called a spinner of tales” (*Plotius Crispinus philosophiae studiosus fuit. Idem et carmina scripsit, sed tam garrul[a]e, ut aretalogus diceretur*, Holder 1979 ad Hor. *S.* 1.1.120). Crispinus also challenges Horace to a writing contest in *S.* 1.4.16 to judge “which man can compose more verses” (*videamus uter plus scribere possit*). Little does bleary-eyed Crispinus know Horace has no stake in this race, for abundant writing is the very skill Horace derides throughout *Satires* 1. Freudenburg 1993: 40 believes this line, *Crispini ... lippi* (*S.* 1.1.120), could be a cryptogram for the name Chrysippus, a famous Stoic. Chrysippus famously penned a passage about surgery for eye cataracts (Jackson 1996: 2248), and is attributed with touting extramission optic theory where “fiery rays pour out from the organ of sight” (*Aet. Plac.* 4.15.3, Bartsch 2006: 65-6), thus drawing a further connection between Horace’s poetry, sight, and philosophy.

⁶⁶ Brown 1993: 100; Barchiesi and Cucchiarelli 2005: 209.

Therefore, the literary persona in *S.* 1.5 is bleary-eyed to indicate that Horace may have already written too much, and he appropriately truncates the narrative: “Brundisium is the end of a long journey and a long poem” (*Brudisium longae finis chartaeque viaeque est*, 104).⁶⁷ The end of the narrative journey is also the end of the text. Horace’s *Satires* thrive on establishing boundaries, encapsulated by the formulaic *iam satis est*, translated as “that’s enough now,” or even “it’s satire now,” a play on the similarities between *satis* and the word for satire, *satura*.⁶⁸ The phrase is consciously placed at the end of programmatic *S.* 1.1 next to Crispinus’ mountain of rolls. It also appears in *S.* 1.5, further indicating Horace’s hesitation to say another word and demarcating the aesthetic boundaries for his pithy satire which are elsewhere applied to human behavior, food consumption, and poetic speech.⁶⁹ By invoking body metaphor to aid his subject-oriented invective, Horace clarifies his pithy programmatic vision for *Satires* 1, silences his persona and, by extension, silences himself.

In this way, *S.* 1.5 is not only a rewrite of Lucilian satire and rejection of his hallmark *libertas*, but also a chance for Horace to laugh at the audience’s expense. The debased and excluded persona characterizes the audience’s assumption about Horace – and perhaps also reflects Horace’s own feelings of inadequacy – as the unworthy companion of the great man Maecenas. The exclusion of Horace’s persona throughout the poem is not a rejection of

⁶⁷ Gowers 1993a: 60; Freudenburg 2001: 56 calls the abrupt ending a “notorious letdown” and that Horace leaves the reader hanging in the wrong place, indicating not the “end” of the journey but the “limit” (*finis*) of Horace’s satire (57).

⁶⁸ *S.* 1.1.120; 1.5.13; Freudenburg 1993: 193.

⁶⁹ For discussion of *satis* in relation to Horace’s discourse of food, see Chapter 2: 88-9.

Maecenas' friendship,⁷⁰ but just one method by which the satirist responds to external criticism of his humble parentage as a freedman's son (*libertino patre natus*, *S.* 1.6.45, 46).⁷¹ Lucilius would respond to his critics by turning the critical gaze onto them through personal attacks ("with a lot of salt," *sale multo*, *S.* 1.10.3). Rather, Horace plays into public expectations of him as a lowly and debased figure, excluded from the important activities of his patron. The persona's exclusion mimics the perceived real-life separation between Maecenas and Horace, economically and socially, and in the process turns himself into the butt of an unspoken joke. The reality, however, is that Horace the poet was friend to Maecenas and integral member of his literary network. The real joke, then, is on the readers for believing the rumors. By recognizing and fulfilling the public impression of himself through literature, Horace affirms his own place within Maecenas' social network. Horace's milder satire eschews the generic convention of satire introduced by Lucilius and turns the satiric gaze into a reflexive one that is aimed at his own persona.

Dashed Expectations

This section observes how Horace situates his bleary-eyed persona within a context that strictly avoids vision or propagates its negative reputation. For a poem where Horace presumably "goes

⁷⁰ DuQuesnay 1984: 43 elaborates, saying that "it would clearly be wrong to infer that Horace's affection for Maecenas was less than wholehearted" because of his persona's separation.

⁷¹ Horace's parentage (biologically and literary) is a recurring *topos* in *S.* 1.6: *quo patre natus?* (29); *quo patre sit natus* (36); *pater quod erat meus* (41); *nunc ad me redeo libertino patre natus* (45); *me ... libertino patre natus* (46).

to see” (*visere*) many towns and cities,⁷² there is a dearth of Latin words for visual perception.⁷³ Most verbal descriptions of travel highlight physical movement rather seeing new sights: “we came up to (*subimus*) Anxur” (*S.* 1.5.25); “we left behind (*linquimus*) Fundi” (35); “we stretched (*tendimus*) to Beneventum” (71). Moreover, several of the towns are treated as animated subjects of verbs: “Aricia **received** me” (*me accipit Aricia*, 1); “a little villa at Pons Campanus **provided** us with shelter” (*Campano ponti quae villula tectum / praebuilt*, 45-6); “a neighboring villa at Trivicum had **received** us” (*nos vicina Trivici / villa recepisset*, 79-80); “Gnatia **gave** us laughs and jokes” (*Gnatia ... dedit risusque iocosque*, 97-8). The animation of the towns constructs a passive experience for the traveler. Even though he is physically in motion between stationary locations, the towns seem to be doing all the work.

In fact, the only time the verb *video* appears in *S.* 1.5 is to describe the chaotic scene of a villa catching fire at Beneventum: “then **you would see** the greedy dinner guests and frightened slaves snatching up the food, and everyone wanting to extinguish the fire” (*convivas avidos cenam servosque timentes / tum rapere atque omnes restinguere velle videres*, 75-6). The scene comically portrays the opposing actions of the servants and guests, frantically running around to either save the villa heroically, or ravenously save the food. The verb for seeing (*video*) is delayed emphatically until the end of the phrase, allowing the audience to picture the scene before Horace bids us to actually do so. There is a similar structure in at the end of *S.* 1.8 as the witch-hags are chased out of Priapus’ garden: “**you would see** Canidia’s teeth and Sagana’s tall

⁷² The eighteen towns visited, in order: Rome, Aricia, Forum Appi, Anxur, Fundi, Formiae, Sinuessa, Pons Campanus, Capua, Caudium, Beneventum, Apulia, Trivicum, an unknown town that cannot fit into meter (possibly Venusia, argued convincingly in Freudenburg 2001: 54-5 and Gowers 2009: 53-4), Rubi, Barum, Gnatia/Egnatia, and Brundisium.

⁷³ Cf. the unexpected abundance of words for sight in *S.* 2.2 treated in Chapter 2: 83-4.

wig fall away ... with a hearty smile and laugh” (*Canidiae dentes, altum Saganae caliendrum / excidere ... cum magno risuque iocoque videres*, 48-50). With the potential subjunctive *videres* in both passages, Horace portrays his persona as a detached observer of the scene – a disengaged voyeur, set apart from the action. The persona then beckons “you” to observe along with Horace, making the audience complicit in his voyeurism and ultimately his laughter. The act of seeing, then, is a precursor to laughter.

Contrary to what the vocabulary count tells us, vision and sight underlie much of the trip – even if that sight is distorted or unexpected somehow. The verb *exspecto* (“to look out for, wait for, expect”), derivation of *specto*,⁷⁴ appears twice in key scenes to convey the unfulfilled expectation of bodily pleasures. Early in the poem, the persona has just declared war on his stomach thanks to a bad experience with dirty water (*S.* 1.5.7-8) and cannot ingest food. Instead, he “**looks on** with a very disagreeable temperament as his companions eat” (*cenantes haud animo aequo / exspectans comites*, 8-9). In this scene, *exspectans* means both “looking on” but also “expecting,” as though the persona is anticipating the food that it is impossible for him to eat. The persona’s expectations for food, and thereby socialization and conversation, are dashed

⁷⁴ *ex + specto, -are* (*OLD* s.v., *TLL* v/2.1888.10-49). The compound verb *exspecto* provides a nuanced meaning of *specto*, where *specto* mean “to see visually” or “to examine something” that is real, while *exspecto* encompasses “to look out for” something or “to wait” on something that is expected to come with anticipation, hope, or desire: “I look out for (*expecto*) that which I want to see (*spectare*)” (*expecto quod spectare volo*, Var. *L.* 6.82). But *specto* and *exspecto* simultaneously occupy the same semantic sphere in some instances and thus could be interchangeable, e.g. Don. *ad Verg. A.* 5.70: “altogether they were present and looked up/looked forward to the gifts of the deserved palm”: the verb ‘they look forward to’ (*expectent*) can mean ‘they hope’ in addition to ‘they see’ (<*cuncti adsint meritaque expectent praemia palmae*> ... *expectent potest significare sperent, potest et videant*).

by his ailing body. And thus, he is fashioned into a sort of Tantalus archetype who is eternally tempted by observing unattainable food.⁷⁵

At the end of *S.* 1.5 the persona again exhibits bodily expectations – this time for sex: “here I very stupidly **wait up** until the middle of the night for a lying girl” (*hic ego mendacem stultissimus usque puella / ad mediam noctem exspecto*, 82-3). The *mendax puella* does not show up despite a prior arrangement, which results in the persona, who anticipated sex, having nocturnal emission.⁷⁶ The verb *exspecto* again gives the impression that he visually “looked out” for the girl, perhaps gazing out his window. But the only “seeing” that the persona actually accomplishes is “expecting.” For Horace’s persona, his hopes and expectations exceed his grasp – or rather, exceed the limits of his dysfunctional body. When the desired outcomes for food and sex are not possible, the satirist is only left to have hopes and expectations, however fruitless they may be.

⁷⁵ Tantalus, a symbolic miser, is a recurring motif throughout the poetry of Horace, appropriately appearing in scenes of starvation, e.g., *S.* 1.1.68-9: “thirsty Tantalus grabs at the rivers that flow from his lips” (*Tantalus a labris sitiens fugientia captat / flumina*); and *Epod.* 5.32-5: “so that the boy can be buried with his face sticking out for the whole day while a feast is changed out two and three times” (*quo posset infossus puer / longo die bis terque mutatae dapis ... cum promineret ore*) in order that Canidia can harvest his desiccated liver for a love potion. I also believe there is a connection Horace is trying to make between the sin committed by Tantalus of dismembering and cooking his son and the sin of poetic dismemberment from *S.* 1.4.62 (*disiecti membra poetae*), where there is also an emphasis on the consumption of the body – this time a poet’s “body” of work (Bartsch 2015: 21-5 follows the connection with Thyestes, offspring of Tantalus, and Persius’ decoction).

⁷⁶ This scene will be discussed at length below in the section “The Reflexive Satiric Gaze” (60-8).

As Kirk Freudenburg notes, “broken expectations are the stuff of this poem.”⁷⁷ The persona’s unfulfilled expectations reflect the audience’s anticipation throughout the poem. The audience would expect a glimpse into the peace talks between Octavian and Marc Antony, which is euphemistically reduced to “the reconciliation of former friends” (*aversos ... componere amicos*, *S.* 1.5.30). Horace, therefore, inverts the logical, anticipated focus of the trip by relegating what should be the main event (the treaty) into background, and putting what should be background (eating, camaraderie, body ailments) into the foreground. The persona’s obscured vision due to *lippitudo* may metaphorically represent the persona’s own obscured perspective regarding the trip as though he is deliberately turning a blind eye to – or “unseeing” – the politics involved.⁷⁸ Since the persona could not see the political meeting, he cannot *say* anything about it, which explains and even justifies his silence. The audience’s perspective relies on the persona’s limited vision – we see what he sees, even if that vision is obscured through bleary eyes. The persona’s gaze turns away from the public realm and toward the private where he watches out for (*exspecto*) his opportunity to satisfy his corporeal pleasures. In disconnecting the persona from the political realm, Horace too disconnects his audience, compelling them to remain in the realm of satire where trifles reign.

Observing the Faults of Others through Bleary Eyes

The remainder of *S.* 1.5 is filled with oblique references to vision and ocular dysfunction outside of *lippitudo*. For example, Horace’s traveling “companion” is the learned Greek writer

⁷⁷ Freudenburg 2001: 55, who elaborates: “readers of the poem are repeatedly duped and undone by their own expectations.”

⁷⁸ Reckford 1999: 525; Freudenburg 2001: 54; Plaza 2006: 205; Freeman 2014 *passim*.

Heliodorus (*rhetor comes Heliodorus*, 2), which Emily Gowers suggests may actually mean Horace took along his book, “The Sights of Italy,” in which an eye disease is cured by a fountain.⁷⁹ Horace also refers to a one-eyed aedile, Aufidius Luscus (34), an official within the small municipality of Fundi.⁸⁰ Aufidius Luscus is an object of derision as the travelers mock his regalia for its pretension in a backwater town: “we laugh at the regalia of the **insane/unsound** scribe,” *insani ridentes praemia scribae*, 35). He is literally *insanus*, “unsound” or “not whole,” perhaps because he is missing an essential body part: his eye, hence he is “one-eyed” (*luscus*). Horace establishes Aufidius Luscus as his doublet, as they share several biographical details: they are both provincial (hailing from Fundi as opposed to Venusia), hold the same occupation as a *scriba* (the post that Horace held in Brutus’ army), and they both share ocular impairment (*luscus* as opposed to *lippus*). But while Aufidius Luscus is *insanus*, Horace portrays himself as *sanus* (“whole,” “healthy,” “sensible”) with regard to friendship: “while I am **sane/whole**, I would consider nothing better than an agreeable friend” (*nil ego contulerim iucundo sanus amico*, 44). Despite his bodily dysfunction that renders his persona physically *insanus*, Horace is made *sanus* through friendship – a statement that imbues this passage with Epicurean flavoring.

At the center of the poem the muse is invoked to begin the mock epic battle/Aristophanic *agon* between Sarmentus, a freedman among Maecenas’ entourage, and Messius, a local *scurra*. The fight devolves into a battle of words as the men degrade one another’s disfigured bodies, in which there are some insults regarding eyes.⁸¹ Sarmentus first likens Messius to a wild horse

⁷⁹ Gowers 1993a: 32. Fragments of the *Italica Theamata* can be found in Stob. 3.

⁸⁰ Persius chastises Horace for mocking a “one-eyed aedile” (1.128-30). The epithet *luscus* is used in epigram to indicate scurrility and “the lowest type of humour” (Watson 1982: 71).

⁸¹ The fight between the *scurrae* derives from Lucilian fragments that feature a gladiator fight staged for entertainment (Reckford 1999: 543). Lucilius’ *scurrae* also exhibit physical deformity, but the visual references are

(*equi / feri*, *S.* 1.5.56-57), often translated as “unicorn,” because Messius’ forehead is stamped with a hideous birthmark (*foeda cicatrix*, 60) which marks where his “horn” should be. Messius’ *cicatrix* has a plurality of meanings. First, the singular birthmark on his forehead conjures imagery of the Cyclops Polyphemus of the *Odyssey* after Odysseus has blinded him, leaving a scar where his singular eye used to be.⁸² In the *Odyssey*, Cyclopes are rustic herders who live in caves, perhaps as a further insult to Messius’ provincial origins (ironically expressed by *clarum genus Osci*, 54), and ultimately Horace’s own origins.⁸³ Messius later “dances steps of the Cyclops shepherd dance” (*pastorem saltaret uti Cyclopa*, 63) further securing his connection with the one-eyed herders. As the embodiment of eye dysfunction, the repeated suggestion of Cyclopes and one-eyed-ness reminds the audience that eyes and vision are still looming in the background of this poem.

In addition to reading *cicatrix* as a literal scar on Messius’ forehead, the word also carries the figurative meaning of a character blemish, vice, or weakness. Throughout the *Satires*, Horace

new in Horace. In Lucilius’ version, much like Horace’s, the disfigured body is emphasized: *Broncus Bovillanus dente adverso eminulo hic est, rinoceros* - “jut-mouth Bovillanus, with a tooth protruding slightly, is this: a rhinoceros” (117-8 M = 109-10W = 3.13C). Lucilius’ gladiator has a protruding tooth likened to a rhinoceros’ horn, just as Horace’s Messius is scarred with a *cicatrix*, purportedly evidence of a removed horn and his third eye. Similar to the posturing in *S.* 1.5, Lucilius’ gladiators also hurl “yo’ momma” jokes at one another: “she didn’t give birth to him, but dumped him out from her back side” (*non peperit, verum postica parte profudit*, 119M = 111W = 3.14C).

⁸² Brown 1993: 146. *Cicatrix* is a term used of scarring on the cornea (Jackson 1996: 2229), which would be in keeping with an injured eye.

⁸³ Goh 2015 argues that the construction of a “Campanian Cyclops-figure” in Messius Cicirrus (110), along with other Campanian motifs such as horses and gladiators in *S.* 1.5, playfully suggests Lucilius’ own Campanian origins without making direct reference (93-4).

rejects judging the superficial faults of others. At first blush this seems an odd thing for a satirist to claim, but it is in keeping with Horace's departure from Lucilian *libertas* and embracing Epicurean philosophizing. Sometimes the internal faults of individuals are physically manifested on their bodies, a theme explored in *S.* 1.6:

atque si vitii mediocribus ac mea paucis 65
mendosa est natura, alioquin recta, velut si
egregio inspersos reprehendas corpore naevos [...]
causa fuit pater his. (Hor. S. 1.6.65-71)

But if my nature, otherwise honest, is blemished with only a few, trifling faults – just as if you would criticize moles that blemish an outstanding body – my father is the reason for this.

This poem is a literary retelling of Horace's first introduction to Maecenas his literary "father."⁸⁴ On the topic of fathers, Horace draws connections to his birth father who spared no expense to educate his mind and form his character.⁸⁵ The scrutinized body with moles is a manifestation of Horace's nature or personality (*natura*, 65), as cultivated by his father. Overall, his personality is "honest" (*recta*, 66), and even if he possesses "a few trifling faults" (*vitiis mediocribus ... paucis*, 65) it should not change an onlooker's judgment of his overall character. Physical "blemishes" (*naevos*, 67) are superficial and they do not obscure the appeal of an "outstanding

⁸⁴ Horace's experience of being introduced into Maecenas' network is like that of being born: he was speechless in Maecenas' presence (*singulatim pauca locutus*, *S.* 1.6.56; *pudor prohibebat plura profari*, 57) and childlike (*infans*, 57). Henderson 1999: 184 and Schlegel 2005: 120 see a "gestation period" when Horace is called back after nine months (*nono post mense*, 61), although it should be noted that the Latin language counts inclusively and refers to childbirth taking place in the tenth month.

⁸⁵ S. 1.6.71-6: “My father, a poor man on a big-small estate, was the cause of these things: he didn’t want to send me to Flavius’ school ... but dared to take his son to Rome for schooling” (*causa fuit pater his, qui macro pauper agello / noluit in Flavi ludum me mittere ... sed puerum est ausus Romam portare docendum*). Cf. S. 2.1 where the persona calls interlocutor and jurist Trebatius “noble father” (*pater optime*, 12), and Trebatius calls the persona “boy” (*puer*, 60).

The *lippus* persona in *S.* 1.5, then, is both the disfigured individual whose physical shortcomings must be overlooked, but also the embodiment of “turning a blind eye” to the faults of others. Horace emphasizes this meaning of *lippus* in *S.* 1.3:

When you, bleary-eyed, investigate your own faults with ointment-filled eyes, why do you see as fine a detail in the faults of your friends as an eagle or an Epidaurian serpent? But on the other hand it happens for you that they examine your faults in turn.

⁸⁷ Gowers 2012: 126.

healing method in the ancient world. Ailing patrons spent the night in temples, hoping to be visited and healed by Asclepius in their dreams. Sometimes it was reported that the serpent, as the patron animal of Asclepius, played a key role in miraculous healings.⁸⁸ Just like the god he represents, the serpent is the harbinger of healing and health.⁸⁹ In *Satires* 1.3, the *lippus* man likened to the Epidaurian serpent does not point out others' faults for the purpose of healing them. Their faults are more apparent because he critically searches for them, rather than recognizing his own need for self-improvement.

In *S.* 1.5, Horace makes his persona's physical appearance as dysfunctional or ugly through *lippitudo*, in effect using the persona's body to demonstrate overlooking physical faults in preference to character qualities. Yet, as we have seen, Horace revels in deriding the physical bodies all throughout *S.* 1.5, contradicting his earlier dictum: he makes fun of the *lusci*, Sarmentus and Messius hurl insults at one another's blemished bodies, and the persona is an object of the audience's and even his own laughter. Elsewhere in the *Satires*, Horace turns his scrutinizing gaze onto bodies that are ugly, like those of the witch-hags in *S.* 1.8. It seems, then, that overlooking faults and blemishes is not advice for the satirist, but the audience. When Horace beseeches the audience to overlook "trifling faults" (*vitiis mediocribus*, *S.* 1.6.65) he is also referring to the faults of his poetic body, that is, his text. The audience may find fault with

⁸⁸ *Iamata* A17 (LiDonnici 1995):

οὗτος τὸν τοῦ ποδὸς δάκτυλον ὕ-
 πό του ἀγρίου ἔλκεος δεινῶς διακείμενος.
 [...] ὕπνου δέ νιν
 λαβόντος ἐν τούτῳ **δράκων** ἐκ τοῦ ἀβάτου ἐξελθὼν τὸν δάκτυλον
ιάσατο τῇ γλῶσσῃ

A man, suffering badly in the toe of his foot from a fierce ulcer. [...] When sleep took hold of him in this place, a **snake** came out of the Abaton and **healed** his toe **by licking it**.

Cf. *Ar. Pl.* 733-747.

⁸⁹ Cf. the serpent's *venenum* elsewhere in the *Satires* is used to harm (see Chapter 2: 109-18).

Horace's choice of genre, which itself is accused of being "trifling" (*nugarum*, *S.* 1.9.2; *nugas*, 2.6.43). Nevertheless, we are urged to set aside any judgment of his satire which may not adhere to the strict traditions of satire, but beneath the surface the poetry is well-ordered, clean, and beautiful.

The bodies throughout *S.* 1.5, then, are representative of Horace's physical text. Returning briefly to the *agon*, Messius stands out as another blemished body, and therefore another manifestation of Horatian satire. Against his own advice, Horace bids the audience to laugh at the blemishes of Messius through the mocking voice of Sarmentus: due to his *cicatrix* he is likened to a wild animal, a blinded Cyclops, and made to dance for the amusement of others. Even Horace's *lippus* persona can see well enough to observe this degrading show with his friends. The performative aspect of the fight invites the audience to watch, judge, and laugh along with Horace. The persona has become an audience member himself and he revels in the fight while he dines: "all in all, we gladly prolonged that meal" (*prorsus iucunde cenam producimus illam*, 70). Although Horace usually cuts short his poetry, *S.* 1.5 included (*iam satis est*, 13), he prolongs this voyeuristic activity.

The mock *agon* is a meta-theatrical display of Horace's approach to satire. The performance incorporates familiar themes and characters from other genres, but mixes them into a new, smooth and seamless concoction, mirroring the nature of satire itself as a hodge-podge, a *lanx satura*. The Cyclops is an interesting medium to showcase Horace's interpretation of *lanx satura*. These beast-men have been a favorite topic across literary genres: in epic,⁹⁰ comedy,⁹¹

⁹⁰ Hom. *Od.* 9, especially lines 375-400 where Polyphemus is blinded by Odysseus.

⁹¹ Ar. *Pl.* 290-1: "And so I want to lead you, going 'threttanelo! (like a cithara),' imitating the Cyclops and dancing to and fro on my feet" (καὶ μὴν ἐγὼ βουλήσομαι θρεττανελὸ τὸν Κύκλωπα / μιμούμενος καὶ τοῖν ποδοῖν ὥδὶ παρενσαλεύων / ὕμῳ ἄγειν).

satyr drama,⁹² and pastoral poetry.⁹³ Horace takes advantage the Cyclops' generic versatility and ability to take on different literary forms. By playing with the character of the Cyclops, Horace creates a mixed-genre performance in a theatrical context whose object is to elicit laughter. The *agon* is simultaneously a tribute to Horace's predecessors and a case study for Horace to show his rewrite of traditional satire popularized by Lucilius.

Throughout the poem, references to eyes and vision can be read between the lines. Horace's persona, unable to partake in games and food, is only able to be an observer of the events of the trip. He watches his comrades eat because he cannot due to an upset stomach; he watches out for the *puella mendax*; and he is an audience member during the battle of the *scurrae*. In none of these activities does he actively participate. He only observes. Yet his account is observed from his own bleary-eyed perspective, making it a true Horatian account which filters what the poet wants the audience to see.

The Reflexive Satiric Gaze

The topic of dashed expectations continues as we return to what is arguably the climactic scene of *S.* 1.5 – the nocturnal emission. Here we witness Horace rewriting a well-known passage from Lucretius to emphasize his viewpoint and invert the conventions of the satiric gaze. The persona's sexual climax doubles as the poem's narrative climax which is followed quickly by the poem's abrupt ending: "Brundisium is the end of a long poem and a long journey" (*Brundisium longae finis chartaeque viaeque est*, 104). In this scene, there is yet another direct mention of

⁹² Eur. *Cyc.*

⁹³ Theoc. *Id.* 11.

sight (*visus*, “vision”) referring to Horace’s erotic dream while he awaits the *puella mendax* who never arrives:

*hic ego mendacem stultissimus usque puellam
ad mediam noctem exspecto; somnus tamen aufert
intentum Veneri; tum immundo somnia visu
nocturnam vestem maculant ventremque supinum* (Hor. S. 1.5.82-5).

Here I very naively wait up for a deceptive girl into the middle of the night. But sleep carries me away, although I’m intent on love. Then thanks to a dirty vision my dreams mess my pajamas and my stomach while I lie on my back.

Both his “dreams” and “vision” appear in visually entangled word order (*immundo somnia visu*, 84). The appearance of vision, specifically a “dirty vision” (*immundo ... visu*, 84), is the impetus for Horace’s nocturnal emission. The ejaculation is referred to in euphemistic terms as simply “my dreams mess my pajamas” (*somnia ... / nocturnam vestem maculant*, 84-5). At the end of this scene, the persona lies supine (*supinum*, 85), a position that suggests submission to his bodily passions.

This passage evokes language and imagery from Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura* 4.1030-6 on sex, a connection that has been noted by scholars but left untreated in the scholarship.⁹⁴

Lucretius’ (c. 98-55 BCE) Epicurean didactic epic, published after the poet’s death c. 49 BCE, serves as a model for Horace’s *Satires* 1 in its form (hexameter poetry) and content (philosophical and moral discussion from an Epicurean perspective). The passage from *De Rerum Natura* expands upon the sensational influence vision wields over the human body.⁹⁵

⁹⁴ Reckford 1999: 544 n. 37; Freudenburg 2001: 54 refers to Horace’s “Lucretian dreams”; Gowers 2012: 207 writes that the reference “enhances the Lucretian colouring” of the passage.

⁹⁵ There may also be a Lucilian precedent for Hor. S. 1.5.82-5 (Brown 1993: 148; Sommerstein 2011: 34 n. 34; Gowers 2012: 207): “I wet the bed, I left stains on the skins with my ‘foot’” (*perminxi lectum, inposui pede pellibus labes*, Lucil. 1248M = 1183W = *hexametri incertae sedis* 73C). The connection between Horace and this fragment has been understudied. The verb *permingo/permeio* could be a sexual innuendo, used in Hor. S. 1.2.43-44 as a

Tum quibus aetatis freta primitus insinuatur 1030
semen, ubi ipsa dies membris matura creavit,
conveniunt simulacra foris e corpore quoque
nuntia praeclari voltus pulchrique coloris,
qui ciet inritans loca turgida semine multo
ut quasi transactis saepe omnibus rebus profundant 1035
seminis ingentis fluctus vestemque cruentent. (Lucr. 4.1030-6)

Then seed first creeps into the sea of youth for some people when the very day of maturity has created it within the limbs, and images assemble from outside each body and bring forth a shining face and beautiful complexion, which stirs and excites the places to swell with much seed so that often they might pour out huge floods of seed, as if they had gone all the way, and stain the clothes.

Lucretius explains the technicalities of ejaculation in direct and lofty language. The “seed” (*semen*, 1031) builds up in the body (*loca turgida*, 1034) from observing erotic images (*simulacra*, 1032) until its final release (*transactis ... omnibus, profundant*, 1035). When Horace adopts this passage from Lucretius to enrich his *Satires*, he lowers the discourse to fit its new, satiric context. He uses simple language to describe the nocturnal emission that is reduced to only a few lines. His dreams “**mess his pajamas**” (*somnia ... nocturnam vestem maculant*, 84-5), which echoes Lucretius’ *vestemque cruentent* (“and **stained the clothes**,” 1036), but does not entirely duplicate it. Horace adds to his account *ventremque supinum* (“while I lie on my back”), which fits the metrical space occupied by *vestemque cruentent*. But it seems strange to find a stomach (*venter*) in an erotic context.

punishment for adulterers: “Here he gave money in exchange for his body, and the henchmen sodomized him” (*dedit hic pro corpore nummos, / hunc perminxerunt calones*); Gowers 2012: 101 likens the use of *perminxerunt* to that in the Lucilius fragment in a similar vulgar meaning. Cf. *S.* 1.8.38 beseeches Julius, and soft Pediatia, and Voranus the thief to “come to piss and shit on me” (*in me veniat mictum atque cacatum*), in which *cacatum* and the list of effeminate men have connotations of receiving anal intercourse (Gowers 2012: 277). The verb “to urinate” could be understood in a vulgar register as well, especially in a satiric context where it often associated with ejaculation (Adams 1990: 142, citing Catul. 67.30; Pers. 6.73; Mart. 11.46.2).

The image of the supine persona allows for a deeper reading of the narrative connected through bodies. The addition of *ventremque* supplies yet another word that begins with “ve / vi,”⁹⁶ a further allusion to the name of the town Horace will not name – Venusia, his home town. Additionally, the presence of *venter supinus* acts as a reminder of Horace’s first body mishap from earlier in the poem which also centered on the stomach (utilizing the same word, *venter*): Horace drank bad water, and the result was a stomachache (*ventri / indico bellum*, *S.* 1.5.7-8). The stomach completes a ring composition within *S.* 1.5 and solidifies the dominance of the body over the mind. The stomach is a symbol of gluttony and indulgence of pleasures and tends to have a mind of its own as the control center of the body.⁹⁷ The placement of the persona’s body *supinus* highlights the persona in a subservient role to his passions. The reclining position often indicates that the body is being pleased or fulfilling its desires: one reclines on the elbow to eat,⁹⁸ and lies down completely to sleep,⁹⁹ and have sex.¹⁰⁰ The word *supinus* is also used of a

⁹⁶ *Veneri, visu* (*S.* 1.5.84), *vestem* and *ventremque* (85) (Freudenburg 2001: 54). Gowers 2012 adds *viginti* (*S.* 1.5.86), *versu* (87), *venit vilissima* (88), and *viator* (90) and calls these “cryptic allusions” to Venusia (207-8).

⁹⁷ E.g., the stomach barks (*latrantem stomachum*, *S.* 2.2.18) and the **gullet** asks for food (*ait ... gula*, *S.* 2.2.40); the stomach can be sick (*aegrum ... stomachum*, *S.* 2.2.43) and angry (*iratum ventrem*, *S.* 2.8.5). See Chapter 2: 118-20 for the stomach’s role in food consumption, digestion, and its control the body.

⁹⁸ Cf. *S.* 2.6 “He **spread out** on a chaff from this year’s harvest” (*palea porrectus in horna*, 88); “he placed him **spread out** on a purple garment” (*purpurea porrectum in veste locavit*, 106); “he rejoiced **reclining**” (*ille cubans gaudet*, 110). At a formal Roman banquet, one dined while reclining on a couch, as in *S.* 2.8.20-1: “I [reclined] on the top [couch], and next to me Viscus Thurinus; and below was Varius” (*summus ego et prope me Viscus Thurinus et infra ... Varius*).

⁹⁹ Cf. *S.* 1.5: “And he snored **on his back**” (*stertitque supinus*, 19).

¹⁰⁰ Cf. *S.* 2.7.50: “Or she, lustful, with her ass spurs me **lying down** like her horse” (*clunibus aut agitavit equum lasciva supinum*).

parasite bending back to smell food, another form of engagement with bodily pleasure.¹⁰¹ In *S.* 1.5, the persona splayed on the bed lying down after the nocturnal emission similarly signals his vulnerability and defeat by his body's passions.

There is a strong correlation in both scenes between sight and sexual desire. Seen images, identified as *visus* in Horace and *simulacra* in Lucretius, engender erotic desire. *Simulacra* (Latin translation for Greek εἰδωλα) are "tenuous and illusory" images or memories of an object, which, according to intromission theory, penetrate the eye and are projected into the brain.¹⁰² In this context, they titillate and arouse the viewer and "prove as efficacious as actual intercourse in producing the release of pressure through ejaculation."¹⁰³ Horace's *visus* and *somnia*, which also appear to him in his mind's eye and engender lust, suggest the idea behind Lucretius' *simulacra*. But rather than use technical Luretian terminology, Horace modifies his language to simply *visus*; he channels Lucretian optic theory of intromission, but as he does with many references to

¹⁰¹ At *S.* 2.7.38, the parasite Mulvius confesses to be "fickle and slave to the stomach, I **tilt back** my nose at the smell" (*duci ventre levem, nasum nidore supinor*).

¹⁰² Bartsch 2006: 59-62. See in this chapter "Theories of the Gaze and Literary Theory" for further information on intromission vision theory (27-8).

¹⁰³ Brown 1987: 71. Lucretius argues that the recurring *simulacra* of loved ones can confound the body by throwing it into a state of disequilibrium where it can never be satiated: "Venus mocks lovers with images and they cannot satisfy their bodies by gazing at bodies closely" (*Venus simulacris ludit amantis, / nec satiare queunt spectando corpora coram*, 1101-2). Hence, Lucretius calls for the cessation of love and emotional attachment, and when aroused he directs men "to cast the gathered liquid into any body whatsoever" (*iacere umorem conlectum in corpora quaeque*, 1065) (Brown 1987: 72-3).

other genres, “compresses and lowers” it to suit the context of satire,¹⁰⁴ and the framework of the poem: faulty sight. In a poem so concerned with vision, seeing, and not seeing, this is the first and only time that a word derived from *video* is used. Yet, when the persona is finally able to see, his sight is still undermined by being “unclean” (*immundo*, 86), a word that can mean “impure” or “raunchy,” but also literally “stained,” much like his bed clothes after he ejaculates (*vestem maculant*, 85).¹⁰⁵ Just as the persona’s waking vision is obscured with pus and fluid in his leaking, bleary eyes (*lippus*), his dreaming vision is also clouded.

Horace highlights his persona’s faulty vision in multiple contexts – both waking and dreaming – and prompts the audience to question not only what is real, but also the efficacy of reality. First, this calls into question Horace’s own perception of his political reality. Scholars have read this scene as a reaction against the political backdrop of the trip and the illusory nature of a peaceable outcome between Octavian and Antony, which has an analogue in the broken “treaty” between Horace’s persona and the *puella*.¹⁰⁶ Peace was not realistic for the former allies nor the Republic, a situation realized in 35 BCE at the time of the publication of *Satires* 1.¹⁰⁷ Similarly, sex was not in the cards for Horace that night. In this cynical reading of the poem, Horace’s hopes for the future are unraveled. But rather than expressing blatant “skepticism and fear” about the future of the Republic, he turns it into a joke at his own expense.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁴ Harrison 2007b: 81; he cites many examples of when Horatian satire “brings the potentially lofty ... narrative immediately down to the satirical level. Once again the satiric context is enriched by didactic material, but that material is suitably modified for its new location. This is not so much parody as a shift of generic framework” (85)

¹⁰⁵ And perhaps reminiscent of the dirty “muddy flow” (*lutulentus flueret*, *S.* 1.4.11) attributed to Lucilius.

¹⁰⁶ Gowers 1993a; Schlegel 2010; Freeman 2014.

¹⁰⁷ Reckford 1999: 545.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*: 536.

I also believe that Horace is inviting the audience to question the reality he has constructed in *S. 1.5*. He has in fact posed a paradoxical question: can a satiric persona who cannot see clearly critique? Eyes enable vision and occupy the space of viewership, voyeurism, and, particularly in the realm of satire, judgment. A satirist usually focuses his gaze on human action and social convention to provide judgment and social commentary. The bleary-eyed persona, however, cannot scrutinize other people through his inflamed eyes because he cannot *see* them *clearly*. Although he shares the same physical space as his traveling companions in *S. 1.5*, he does not observe their faults. In fact, the persona only speaks fondly of his traveling companions and friends: Fonteius Capitos is “a gentleman to the fingertips” (*ad unguem / factus homo*, 32-3); “the earth bore no purer souls, nor is there anyone else to whom I am more attached” (*animae quales neque candidiores / terra tulit neque quis me sit devinctior alter*, 41-2); “while I am sane I would consider nothing equal to an agreeable friend” (*nil ego contulerim iucundo sanus amico*, 44). Similarly, his bleary eyes prevent him from witnessing the peace talks, perhaps to imply there is nothing to see.

Essentially, Horace’s *lippitudo* signals his rejection to gaze critically at others both on the level of the narrative, and as a writer of satire. In doing so, Horace also inverts the power structure inherent in Mulvey’s powerful male gaze, the goal of which is to satisfy visual pleasure. Horace does not subject other characters “to a controlling and curious gaze” inherent in the motivation behind scopophilia;¹⁰⁹ nor is there “a separation of the erotic identity of the subject from the object”¹¹⁰ because the identity of subject and object is the same – Horace and his eponymous persona. When Horace has his satiric persona reject gazing (or “unsee”), he is

¹⁰⁹ Mulvey 1999: 835.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*: 837.

rendered passive and powerless – instead of actively initiating the gaze.¹¹¹ In lieu of a powerful and active satiric gaze, Horace adopts a power structure based on Lucretian optic theory that hails the passive observer. Horace transmits the passivity of his persona by obstructing his persona's gaze and redirecting the narrative expectations of the characters and thereby the audience. Therefore, Horace the poet is still the arbiter of the gaze, controlling where both his characters and audience are allowed to look. In doing so, he affirms his power as a narrative authority despite the weaknesses of his characters – including his eponymous persona.

Horace's manipulation of the gaze indicates an inverted power structure, characteristic of Bakhtin's carnivalesque.¹¹² Horace's *Satires* are filled with inversions: the interchange between sick bodies and healthy bodies; women threatening men (*S.* 1.8); mice sitting at the dinner table like humans (*S.* 2.6); a slave chastising his master (*S.* 2.7); and a banquet where the narrative underemphasizes eating and tasting (*S.* 2.8). These inversions enhance Horace's *Satires* and work together to highlight the greatest inversion of all in the public eye: the son of a freedman befriending the great man Maecenas.

Essentially in *S.* 1.5, Horace fashions his persona and himself as a satirist who cannot critique others. Rather, in an unusual reversal of satiric object, Horace refocuses his satiric gaze onto himself via his literary persona by portraying him as *lippus*. In doing so he empowers the audience by bidding them to partake in judging the satiric self along with himself. He has called the audience's attention to his badly dysfunctional body making it an object of audience gaze and criticism. And by making his persona something to be observed and stared at, he takes on a passive role – the opposite of what a satirist should be. Rather than unleash criticism, he

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*: 835, where she describes the gaze as “essentially active.”

¹¹² Miller 1998 (2009) discusses these inversions in more detail as related to Roman satire.

becomes an object of his own and the audience's judgment. In doing so, Horace shows himself to be a completely new type of satirist.

The Bleary-Eyed Onion Eater as Synaesthete

The final section of this chapter situates *lippitudo* within the larger tradition of satiric poetics. I argue that Horace draws inspiration for his *lippus* persona from a Lucilian fragment that concerns the onion and its impact on the body: “an onion grower / eater is **bleary-eyed** from constantly eating the pungent onion” (*lippus edenda acri assiduo ceparius cepa* 195M = 217W = 5.10C). The onion is a highly acerbic vegetable that impacts several of the body's senses, making it a nexus of sensory experience and metaphor for satiric poetics.

Raw onion has a pungent odor, bitter taste, and causes bad breath. Because of its rustic association with early Rome, the onion came to be considered a rustic food and avoided by the upper-class palate, and therefore was frequently omitted from ancient recipe books.¹¹³ The onion was a featured food item in the diets of the early Romans, according to Varro, which left them smelling rank: “our grandfathers and great-grandfathers, although their **words smelled** of garlic and **onion**, nevertheless they were high-spirited men” (*avi et atavi nostri, cum alium ac cepe eorum verba olerent, tamen optime animati erant, Men.* 63). The onion draws together a culinary-literary metaphor through the sense of smell. It is the words (*verba*), not the breath, of the early Romans that literally smelled owing to the contents of their primitive diet. The onion then, with its connection to early Roman culinary simplicity and rustic living, can be a signpost for unrefined speech in anyone who consumes it – including a poet, whose otherwise sophisticated palate could be tainted by the presence of this simple, smelly vegetable.

¹¹³ Gowers 1993b: 297.

The onion undoubtedly impacts the sense of taste and the smell of one's breath, but Lucilius' fragment focuses on the onion's ocular effect. When an onion is cut, it releases an enzyme that induces ocular irritation and watering. Therefore, Lucilius' *lippitudo* is not "eye inflammation," as it was used in Celsus and Horace, but indicative of a physical response manifested in the eyes to an external stimulus, i.e., the onion (*cepa*). There is even linguistic evidence to back up the interpretation of *lippus* as "watery-eyed" as opposed to "bleary-eyed." Benjamin Fortson analyzes uses of the word *lippus* throughout Latin literature side-by-side with its etymological origins and concluded that its original meaning was closer to "watery,"¹¹⁴ similar to the ocular response to onion enzymes.

Garlic, cousin to the onion, is already featured prominently in the *Epodes* of Horace. In fact, Emily Gowers calls garlic a "uniquely appropriate 'food' for iambic anger" due to its bitter taste and tendency to appear in contexts of conflict.¹¹⁵ For example, in *Epod.* 3 garlic has made its way into a meal at Maecenas' dinner party, prompting Horace to question whether it has been poisoned: "has it deceived me that snake blood has been cooked into these herbs? Or has Canidia made the meal foul?" (*num viperinus his cruor / incoctus herbis me fefellit? an malas / Canidia tractavit dapes?* 6-8). Horace, believing this to be a jest on Maecenas' part, curses him with a love-less night owing to his garlic breath: "I pray that your girl put her hand up in the way of your kiss and sleep on the furthest corner of the bed from you" (*precor, manum puella savio opponat tuo, / extrema et in sponda cubet*, 20-2). Garlic has a penchant for ruining meals, like the resurgence of Canidia's figurative garlic breath in *S.* 2.8: "We fled ... as though Canidia had

¹¹⁴ Cf. Pl. *Cur.* 318 and *Rud.* 632. Fortson 2008: 55 writes, that instead of meaning "bleary" or "sticky," "a far better semantic match, I suggest, is the root *uleik 'liquid, flowing' that is the source of the family of Latin *liquescere* 'become liquid', *liquens* 'liquid, flowing.'"

¹¹⁵ Gowers 1993b: 281; see 280-310 for the full treatment of garlic in the *Epodes* and *Satires*.

breathed on [the food] with breath fouler than African serpents” (*fugimus ... velut illis / Canidia afflasset peior serpentibus Afris*, *S.* 2.8.93-5). The witch Canidia substitutes her usual weapon of choice, *venenum*, with garlic – another type of poison (“she turns human minds with **poisons**,” *versant atque venenis / humanos animos*, *S.* 1.8.19-20) and a staple of Horace’s iambic poetry (*Epod.* 3, 5, and 17). When Canidia reappears in Horace’s satiric corpus (*S.* 1.8, 2.1, 2.8), it signals the presence of iambic vitriol, bitter invective, and anger – the embodiment of garlic.¹¹⁶

Similar to garlic, the onion is also a key metaphor in the *Satires* and, I would like to posit, is the ideal food symbol for satire. Horace models his *lippus* persona on Lucilius’s bleary-eyed (or watery-eyed) *ceparius* as a reflection of his satiric poetics. The onion is innocuous upon first glance; but when someone cuts through all of its layers, the odor becomes impossible to ignore. Similarly, the genre satire also has layers: it is humorous on the surface, but contains serious social and moral criticisms at its core. Sometimes those criticisms are harsh and acerbic, leaving its audience in tears (as an onion can leave one “watery-eyed,” *lippus*). In the case of Horatian satire, however, they are tears of laughter. In *S.* 1.5, laughter abounds, especially among friends: “we left behind Fundi, **laughing** at the regalia of the crazy praetor” (*Fundos ... linquimus, insani ridentes praemia scribae*, *S.* 35); the friends “**laugh**” at the accusations hurled between Sarmentus and Messius (*ridemus*, 57); and the city “Gnatia gave us both **smiles and laughter**” (*Gnatia ... dedit risusque iocosque*, 97-8). Elsewhere, Horace directly addresses the audience to laugh at ridiculous sights, like when the witches are expelled from the garden and their wigs and false teeth fall behind them: “you would witness [this] **with a hearty smile and a laugh**” (*cum magno risuque iocoque videres*, *S.* 1.8.50). As Horace writes in an iconic description of his satire, he “**laughs** while telling the truth” (*ridentem dicere verum*, *S.* 1.1.24). But, just like the

¹¹⁶ See Chapter 2 for a list of culinary-literary metaphors (77-8), and for Canidia’s role as a poisoner (109-18).

bitterness of the acerbic onion (*acri ... cepe*, Lucil. 195M = 217W = 5.10C), Horace's laughter has some bite to it: "why are you **laughing**? Change the name and the story is about you" (*quid rides? mutato nomine de te / fabula narratur*, S. 1.1.68-9).

Furthermore, Lucilius' onion fragment plays with the conventions of satiric persona and satiric objects. The word *ceparius* is rare¹¹⁷ and ambiguous, potentially referring to "onion eater," "onion seller," or "onion grower." This semantic ambiguity simultaneously places the *ceparius* in the position of onion distributor and consumer, which bears significance in a satiric context. Just like the onion grower partakes of his own produce, the writer of satire makes himself a character within his satire and an integral part of his own creation. But this has ramifications: just as the *ceparius* renders himself *lippus* (watery-eyed) in the process of eating his own produce, Horace makes his own persona *lippus* (bleary-eyed) throughout S. 15. Essentially, when the satirist unleashes his satire's caustic stench into the world, he impacts even himself in the process. Horace metaphorically represents this dual role of the satirist by turning his eponymous persona *lippus*, simultaneously showing himself to be the poetic ego and satiric object. In sum, not even the satirist is free from the impact of his own satire.

The Satiric Journey¹¹⁸

The concept of the journey in Horace's *Satires* is important because of Horace's reliance on Lucilius' *Iter Siculum*. By narrating his own version of the *iter*, Horace shows that he follows the precedents established by Lucilius, but also distinguishes himself from his literary predecessor. Namely, Horace makes his *iter* shorter, he fashions a passive and sickly persona

¹¹⁷ Of its nine appearances in Latin literature, the only occurrence prior to the fifth century CE is Lucilius' fragment.

¹¹⁸ After Cucchiarelli 2002, '*Iter Satiricum*.'

who spends much of the trip reclining in various ways (*supinus*), and he creates a rich mixture of allusions to other literary traditions, like Lucretian didactic, technical literature, bucolics, epic,¹¹⁹ and comedy.¹²⁰ The concept of travel also forges a connection with an iconic image from Horatian satire, his “walking Muse”: “and so, when I have taken myself out of the city and into my mountain refuge, what should I celebrate first in my satires and with my **walking Muse**?” (*ergo ubi me in montis et in arcem ex urbe removi, / quid prius illustrem satiris **Musaque pedestri**? S. 2.6.16-7*). Horace’s *Satires*, much like this sauntering muse, progress at a sauntering pace. It is odd to see dialogue in hexameters, just as it is odd to see a muse traveling by foot. Walking connotes a mode of travel suited for common people and a simple, even rustic, lifestyle. This image is suited to the context for Horace’s simple *Satires*, which strive to showcase a multitude of perspectives. The lofty genres epic and tragedy, on the other hand, are associated with upper-class ideals, and thus are best represented by equestrian imagery and swift muses.¹²¹

Horace is a poet who occupies two roles as satiric narrator and satiric object. Additionally, he occupies two physical spaces. As in the passage above from *S. 2.6* – “when I have taken myself out of the city and into my mountain refuge” – Horace straddles the boundaries between the city (*urbs*) and country (i.e. his escape into the mountains, *montis*). He finds himself constantly in a state of travel between the two extremes, whether he literally takes to the road (*S. 1.5*), or considers to himself which lifestyle he prefers (*S. 2.6*). *S. 2.6* encapsulates the split in Horace’s time and attention between the city and the country, made evident through another satiric journey in the narrative of the city mouse and the country mouse. The rodents that

¹¹⁹ Gowers 2012: 183-4.

¹²⁰ Cucchiarelli 2001: 25-9, 47-8 likens the journey as a *katabasis* similar to that in Aristophanes’ *Frogs*.

¹²¹ Freudenburg 1993: 183-4, 206-7.

embark on a journey signals our entry into Chapter 2 on Taste in Horace's *Satires*, and the transition from *Satires* 1 to *Satires* 2, published c. 30 BCE. We also continue our journey to trace the sensory experience Horace fashions for us with the emphasis on gustation in *Satires* 2. Throughout *Satires* 2, and especially in the city and country mouse fable of *S.* 2.6, Horace uses the aesthetics of all the senses to enhance the sense of taste. The gustatory experience becomes a metaphor for Horace's idealized way of life via the "slender diet" (*victus tenuis*) and adds flavor and nuance to the form and content of his *Satires*.

CHAPTER 2

TASTE

Introduction

Food and flavors abound in *S.* 2.6, which contains a narrative of the classic fable of the city mouse (*mus urbanus*) and the country mouse (*mus rusticus*).¹ Each mouse visits the other's home, first in the country and then in the city, allowing the guest-friends to experience rural and urban lifestyles to which they had been hitherto unaccustomed. In the country, the *mus rusticus* plays host to the *mus urbanus* in his poor hovel (*paupere ... cavo*, 80-1). The country mouse displays stereotypical characteristics of a rustic dweller: he is "rough and attentive to his food stores" (*asper et attentus quaesitis*, 82); he has a "stingy disposition" (*artum ... animum*, 82-3); and he is called a "country bumpkin" (*agrestem*, 98, 107). Although the *mus rusticus* is humble in his culinary proclivities, he is simultaneously generous in his hospitality:

*neque ille
sepositi ciceris nec longae invidit avenae,
aridum et ore ferens acinum semesaue lardi* 85
*frusta dedit, cupiens varia fastidia cena
vincere tangentis male singula dente superbo.* (Hor. *S.* 2.6.83-7)

He begrudged neither the stored-away chickpea nor the long oat, and he carried the dry grape and half-eaten morsel of lard in his mouth and served it! With the varied meal, he was wishing to overcome his guest's contempt, who had hardly touched anything with his haughty tooth.

The *mus rusticus* serves a variety of foods that represent his humble lifestyle and embody a country aesthetic. He serves a chickpea (*sepositi ciceris*, 84), long stored-away to imply that the mouse may have been saving it for a special occasion. The oat (*avenae*, 84) is also served – in the singular like *cicer*, which seems to suggest meagerness and simplicity – along with a dried

¹ Horace's fable is based on Aesop. 314 (Perry 2007). Later versions include Babr. 108 and Phaed. *Fab. Aesop.* 9.

grape (*aridum ... acinum*, 85) which may be a mouse-sized draft of wine. Finally, there is a single luxury item – a piece of fat (*lardi*, 85) that has been half eaten. The country mouse clearly takes pride in serving his humble meal: he does not skimp on serving his best foods (*neque ... invidit*, 83-4), and fastidiously tries to impress his guest with the varied fare (*varia ... cena*, 86), conveying a sense of generosity within his meager means. The *mus urbanus*, on the other hand, is underwhelmed by the country diet. Language of contempt (*fastidia*, 87) is delayed to the end, allowing the reader to digest the mouse's disappointment slowly along with the meal. The city mouse's haughty tooth (*dente superbo*, 87) is metonymy for his picky palate and preference for more luxurious meals that are the subject of critique throughout *Satires 2*.

The meal served by the *mus rusticus* shares features of Horace's own diet described in *S. 1.6*: Horace, alone but content, is described eating a small bowl of leeks (*porri*, 115), chickpeas (*ciceris*), and cake (*lagani*). Similarly, in *S. 2.6* Horace's table at his Sabine farm is filled with beans and veggies: "O when will my beans, relatives to Pythagorus, be served, along with my little vegetables sufficiently rubbed with rich lard? (*o quando faba Pythagorae cognata simulque / uncta satis pingui ponentur holuscula lardo?* 63-4). Food for Horace – and elsewhere in ancient literature – is not simply physical nourishment, but carries a symbolic value. Horace's modest fare of beans and humble veggies are foods associated with Rome's idealized rustic past,² an association that also applies to the country mouse's dinner. Horace manipulates the food and culinary experience in *S. 2.6* to compare city life and country life, through which he criticizes luxurious dining and excessive flavor. We will return to the mice later in this chapter, but now turn our attention to scholarship on food in antiquity.

² Hudson 1989: 73-4. Potter 2015: 121-2 argues that the gastronomic simplicity of the third century BCE is purely an invention of first and second century writers as part of discourse to criticize new and foreign luxuries.

It is well attested that descriptions of food in Roman literature carry significance and symbolic value.³ Generally, dining scenes “serve as microcosms” for moral and cultural values and the Romans’ way of life.⁴ In fact, the Latin word for dinner party, *convivium*, is derived from the word “to live” (*vivo*). Cicero takes note of the appropriateness of this derivation in his letter to Paetus, writing that a *convivium* provides a slice of life on a smaller scale.⁵ The food that people consume can be used to illustrate aspects of their character, which is a theme repeated throughout *Satires* 2 (and *S.* 2.2. in particular). Similarly, Suetonius uses Augustus’ simple eating habits to reflect his humble character and self-discipline. Augustus was known to eat simple foods that have rustic associations – coarse bread (*secundarium panem*), small (not big!) fish (*pisciculos minutos*), hand-made cheese (*caesum ... manu pressum*), and figs (*ficos*)⁶ – aligning his culinary tastes with Rome’s ideal past, and by extension his moral outlook with old Republican values. In his speech *Against Piso*, Cicero points to Piso’s lavish dinner parties to illustrate his moral corruption. Piso’s table lacks the standard luxury foods that one would expect in a stereotypical culinary depiction of licentiousness, like shellfish. Rather, Cicero describes a *cena* filled with images of degradation to match Piso’s degraded character: rancid

³ See especially Gowers 1993b, 2012; Bramble 1974; Hudson 1989; Bartsch 2015.

⁴ Richlin 1992b: 180. A similar argument is found in Gowers 1993b: 25-6, with the qualification that Greek and Roman dinner parties primarily relate viewpoints, concerns, and the worldview of the elite; also D’Arms 1990 on the conflicting notion of social inclusion and discrimination in Roman dinner parties (especially 314-19).

⁵ Cic. *Fam.* 9.24.3: “We call [dinner parties] ‘*convivia*’ because it is then that we truly live together” (*nos ‘convivia,’ quod tum maxime simul vivitur*).

⁶ Suet. *Vit. Aug.* 74: “His meals were small and generally plain” (*cibi ... minimi erat atque vulgaris fere*).

meat is served (*carne subrancida*), lazy servants (*servi sordidati*) wait on guests, and Piso vulgarly drinks wine straight from the jar (*bibitur ... de dolio*).⁷

Food and dining scenes are equally, if not more, integral to satire – a genre that concerns itself with the body’s “lower” body parts, sensations, and functions (eating, hunger, digestion, defecation, and sex).⁸ The name satire boasts derivation from the culinary metaphor *lanx satura*, a “stuffed dish” or charcuterie plate filled with a variety of foods.⁹ This chapter traces the sense of taste throughout Horace’s *Satires*, particularly Book 2 where Horace amplifies the culinary imagery and prominence of the body organs involved in taste, consumption, and digestion: the mouth, tongue, and stomach. The setting of a Roman *cena* is synaesthetic by nature. In Horace’s dining scenes, noses and eyes are just as important as mouths and tongues. The smell of food, its taste, reputation (*fama*), and the visual appeal of its presentation work in concert to enhance the dining experience for both the dinner guest and audience.

Previous scholarship on food in satire has been instrumental in the construction of this chapter. J. C. Bramble’s *Persius and the Programmatic Satire* (1974) observes how imagery of food and drink in Persius and the Roman satirists act as a literary metaphor: “If literature has a peculiar flavor, the reader or listener tastes or savours it, enjoying the physical sensation.”¹⁰ The food that is put into the body is likened to what is put in the mind (i.e., philosophy), and so “true insights into the virtues of the simple life, and the pleasures of the table are shown to be mutually

⁷ Cic. *Pis.* 67.

⁸ This corresponds to Bakhtin’s bodily lower stratum (“the genital organs, the belly, and the buttocks,” 1984b: 23) that make up his concept of bodily degradation and “grotesque realism” (see generally 18-29).

⁹ Gowers 1993b: 110; Freudenburg 2001: 1-2; Bartsch 2015: 61. For a full discussion of *lanx satura*, see the next section “The Synaesthetic Table” (88-9).

¹⁰ Bramble 1974: 50; see generally 45-66.

exclusive.”¹¹ Emily Gowers’ *The Loaded Table* (1993b) follows Bramble in demonstrating the analogy between food and literature through overlapping language to describe genre (sweet, bitter, salty) and literary style (*pinguis* and *tenuis*).¹² When the metaphor is followed to its natural conclusion, the author is like the cook, and the audience the consumer. Although Gowers’ book-length treatment studies food across genres (Roman comedy, satire, epigram, and iambics), she isolates satire as “uniquely unrestrained in exposing the real links between food, the mixed literary text, and the mixed, expanded city of Rome.”¹³ A recent treatment on food in satire has been conducted by Shadi Bartsch, *Persius: A Study in Food, Philosophy, and the Figural* (2015), in which she analyzes food, dining scenes, extreme flavors, poisons, and sickness throughout Persius’ *Satires*, whose culinary motifs are shown to be modeled on Horace.¹⁴ However, Persius departs significantly from Horace through his concept of decoction¹⁵ and his devotion to the grotesque philosophical metaphor.¹⁶

¹¹ *Ibid.*: 46-7.

¹² On the overlap between culinary and literary metaphor, see Gowers 1993b: 132-3. Most important are the sweet, sour, and bitter flavors described by the Greek words ἀγλευκή, δριμύς, πικρός, γλυκύς, μελιχρός (Bramble 1974: 50); add to these Latin *acris*, *asperus* (“bitter” for the invective and satiric genres), *mel* and *dulcis* (for the melodic genres, where poetry is “sweet” like honey), and *suavis* (“pleasing,” generally applied to all poetry). See also Bartsch 2015: 134-41.

¹³ Gowers 1993b: 46; on Horace’s *Satires*, see 126-79.

¹⁴ Bartsch 2015: 9; see especially 16-25 (on Horace’s dismembered poet) and 141-60 (on Persius’ reception of Horatian vinegar).

¹⁵ *Ibid.*: 64-74.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, especially 74-4 and 167-77.

The sense of smell is also an integral part of experiencing taste.¹⁷ Several treatments on smell have informed my perspective on taste and the senses in Horace's *Satires*, namely Saara Lilja's *Treatment of Odours in the Poetry of Antiquity* (1972), which collects instances of odors and olfactory metaphors in Greek and Roman poetry.¹⁸ Recent scholarship has continued these efforts to identify Rome's sensory landscape, among which are David Potter's numerous publications on the dynamics between smell and social class, where he argues the upper class sought to avoid and cover up foul odors.¹⁹ In "The Scent of Roman Dining," Potter's contribution to *Smell and the Ancient Senses* (2015), he discusses olfactory sensation in culinary experiences as "artificial." Smells at dinner were a mixture of cooking scents that the host tries to conceal, and the heavily perfumed bodies that sit at the table.²⁰ In the same volume, Neville Morley's "Urban Smells and Roman Noses" notes the lower classes' seeming indifference to the stench of urban life in Rome.²¹ Moreover, Morley questions whether the Roman's "impaired olfactory sensitivity" due to the preponderance of smells, both bad and good, from urban centers, has done harm to the Romans' taste buds; this might explain why by modern standards Roman recipes are too sweet, over-spiced, and over-salted.²²

¹⁷ Stevens 2008.

¹⁸ Important for this study is the chapter "Smells Connected with Meals" (1972: 97-119).

¹⁹ "Odor and Power in the Roman Empire" (1999) and "The Social Life of the Senses: Feasts and Funerals" (2014).

²⁰ Potter 2015: 127-30.

²¹ Morley 2015: 117-18; perhaps because they have grown accustomed to the urban smells, such as "a mixture of urine, shit, decay, smoke, incense, cooked meat and boiled cabbage" (119); *contra* Potter 1999 who writes "there can be no question but that the urban air of the Roman empire stank" (169). Morley would agree with this, but with the qualification that repulsion at those odors is characteristic of our modern olfactory sensitivities.

²² Morley 2015: 118.

Let me supply a similar caveat as Gowers did to her study: this is not a historical study about what the Romans actually ate.²³ In fact, my primary concern is not food alone. Certainly, a study on taste presupposes and the presence, if not supremacy, of food. My focus, rather, is to analyze how the physical body experiences food and dining through all the senses, primarily taste, and down into the stomach through the digestive process. This chapter observes the literary dining and culinary scenes in Horace's *Satires*, taking for granted that they exist within the poet's imagination. I do not treat these scenes as evidence for actual Roman dining practices. They are fabrications and exaggerated narratives of elite Roman dining practices that act as a vehicle for Horace's satiric agenda and exhortations for simple living. Where my project departs from previous scholarship is my focus on the multi-sensory nature of Horace's dining scenes. Horace fashions a synaesthetic dining experience for his audience that mirrors the synaesthetic nature of satire as a whole.

The Synaesthetic Table

Sensing the "Slender Diet" (victus tenuis, S. 2.2)

Before we turn to taste proper, the first section in this chapter is dedicated to all of the *other* senses involved in dining. For the moment taste is put on the back burner, which, as we will see, reflects the role that taste occupies in Horace's *Satires*. As David Potter has suggested, a panoply of senses function in concert to create an enriched Roman dining experience – primarily, smell and taste.²⁴ Horace too emphasizes the synaesthetic aspect of dining – the smells, sights, and sounds – only to reveal the emptiness of the dining sensorium. In *S. 2.2*, Horace critiques

²³ Gowers 1993b: 1.

²⁴ Potter 2015: 120, 2014: 29-30; Lilja 1972: 103-6; Stevens 2008.

the sensational spectacle of dining as part of a moral lesson on living within moderation. In the prologue to this poem, he bids the audience to investigate along with him, “unlunched”

(*impransi*, 7):

*Quae virtus et quanta, boni, sit vivere parvo
(nec meus hic sermo est, sed quae praecepit Ofellus
rusticus, abnormis sapiens crassaque Minerva),
discite, non inter lances mensaque nitentis,
cum stupet in vanis acies fulgoribus et cum* 5
*acclinis falsis animus meliora recusat,
verum hic impransi mecum disquirite.* (Hor. S. 2.2.1-7)

Learn, my good friends, what virtue and how great a virtue it is to live within small means. (This is not my speech, but what Ofellus the rustic instructed me – the unschooled wise man of coarse wisdom); but not among shining plates and tables, when one’s sight is stupefied by empty splendor and when the mind, inclined toward falsehoods, declines more noble things. Rather here, unlunched, join me in investigating.

This passage presents a model of Epicurean restraint by recognizing the emptiness of spectacle, and imposing limits of food consumption along with other sensory pleasures. Horace describes an opulent dinner in terms of its visual appeal: everything is shining, from the silver plates and table (*lances mensaque nitentis*, 3) to the general splendor (*fulgoribus*, 5). The visual aesthetics of dining act as a precursor to the meal itself, preparing the tongue for an equally splendid gustatory experience. Horace cautions, however, that the visual aesthetics are empty (*falsis*, 6) and can deceive one’s sense of sight (*acies*, 5) and mental faculties (*animus*, 6) with their superficial appeal. Visual distractions can be likened to the negative impact of food on the mind. Taking pleasure in food and images of perceptible beauty can distract the mind from deeper, philosophical inquiry necessary for parsing the nature of living moderately (*vivere parvo*, 1). Introspective investigation is best achieved on an empty stomach and justifies Horace’s earlier call: “**unlunched**, join me in investigating” (*impransi mecum disquirite*, 7).²⁵

²⁵ Cf. S. 1.6.127-8: “I ate a **light lunch**, however much would stop me from going the whole day on an empty stomach” (*pransus non avide, quantum interpellat inani / ventre diem durare*).

Horace continues to critique how visual aesthetics can impact the gustatory experience. This is evident in the sensational appeal of consuming peacock over the common chicken:

*Vix tamen eripiam posito pavone velis quin
hoc potius quam gallina tergere palatum,
corruptus vanis rerum, quia venerat auro* 25
*rara avis et picta pandat spectacula cauda,
tamquam ad rem attineat quidquam. num visceris ista
quam laudas pluma? cocto num adest honor idem?
carne tamen quamvis distat nihil, hanc magis illa?
imparibus formis deceptum te patet.* (Hor. S. 2.2.23-30)

Nevertheless, if a peacock were served, I would scarcely doubt your desire to brush your palate with this rather than a chicken. You have been corrupted by vanities since this rare bird has come at the price of gold and creates a spectacle with its colorful tail – as if this fact mattered at all. Surely you don’t eat these feathers that you praise? When cooked, is its beauty still present? Although there is no difference in the flesh, you still prefer the peacock to the chicken? It is clear you have been deceived by their unequal appearance.

Horace traces the trajectory of the peacock from its living state to ultimate fate as an entrée. He first paints the image of this rare bird that people hold in their collective imagination: a regal bird spreading its colorful tail in spectacular fashion. The emphatic alliteration of the letter “p” throughout this scene (*picta pandat spectacula cauda*, 26) mimics the clucking sound of the peacock, and also serves to blur the distinction between peacock (*pavone*, 23), its plume (*pluma*, 28), and palate (*palatum*, 24). What was once a vibrant bird has been reduced to mere flesh (*carne*, 29) for consumption. In a way, eating such a rare bird is the ultimate form of destruction for the sake of extravagance. Horace’s unusual discourse minimizes eating to simply “wiping the tongue” (*tergere palatum*, 24) with food, and unveils the triviality of luxury dining. It is unnecessary to go to such lengths, or to eat such exotic birds, in order to satisfy a physical necessity.²⁶

²⁶ Cf. S. 1.2 where Horace draws a parallel between desire for food and sex: “When you are hungry surely you do not shun everything except the peacock and turbot?” (*num esuriens fastidis omnia praeter / pavonem rhombumque?* 115-6).

Corruption by empty visual aesthetics (*corruptus vanis*, 25) also appears in this passage as the dinner guest craves the peacock due to pure vanity: its colorful tail (*picta ... cauda*, 26). The vibrant plume is the initial visual appeal of a peacock. In fact, the pattern on the peacock's tail itself mimics eyes, which underscores the irony of the bird as a visual object of desire when, in a way, it seems to be staring back at its admirers.²⁷ The iconic feathers of the peacock, however – the bird's most desirable feature – are not even consumed; the guests crave the visual presentation of the bird, not the meat itself. The peacock, then, only *seems* to taste better than the chicken because of the dinner guest's exotic visual association of the rare bird. And so, Horace creates a situation where consumption occurs with the eyes rather than the actual mouth and tongue. As he succinctly relates, “I see it's the **visual appeal** that draws you in” (*ducit te species, video*, 35), with the emphatic proximity of visual words *species* and *video*.

Just as we saw in *S.* 1.5 in Chapter 1,²⁸ Horace uses a variety of words for sight and vision throughout *S.* 2.2: *acies* (5), *spectacula* (26), *honor* (28),²⁹ *formis* (30), *species*, *video* (35), and *spectare* (39). This visual discourse stands out in a poem that primarily concerns eating, as though the wrong sense is on display. The emphasis on visual aesthetics in *S.* 2.2 underscores

²⁷ According to an etiological myth, Juno incorporates the eyes Argus, the slain hundred-eyed watchman, into the feathers of her bird, the peacock, e.g., *Ov. Met.* 1.722-3: “The daughter of Saturn took these eyes and placed them on the feathers of her bird and filled its tail with sparkling gems” (*excipit hos [oculos] volucrisque suae Saturnia pennis / collocat et gemmis caudam stellantibus implet*).

²⁸ See Chapter 1: 50-1, 53-60 for the plethora of words and imagery related to sight, particularly eye dysfunction.

²⁹ Here *honor* means a visual mark that inspires esteem or dignity (s.v. *OLD* 6a-b; also *TLL* 2929.28-2930.15, *distinguuntur res vel animantium corpora*; and especially 2930.16-2931.2, *pulchritudo*). E.g., *Hor. Epod.* 17.17-18: “Then your mind and voice faded away and **distinction** was perceptible on your face” (*tunc mens et sonus / relapsus atque notus in vultus honor*); *Verg. A.* 1.589-91: “The goddess infused joyous **luster** in his eyes” (*dea ... laetos oculis adflaret honores*, using Fairclough's 1969-74 translation of *honores* as “luster”).

the primacy of vision in the Roman dining experience and – for Horace and the long literary tradition of Roman banquets – its deceptive nature.³⁰ Longing or desire (*voluptas*) is engendered in the dinner guest by gazing at the food and admiring its presentation before consumption. This desire is so powerful that it competes with – and arguably supersedes – the main event of a dining experience: tasting the food.

The gustatory appeal of the peacock is equally heightened by its word-of-mouth reputation (*fama*). As the Romans dominated more and more of the ancient world, they were exposed to new foods that might have been viewed as intriguing curiosities. Consuming exotic foods would have mirrored Rome's "consumption" (i.e., dominance) of the nations from which the food came.³¹ Undoubtedly, exotic foods in fashion in Rome would have been the subject of rumor and thereby engender desire for consumption through oral report. The force of a food's reputation would impact its desirability, as Horace questions: "Should you give credence to some bit of reputation that fills the human ear, more welcome than poetry?" (*das aliquid famae, quae carmine gratior aurem / occupat humanam?* S. 2.2.94-5). Thus, sound and hearing too could enhance the desirability and taste of food.

Just as the rumor mill augments desire for exotic foods, smell is an intangible but integral element of the dining experience. In fact, taste and smell were often linked in classical discourse as natural sense pairs. The smell of cooking can be full-bodied and sumptuous, previewing the

³⁰ Cf. especially Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis*.

³¹ Gowers 1993b: 9-10; "gluttony was an image of the Romans' uncontrolled appetite for power, their unlicensed absorption of the world" (19).

food that is about to be served.³² Smell can also have a tantalizing effect, preparing the body for eating by causing the mouth to water in anticipation. Although smell has a strong influence on the experience of taste by inciting craving, Horace reminds us that it lacks substance: “the highest pleasure is not in a pleasing smell, but in you yourself” (*non in caro nidore voluptas / summa, sed in te ipso est*, *S.* 2.2.19-20). For Horace, a rich and pleasing smell (*nidor carus*) is an empty superficiality; but it is still strong enough to engender desire for food and take over one’s mental faculties until their cravings are satiated. Rather, the elusive Epicurean “highest pleasure” (*bonum summum*) can be discovered within – through introspection – instead of externally through an intangible smell. This quote from *S.* 2.2 seems to be a reinterpretation of Socrates’ famous aphorism “hunger is the best sauce.”³³ Socrates exhorts his interlocutor to live a life of moderation whereby one only eats what is enough and avoids over-indulgence. Horace touts an agenda of moderation in bodily pleasures similar to Socrates, but he changes Socrates’ image of culinary indulgence, the tasty sauce,³⁴ into an olfactory metaphor. The smell is a more apt image of excess because it has an intangible source of perception, unlike the sense of taste, which requires physical food to be activated. Therefore, smell is intrinsically empty and superficial, and appropriately aligns with Horace’s exhortation to turn inward for knowledge.

³² Cf. *S.* 2.7.38 where Mulvius the parasite says, “I tilt back my nose at the **smell**” (*nasum nidore supinor*). *Contra* Potter 2015 argues that elite Romans would have worked to conceal the scents of cooking, which were considered unpleasant (125), and that guests would not be able to smell the food until it arrived on the table (127).

³³ Xen. *Mem.* 1.3.5: “For he ate as much food as he could eat with pleasure; and he was so prepared for eating that he considered desire for food to be the best sauce” (σίτῳ μὲν γὰρ τοσοῦτῳ ἐχρῆτο, ὅσον ἡδέως ἥσθιε· καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦτο οὕτῳ παρεσκευσμένος ἦει, ὥστε τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τοῦ σίτου ὄψον αὐτῷ εἶναι). Cf. Xen. *Cyr.* 1.5.12.

³⁴ ὄψον is properly “relish” or “sauce,” usually made of fish; it is the equivalent of Latin *garum* or *ius*, which is Horace’s symbol of overly-mixed, super-flavorful concoction that his satire eschews.

Elsewhere in *S. 2.2*, the sense of smell is regarded as occupying a powerful role in connection with food. Human smell is quite finely tuned and sensitive to putrefaction; in fact, it is first through smell that the body can detect when food has turned bad.³⁵ A foul smell can repel the palate from eating by causing the stomach to turn: “Although the boar and fresh turbot **reek**, the putrefied spread agitates a sick stomach when, filled up, it prefers turnips and tart elecampane” (*quamquam / putet aper rhombusque recens, mala copia quando / aegrum sollicitat stomachum, cum rapula plenus / atque acidas mavult inulas*, *S. 2.2.41-4*). The stomach can become overly sated with rich foods, like the exotic turbot. The mere smell of this food (*putet*, 42) can make the stomach sick (conveyed by the proleptic *aegrum ... stomachum*, 43) and crave a simpler fare. Simple foods are easy on the stomach and hence are counted among Horace’s slender diet (*victus tenuis*, *S. 2.2.20*, 53; *ervum tenue*, 2.6.117).

After establishing the evils and pitfalls involved with luxury dining, Horace promotes the slender diet. For Horace, the *victus tenuis* is not only a set of culinary guidelines, but a path to the ideal way of life.³⁶ At the end of *S. 2.2*, Horace gives voice to rustic sage Ofellus who extols this idealized culinary philosophy. Ofellus’ simple meal has additional benefits, such as promoting good health (*imprimis valeas bene*, 71), especially for feeble bodies, and positively impacting the mind: “in fact, the body heavy with yesterday’s vices (i.e., meals) will also weigh down the mind along with it” (*quin corpus onustum / hesternis vitiis animum quoque praegravat una*, 77-8). One must be mindful to eat to promote healthy mind and body as opposed to facilitating sluggishness. Here are the constituents of Ofellus’ *victus tenuis*:

³⁵ Cf. *S. 2.2.59*: “You are not able to tolerate the smell of the oil” (*cuius odorem olei nequeas perferre*); 2.2.89-90: “our forefathers would praise the putrid boar, but not because they did not have noses” (*rancidum aprum antiqui laudabant, non quia nasus / illis nullus erat*).

³⁶ *victus*, like *convivium*, is derived from the verb *vivo*, “to live.”

*'non ego' narrantem 'temere edi luce profesta
quidquam praeter holus fumosae cum pede pernae.
at mihi seu longum post tempus venerat hospes
sive operum vacuo gratus conviva per imbrem
vicinus, bene erat non piscibus urbe petitis, 120
sed pullo atque haedo; tum pensilis uva secundas
et nux ornabat mensas cum duplice ficu.'* (Hor. S. 2.2.116-22)

He said: "On an ordinary day I do not rashly eat anything except vegetables with a foot of smoked ham. And whether a guest has come after a long time, or a welcome neighboring dinner companion has come to me, freed from work because of the rain, it is not acceptable to eat fish ordered from the city, but rather chicken and goat. Then hanging grapes and nuts with a split fig decorate the dessert course."

Ofellus describes a meal that has all the traditional components of a Roman *cena*, but simplified and lowered to a rustic setting. The *gustatio* ("initial tasting" or "appetizer"), which by custom should comprise pure roots, is simply "vegetable" (*holus*, 117); the singular *holus* further underscores the simplicity of the course. The next course, the entrée (or *cena* proper), is a foot of smoked ham (*fumosae cum pede pernae*, 117). If he were to host dinner guests, Ofellus might hospitably serve something nicer, like goat or chicken (*pullo atque haedo*, 121); but fish, acquired from the city, is certainly not on the menu (*bene erat non piscibus urbe petitis*, 120). In the eyes of a farmer, fish appears on dinner tables at a *cena* held in the city as an extravagance and even exotic culinary marvel. It might also conjure images of flavorful *garum*, fish sauce, often served with foods at a *cena* to enhance flavor.³⁷ Rather, Ofellus' meal comprises whole foods that he has reared locally on his own farm. The imported fish of the city opposes the principle of satisfaction with one's lot in life: by only consuming what can be grown within one's means and geographic location, a person lives a sustainable life that is true to his or her limits. As Horace writes, "Great fish and plates bring great luxury and ruin" (*grandes rhombi*

³⁷ *garum* is used in Roman cooking as though it were salt and it "consisted of the liquid strained off from fish offal saturated in salt and left to ferment" (Muecke 1993: 235). *garum* is treated more extensively below in the next section, "Adding Flavor" (105-6).

patinaeque / grande ferunt una cum damno dedecus, 95-6), also referring to the financial toll that luxurious eating requires. The slender diet and imagery of slenderness (*tenuis*) criticize the tide of materialism in Rome, manifested in its far-reaching desires for new foods.³⁸ Ofellus seeks to bring Rome's flavor palate back to country aesthetics and thereby to the rustic ideal of early Rome.

Ultimately, in *S. 2.2* Horace fashions a synaesthetic dining experience replete with luscious sights and enticing smells and sounds. By engaging the readers' eyes, noses, and tongues with his vivid language, Horace paints a dining experience that is simultaneously sumptuous and empty. The sensory aesthetics are metaphorically empty because they are false distractions (*vanis*, 25); they are also literally empty as they are accessible only on paper and physically imperceptible to the audience. As a point of juxtaposition, Horace's idealized slender diet is defined by boundaries and curtails impact of the bodily senses. Horace's culinary philosophy is simply one manifestation of brevity, boundaries, and satiety evident throughout his poetry. The *Satires* are characterized by verbal restraint and paucity of speech. Horace frequently boasts of his terse writing style (*quid multa*, 1.6.82; *est brevitatem opus*, 1.10.9). To this end he often truncates his narrative throughout *Satires 1* (*verbum non amplius addam*, 1.1.121; *Brundisium longae finis chartaeque viaeque est*, 1.5.104). Sometimes the poet even cuts off his characters, whether by death (*cur non / hunc Regem iugulas?* 1.7.34-5) or divine intervention (*sic me servavit Apollo*, 1.9.78). The characters and narrative in *Satires 1* are subject to Horace's imposed limits, boundaries, and ideal of sufficiency.

Nowhere else is the presence of boundaries more evident than in the tautology of the word *satis*, which is repeated twenty times throughout *Satires 1* and 2. It primarily appears in

³⁸ Gowers 1993b: 44.

variations of the phrase *iam satis est* (1.1.120, 1.5.13),³⁹ “that’s enough now,” or even “it’s satire now,” playing on the similarities between *satis* and *satura*, satire.⁴⁰ The word *satis* indicates Horace’s hesitation to say another word, demarcating the lexical and aesthetic boundaries for his pithy satire. Repetition of *satis* serves as a reminder that the word *satura* was possibly derived from the culinary metaphor *lanx satura*, “stuffed plate” or “mixed dish.”⁴¹ The *lanx satura* is a burgeoning plate of various delicacies that takes its name from *satur*, “full up,” as though the dish had consumed its contents, like a stuffed dinner guest (*uti conviva satur*, *S.* 1.1.119).⁴² The stuffed plate is a culinary metaphor for satire’s hodge-podge nature: other genres and generic conventions are heaped up within satire’s boundaries, like a literary charcuterie plate. The satirist must distort its guest genres in different and palatable ways so the reader can easily enjoy consumption and not succumb to sensory overload. The discourse of limits (*satis*) and indulgence (*satur*) is one of the primary conflicts in Horace’s *Satires*.

Satires 2, on the other hand, is more contradictory in its quest for limits. Horace fills the book with images of fatness: burgeoning tables, laundry lists of food, and gluttonous bodies.⁴³ The recurrence of *pinguis* applies to a range of imagery, like gluttonous bodies that are distended

³⁹ Variants of this phrase include: *nil satis est* (*S.* 1.1.62), *quantum satis esset* (1.2.52), *satis est* (1.2.60), *quam satis est* (1.2.66), *non satis est* (1.4.54, 1.10.7, 2.5.4), *non est satis* (2.3.69), *mi satis est* (1.4.116), *nam satis est* (1.10.76), and several others among the twelve occurrences from *Satires* 1, and eight from and *Satires* 2.

⁴⁰ Freudenburg 1993: 193.

⁴¹ Freudenburg 2001: 1-2. The grammarian Diomedes (*Gram. Lat.* 1.485) suggests *lanx satura* as one of several possible etymologies, among which is derivation from *satyri*, “satyrs”; *farcimen*, “stuffing;” or *lex satura/lex per saturam*, a political bill that contains a miscellany. The possibilities are delineated in Gowers 1993b: 110-26, along with further connection between satire and food.

⁴² Gowers 1993b: 110; Freudenburg 2001: 28, and for a full treatment of *satis* v. *satur*, see 27-44.

⁴³ As Gowers 1993b: 133 writes, “The body knew its limits in Book 1, but is inflated in Book 2.”

and pale with food (*pinguem vitiis albumque*, 2.2.21), fatty bacon (*pingui ... lardo*, 2.6.64) sprinkled on slim vegetables, to the rich fodder for animals that have been cooked and themselves become the fodder for human consumption (*pinguibus et ficis pastum iecur*, 2.8.88).⁴⁴ Horace undermines the emphasis on fatness through increased discourse of boundaries and satiety in *Satires* 2. He emphasizes the slender diet, where *tenuis* is the antonym of *pinguis*, and he cuts short the narrative of his ornate meals as though to say his readers cannot read/consume any more. For example, in *S.* 2.6 the mice are frightened mid-meal by barking dogs and retreat, leaving their meal behind; and in *S.* 2.8, the guests quickly abandon Nasidienus' feast at the abrupt appearance of Canidia before any food can be eaten, leaving his characters with empty stomachs. Both of these examples serve to remind us of Horace's previous call for introspective inquiry "unlunched" (*impransi*, 2.2.7), i.e., with a slender belly.

The conflict between thin and fat is manifested in Horace's literary aesthetic to avoid turgid and lengthy prose, like the "fat book" that Callimachus despised,⁴⁵ or the lengthy oeuvre of Lucilius. Horace's descriptions of his prolific predecessor is flavored with the culinary discourse of fatness and abundance: Lucilius' poetry is like a thick, muddy flow (*flueret lutulentus*, *S.* 1.4.11), and he dictates two hundred verses an hour (*in hora ... ducentos ... versus dictabat*, 10), spewing the words from his mouth (like *flueret*) as though it were vomit from an overly-sated stomach. In a contradictory manner, Horace teases his characters' (and readers') senses with lengthy descriptions of food in *Satires* 2 that he later snatches away. This reflects his moral

⁴⁴ *S.* 2.4.42: *ulvis et harundine pinguis*; 2.4.65: *pingui miscere mero*; 2.5.40: *pingui tentus omaso*; 2.6.14: *pingue pecus*. There is only one appearance of *pinguis* in *Satires* 1 at 1.3.58: *tardo cognomen, pingui damus*.

⁴⁵ On *pinguis* as literary metaphor in satire see Bramble 1974: 56-8, Freudenburg 2001: 37-8. On Horace's Callimachean aesthetics in the *Odes*, see Cody 1976 and Mette 1961; and in the *Satires* see Freudenburg 1993, especially 185-98.

agenda of *eating* simply to *live* simply; but it also casts him in the role of a Harpy, not unlike those that appear earlier in the poem.⁴⁶ Horace teases his audience's senses by not allowing them to consume the food/poetry that he has placed before them.

There is a great irony in the apparent contrast between slenderness (*tenuis*) and fatness (*pinguis*) when applied to Horatian satire. Although Horace's *Satires* strive to attain slenderness through Horace's pronouncements for sufficiency, they are anything but. Each line is replete with complex symbolism, metaphor, imagery, and narrative to which the reader can come back time and time again to feast, savoring the juicy and substantial poetry. Horace's *Satires* are rich and, "like a satisfied dinner guest" (*ut conviva satur*, S. 1.1.119), leave the reader full and satiated. The collision of this conflicting imagery identifies Horace's new brand of satire as one of a *tenuis satura*, an oxymoronic "slim fat dish."⁴⁷ The *tenuis victus* appears again in S. 2.6 as we return to the narrative of the city mouse and country mouse.

Aesthetics of the City and Country (S. 2.6)

Let us return to the city mouse and country mouse episode in S. 2.6. When we last left them, the *mus rusticus* had fastidiously fashioned a spread of humble foods (84-6): chickpea (*cicer*), oat (*avena*), dried grape (*aridum acinum*) and half-eaten morsel of bacon fat (*frusta semesa lardi*). This meal contrasts the decadent dining scenes we see elsewhere in the *Satires* (2.2, 2.7, and 2.8). The efforts of the *mus rusticus*, however, do not impress his dinner guest's "haughty tooth" (*dente superbo*, 87). After giving a rousing speech, the *mus urbanus* leads his friend on a

⁴⁶ S. 2.2.40: "Says the gullet, fit for the snatching Harpies" (*ait Harpyiis gula digna rapacibus*); Cf. Canidia's appearance at S. 2.8.94-5 where she fouls food with her mouth like a harpy, on which see Chapter 4: 188-90.

⁴⁷ Gowers 1993b: 126.

journey to the city where he hosts his friend in a city dining experience. As the two dining scenes are laid out before the audience, it becomes apparent that *S. 2.6* is as much about the visual disparity between the two feasts and as it is about the gustatory experience to herald the *victus tenuis*.

Visually, the country home of the *mus rusticus* is as humble as the meal he serves. He lives in a modest burrow (*cavo*, 81), which is in line with the expectations of a mouse's home. After he plays the dutiful host, honorifically called *pater ipse domus* (88),⁴⁸ the country mouse "reclines on this season's chaff" (*palea porrectus in horna*, 88) as though it were a dining couch. While he consumes unrefined grains ("spelt and darnel seeds," *ador loliumque*, 89), he is carefree enough to "leave behind the best crumbs of the feast" (*dapis meliora relinquens*, 89). The relaxed *mus rusticus* is the rodent embodiment of Horace's earlier calls for satisfaction with one's lot and the search for the blessed life (*vita beata*) from programmatic *S. 1.1*: "it happens that we rarely discover someone who claims he has lived a **blessed life** and departs life content with his time spent, like a satiated dinner guest" (*fit ut raro qui se vixisse beatum / dicat et exacto contentus tempore vita cedat / uti conviva satur reperire queamus*, 1.1.117-20).⁴⁹ The concept of the **happy** life (*vive beatus*, 2.6.96) is at the center of this narrative, mirroring

⁴⁸ Cf. *S. 2.8.7* where Nasidienus is also called "the father of the feast" (*cenae pater*) to indicate "his pride in what he is offering and the concern he shows for the meal's success" (Muecke 1993: 230).

⁴⁹ Satisfaction with one's lot is also the theme of the priamel in *Carm. 1.1*: "There are those who take pleasure in collecting dust on an Olympic chariot" (*sunt quos curriculo pulverem Olympico / collegisse iuvat*, 3-4); "you would never convince [the farmer] to sail the sea of Myrto with his Cyprian hull as a frightened sailor" (*illum ... numquam demoveas ut trabe Cypria / Myrtoum pavidus nauta secet mare*, 9-14).

Horace's continued concern with it throughout *Satires* 2.⁵⁰ In the description of Horace's own table at *S.* 2.6.63-76, conversation arises (*sermo oritur*, 71) and he engages in philosophical discourse with his friends concerning "whether people are **happy** in wealth or virtue" (*utrumne divitiis homines an sint virtute beati*, 2.6.74). Conversation (*sermo*) is also Horace's name for his *Satires* (*sermones*), distilling his poetry to topics of casual table talk, but whose content includes lofty philosophical investigation.

The *mus urbanus* delivers a speech that tempts the *mus rusticus* from his rustic lot. The speech uses discourse of death and temporality to remind the *mus rusticus* of his mortality: "there is no escape from death" (*neque ulla est ... leti fuga*, 94-5), "while it is permitted" (*dum licet*, 96), and "live knowing that your time is brief" (*vive memor quam sis aevi brevis*, 97). Death becomes a justification for seizing the moment and the road (*carpe viam*, 93) to embark on a journey of immediate gratification of pleasures that can only be found in the city. Just as the scene shifts from humble abode (*cavo*, 81) to decadent house (*locuplete domo*, 102), so too is there a change in the scene's aesthetic quality. Horace's narrative emphasizes the visually-oriented inversions between the feasts in the city and the country, apparent from the first glance into the urban *domus*:

*cum ponit uterque
in locuplete domo vestigia, rubro ubi cocco
tincta super lectos canderet vestis eburnos
multaque de magna superessent fercula cena,
quae procul exstructis inerant hesterna canistris. 105
ergo ubi purpurea porrectum in veste locavit
agrestem, veluti succinctus cursitat hospes
continuatque dapes nec non verniliter ipse
fungitur officiis, praelibans omne quod affert. (Hor. *S.* 2.6.101-9)*

⁵⁰ *S.* 2.4: "You seem **happy**" (*tu vidisse beatus*, 92), and "guidelines for a **blessed** life" (*vitae praecepta beatae*, 95); *S.* 2.8.1: "How was it at **blessed** Nasidienus' feast?" (*ut Nasidieni iuvit te cena beati?*).

Each mouse left his footprints in an opulent home, where a cloak painted with red dye shone over ebony couches, and large trays were left over from a large dinner, which were in piled baskets long left over from yesterday. And so, when he (the city mouse) situated the country mouse stretched out on a purple garment, the host, just like a girded waiter, runs around and keeps the feast coming and obsequiously performs the duties, tasting ahead of time everything that he brings to the table.

The white couches are decorated with dyed coverlets, nearly shining in their splendor (*canderet*, 102). The word order of the plates left over from dinner compounds imagery of largess and abundance (*multaque de magna superessent*, 104). Food from the day before (*hesterna*, 105) that is left in a heaping pile of baskets (*exstructis ... canistris*, 105) conveys the urban dinner's temporality, waste, and lazy clean up efforts. The image of yesterday's food contrasts with the country mouse's old chaff couch (*palea ... horna*, 88) whose age is measured by the growing season rather than by the day it was cooked (*cena ... hesterna*, 104-5). The imagery of food carefully saved and stored away (*attentus quaesitis*, 82; *sepositi ciceris*, 84) is integral to contextualizing the country dining scene. In the country, food must be labored for and stored away for a long time, which makes the country mouse's dinner a monumental effort on his part despite its lackluster sensory aesthetics. In the city, food is similarly "heaped," but symbolizing waste: abandoned and partially eaten food that has not yet been cleaned up. Because of the lazy clean up efforts by the dwellers of the house, the mice do not have to labor for their easy pickings.

As they settle down to eat, the city mouse physically poses the country mouse (*locavit*, 106) to lounge in a similar manner as he did in the country. In the country the *mus rusticus* stretches out on a makeshift couch – a rough old chaff (*palea porrectus in horna*, 88) – which symbolizes agrarian simplicity. Here, with similar language and syntax, the country mouse similarly stretches out on purple cloth (*purpurea porrectum in veste*, 106). The color and texture are the epitome of comfort and regal luxury. This upgrade in reclining symbolizes the mouse's desire to change his lot in life: just as the *mus rusticus* has traded his country lifestyle for city lifestyle,

and went from host to guest, he also trades in his chaff for purple cloth. The *mus rusticus* finds enjoyment in this alternate lifestyle as he “rejoices in his changed circumstance” (*gaudet mutata sorte*, 110).

The *mus urbanus*, then, sets to work playing the host for his friend. His method of serving the food elevates imagery from the previous scene (namely, imagery of mouths and teeth) to communicate that he is a more evolved rodent specimen:

*veluti succinctus cursitat hospes
continuatque dapes nec non verniliter ipse
fungitur officiis, praelibans omne quod affert.
ille cubans gaudet mutata sorte bonisque
rebus agit laetum convivam.* (Hor. S. 2.6.107-11) 110

With his clothes tucked, the host runs about and keeps the feast coming, and he himself performs his duties in the manner of a slave, pre-tasting everything that he brings. The country mouse reclines and rejoices in his changed circumstance and good fortune as he plays the happy dinner guest.

The *mus urbanus* runs around (*cursitat*, 107) and serves his guest with language used of human servants:⁵¹ he is well girded (*succinctus*, 107),⁵² displays obsequiousness (*verniliter*, 108), and he pre-tastes the food (*praelibans*, 109) like a human *praegustator* would test his master’s food for poison.⁵³ Rather than use the customary verb base *gusto* (from *praegusto*), Horace adjusts language of tasting to be appropriate for a mouse, *praelibo*, literally “pre-nibbling.”⁵⁴ The city mouse as *praelibator* draws attention to his mouth and recalls how the *mus rusticus* previously served the food with his mouth (*ore ferens*, 85). Carrying food in his mouth is an action

⁵¹ West 1974: 72-3.

⁵² Cf. S. 2.8.70: “Slave boys girded-up tightly” (*praecincti recte pueri*).

⁵³ West 1974: 72; Muecke 1993: 211.

⁵⁴ A variant reading is *praelambens* (codd.), “pre-licking,” which emphasizes the sensory component of the action.

appropriate for mouse⁵⁵ and exhibits behavior that is natural for his species. The dining scene in the city, however, is elevated to fit the human realm. The *mus urbanus* serves like a human slave and pre-nibbles the food; and he gives a lengthy pseudo-Epicurean speech (90-7) in the manner of a philosopher – or at least a charlatan. The city mouse shows himself to be urbanized and detached from his mousy heritage by mimicking human behavior in a culinary and epistemological context. In acting like a human and living among them,⁵⁶ he blurs the distinction between human and animal, and between country (where he should live) and city (where he chooses to). Essentially, the *mus urbanus*, with his philosophizing and anthropomorphic behavior, does not know his own place.

The mouth is a locus of gustatory pleasure. The city mouse “pre-nibbles” the food in the city to ensure that his guest will enjoy it, and he rejects the humble meal in the country because of his “haughty tooth” (*dente superbo*, 87) or refined sense of taste. The imagery of teeth and mouths is important throughout the *Satires*, especially for the emphasis on food in Book 2.⁵⁷ The mouth

⁵⁵ West 1974: 71: “How else would a mouse carry food if not in his mouth?” Carrying food in the mouth is an animal behavior, like the ants in *S.* 1.1.33-4: “the ant, a great laborer, carries whatever it can in its **mouth**” (*magni formica laboris / ore trahit quodcumque potest*); and dogs in *Epod.* 5.23: “bones snatched from the **mouth** of a hungry dog” (*ossa ab ore rapta ieiunae canis*).

⁵⁶ The city and people are conflated earlier at *S.* 2.6.92: “do you wish to prefer **civilization and the city** to the rugged forest?” (*vis tu homines urbemque feris praeponere silvis?*).

⁵⁷ More accurately, the parts of the mouth are used as metonymy for mouths, eating and tasting in the *Satires*: *palatum*, “palate” (*gallina tergere palatum*, 2.2.24 ; *ante meum nulli patuit quaesita palatum*, 2.4.46; *ne gallina malum responset dura palato*, 2.4.18); *gula*, “gullet” (*ait Harpyiis gula digna rapacibus*, 2.2.40; *nil servile gulae parens habet?*, 2.7.111); *faux*, “throat” (*num, tibi cum faucis urit sitis, aurea quaeris pocula?*, 1.2.114). Teeth (*dentes*) are almost exclusively used to describe feral animals (*variae cum dente colubrae*, 1.8.42; *dente lupus*,

is the passageway for food's entry into the body, and the teeth help to break down that food to facilitate digestion. Nowhere is the tooth more prominent than in programmatic *S.* 2.1 where Horace addresses his critics: "and envy, seeking to drive her **tooth** into something fragile, will strike something solid" (*invidia et fragili quaerens illidere **dentem** / offendet solido*, 77-8).⁵⁸ Readers of Horace's "fragile" (or rather, "slender," *tenuis*) satire will be surprised to find that it has substance. It is not poetry to be disregarded because it does not count among the lofty genres of epic, tragedy, or history. Horace's readers will find they can sink their teeth into his *Satires* – and that it will bite back. In addition to its practical function for receiving nourishment and facilitating digestion, the mouth is also responsible for uttering words,⁵⁹ whether it is poetry (*carmina*) or conversations (*sermones*).⁶⁰ The mouth takes on many functions (eating, drinking, singing, talking), which only strengthens the association between culinary and literary imagery.

Arguably the most significant sensory experience in the urban dining scene of *S.* 2.6 is the sudden auditory interjection. As the mice are settling into their new environment and enjoying their stolen meal, "suddenly a loud crash of the doors" startles them (*subito ingens / valvarum strepitus*, 2.6.111-12). The booming sound echoes throughout the house whose lofty walls, once

cornu taurus petit, 2.1.52, *neque calce lupus quemquam neque **dente** petit bos*, 55; ***dente** superbo*, 2.6.87), or bestial women (*Canidiae **dentis** ... excidere*, 1.8.48-9; *saeva **dente** livido / Canidia*, *Epod.* 5.47-8).

⁵⁸ Cf. *Pers.* 1.114-5 on Lucilius' "biting" satire: "Lucilius ripped into the city ... and **broke his molar** on them" (*sequit Lucilius urbem ... **genuinum fregit** in illis*).

⁵⁹ Bramble 1974: 55. For Richlin 1992b: 69, the mouth can be both obscene (oral sex) and non-obscene (speaking, eating). Corbeill 1996: 101-2 writes that the mouth is a metaphor for "moral turpitude" and is involved in "speaking, chewing, swallowing, and other oral activities," including sex; see generally 101-27.

⁶⁰ Cf. *S.* 1.4.43: "To him who has a more prophetic mind and a **mouth** for speaking great things" (*cui mens divinator atque **os** magna sonaturum*); *Ars.* 323: "the Muse gave the Greeks the ability to speak with a facile **mouth**" (*Grais dedit **ore** rotundo / Musa loqui*).

a sign of wealth, function now only to amplify the sound: “the lofty house resonated with (the barking of) Molossian dogs” (*domus alta Molossis / personuit canibus*, 2.6.114-15). The *strepitus* interrupts the meal by shaking the mice from both their couches and false sense of security. They are frightened (*pavidi*, 113; *exanimis trepidare*, 114) and scurry about the room (*currere per totum*) for cover. The crash also awakens the *mus rusticus* to the realities of urban life and makes him regret his trek from his designated lot.⁶¹ He resolves to quit the city and return to the country where “the forest and my hovel, free from traps, will suffice for me with its simple vetch” (*me silva cavusque / tutus ab insidiis tenui solabitur ervo*, 116-17).

One of the most surprising details about this narrative is the lack of description of food in the urban meal. Certainly, we receive the impression that the urban meal is more refined because of the context but there is no lengthy culinary narrative of the food proper. Aesop’s version of this fable elaborates on types of food served in the city: “he let him feast on all kinds of meat and fish and even cakes.”⁶² In Horace’s satiric version, the food is simplified to merely a “feast” *dapes* (108). The word is elevated language for a meal, but is not even special within this narrative. The same word is also used, probably ironically, to describe the rustic meal (*dapis meliora relinquens*, 89). Horace painstakingly relates the exact foods served in the country, aligning it with his humble veggies and *victus tenuis* (here, the “slender vetch” *ervum tenue*). There are a

⁶¹ The power of sound in dining is also evident in the verbal reputation of exotic foods (*famae*, *S.* 2.2.94); see also *S.* 2.8.11-12 where Nasidienus’ excessive narrative about each dish renders the food unappetizing: “[the foods would have been] pleasant things, if the host didn’t narrate their origins and natures (*suavis res, si non causas narraret earum et / naturas dominus*). Cf. *Petr.* 28.5, where music that accompanies each new course.

⁶² Translation from West 1974: 67. Cf. *Babr.* 108: “He showed him there was a mound of barley groats, a heap or jug of all kinds of figs, jars of honey, and baskets of date palms” (ἔδειξε δ’ αὐτῷ, ποῦ μὲν ἀλφίτων πλήθη, / ποῦ δ’ ὀσπρίων ἦν σωρὸς ἢ πίθοι σύκων, / στάμνοι τε μέλιτος σώρακοί τε φοινίκων, text from Perry 2007: 352).

few possibilities to explain this discord. The absence of food at the feast prefigures the meal's interruption where food is taken away before it can be savored. Alternately, Horace promotes the *victus tenuis* / *ervum tenue* as a model for living moderately, so naturally he would focus on the one meal that supports this agenda. While I do not deny that these motivations are possible, allow me to posit another explanation related to the senses. Horace omits food in the urban dinner to emphasize the inundation of *other* senses present at the feast. The traditional Roman *cena* is less concerned with eating food or providing nourishment as it is with putting on a spectacle to amuse and delight. With its ornate table settings, bountiful abundance of heaping foods, and comforts afforded to the bodies around the table, the *cena* would have been a sensory overload for the dinner guest. Horace recreates this aspect of dining for his audience through narrating very little about the specific dishes or food served in the city.⁶³

In this section we have witnessed that the episode of the city mouse and the country mouse is enriched by the wide range within the sensorium: the sights and tastes especially combine to create a visual, auditory, and gustatory dichotomy between the meals in each place. The meals also allow Horace to critique urban lifestyles at the same time as dissatisfaction with one's lot. The addition of a sudden and unexpected sensory interjection – i.e., the sudden crash – shatters the illusion of urban life, but also marks the poem's climax. The simple lifestyle prevails in the end when the *mus rusticus* resolves to return to the country. His “simple vetch” (*tenui ... ervo*, 117) is an apt culinary representation for his country lifestyle characterized by scrounging and saving foods to enjoy simply in the rugged environment.

The moral of the fable is fairly simple when distilled down to its component parts: country life is good, and city life is bad. But satire is full of contradictions and instances of crossing

⁶³ Cf. S. 2.8, which features another feast where the narration deemphasizes eating and tasting (*fugimus*, 93).

established boundaries – even by the Horace persona. According to *S.* 2.6, when he is in the city Horace idealizes his rustic fare from his Sabine farm: “O when will my beans, relatives to Pythagoras, be served, along with my little vegetables **sufficiently** rubbed with rich lard? (*quando faba Pythagorae cognata simulque / uncta satis pingui ponentur holuscula lardo?* 63-4).⁶⁴ The appearance of *satis* in this pivotal scene signals Horace’s concern with boundaries and his return to the theme of *mempsimoiria* from *S.* 1.1.⁶⁵ The persona’s satisfaction with his culinary lot has applications to his satisfaction with his lot in life. However, in the next poem, Horace reneges on his own proscription for simple dining. In *S.* 2.7, a celebration of Saturnalia and role-reversals, Horace’s servant Davus pokes fun at his master’s contradictions, saying, “If you were never by chance called to dinner (at Maecenas’), you would praise your carefree vegetables” (*si nusquam es forte vocatus / ad cenam, laudas securum holus*, 2.7.29-30). But Horace’s manner completely changes when called by Maecenas, and he eagerly becomes a greedy “last minute dinner guest” (*serum ... convivam*, 2.7.33-4). Horace takes on qualities of the stock parasite character Mulvius, who confesses to be “fickle and slave to the stomach, I tilt back my nose at the smell, weak, lazy, and if you wish, add that I’m a glutton” (*duci ventre levem, nasum nidore supinor, / imbecillus, iners, si quid vis, adde popino*, 2.7.38-9).

Horace’s persona is the embodiment of dissatisfaction, the very human condition he criticizes elsewhere in his poetry, particularly the conflict between city and country. When he is in the city Horace craves his country fare; and when he is in the country, Horace longs for the city and

⁶⁴ Horace alters the country mouse diet from the fables (primarily consisting of figs, grapes, fruits, and roots) to “characterize his own simple standard of living” (West 1974: 71).

⁶⁵ *S.* 1.1.1-3: “Why is it, Maecenas, that no one lives content with the lot that prudence provided or chance threw his way, but instead praises those who follow different paths?” (*Qui fit, Maecenas, ut nemo quam sibi sortem / seu ratio dederit seu fors obiecerit, illa / contentus vivat, laudet diversa sequentis?*).

lavish dinners. He both figuratively and literally crosses the boundaries between city and country. This contradiction inherent in the persona's outlook also reflects the nature of satire. Satire boasts to operate within established boundaries of moral behavior with its repetition of *satis* and ideal concepts of sufficiency; yet, on the other hand, satire is defined by its incorporation of other genres and viewpoints into a singular poetic form (*lanx satura*). It is a literary form defined by constructing boundaries only to break them down.

Now that we have observed how Roman dining is a consortium of the senses, let us zone in on the sense of taste. In the next section, food itself is on display, imbued with the bitter flavors associated with the satiric genre. The satirist as the cook will add a dash of salt, vinegar, *garum*, or nothing at all to his food (i.e., poetry) to transmit his satiric agenda.

Adding Flavor

Salt, Vinegar, and Fish Sauce

In *S.* 2.4, Horace dons the satiric mask of gourmand and pseudo-philosopher, Catius who extols the tenants of his gastro-philosophy. Catius pronounces:

nec sibi cenarum quivis temere arroget artem 35
non prius exacta tenui ratione saporum.
nec satis est cara piscis averrere mensa
ignarum quibus est ius aptius. (Hor. *S.* 2.4.35-8)

May no one rashly claim to know the art of dining before he has extracted a subtle knowledge of flavors.
But it is not enough to clear away fish from an expensive table being ignorant of the best sauce for it.

In this dictum, Catius lays out the “law” of his gastronomy, appropriately punning on *ius* (which means both sauce and law).⁶⁶ The cook must have a “subtle knowledge of flavors” (*tenui*

⁶⁶ Gowers 1993b: 133 argues the presence on *ius* “makes a parallel between the codification of the law and gastronomy”; also see 155-7. Horace’s preoccupation with *ius* as having connections to law may point toward satire’s etymology from *leges per saturam*, or the laws that grouped a variety of bills together to be passed as one.

ratione saporum, 35), which harkens back to language of slimness (*tenuis*) appropriate for Horace's slender diet and slim satire. It is quickly followed by "it is not enough," (*nec satis est*, 37), another reference to *satis* which signals that Horace is still applying measures and boundaries to the food, despite Catius' luxurious recipes. In this passage, culinary tastes are likened to literary ones. Just as food can be seasoned in different ways through the cooking process to alter or enhance its taste, satire can be flavored in different ways to suit the agenda of the satirist, who is made into a "meta-literary cook" by this metaphor.⁶⁷ In this section, Horace as the poet-cook concocts scenes of culinary excess and abundance that are generously flavored to contrast with his own quests for a slender, naturally-flavored meal and lifestyle.

J. C. Bramble argues that certain types of literature, like dishes themselves, need to be seasoned in order to be palatable to the audience, i.e., the consumer.⁶⁸ Using culinary language to describe literature is well attested in antiquity, as reflected in Quintillian: "something must be salted in order to not be boring, just like a simple seasoning for oratory" (*salsum igitur erit, quod non erit insulsum, velut quoddam simplex orationis condimentum*, *Inst. Or.* 6.3.19). Just as the Greeks and Romans described poetry in terms of its honey-sweet flavors,⁶⁹ metaphors of salt (*sal*), vinegar (*acetum*), and sauce (*garum*) were used to describe genres in the lower registers: satire, iambics, and comedy. These bitter tastes signal sharp-flavored poetry full of wit and stinging criticism. For example, Aristophanes jokes that salt and vinegar are needed to season Sthenelus' bland tragedies: "A: But how can I consume Sthenelus' verses? B: By soaking it in

⁶⁷ Cf. *Ep.* 2.2.61-2, where Horace plays the role of the poet-cook: "Like dinner guests at my house, they seem to disagree, each asking for different things for their individual tastes" (*mihi convivae prope dissentire videntur, / poscentes vario multum diversa palato*).

⁶⁸ Bramble 1974: 52-4.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*: 50; Bartsch 2015: 133-4.

vinegar or dry salt.”⁷⁰ Similarly, Martial writes that vinegar is a natural seasoning for biting epigram: “it is not at all pleasing that this food (i.e., epigram) be deprived of bitter vinegar” (*nec cibus ipse iuvat morsu fraudatus aceti*, 7.25.5). Additionally, Pliny describes Martial’s poetry as full of “wit and bitterness” (*salis ... et fellis*) – literally “salt and bile,” the latter of which is not a flavor, but important in the digestive process.⁷¹ Biting wit and invective speech were potent enough, then, to leave a figural bitter taste in the reader’s mouth.

Writing satire is also characterized in terms of culinary metaphor. Horace addresses the inclusion of flavorful salt, vinegar, and sauce into the food he writes, and metaphorically in his poetry, like the black salt (*sal niger*) that can be found in his *Satires*.⁷² However, in Horace’s scenes of ideal rustic dining, salt, vinegar, and sauces are not included among the listed ingredients. The use of extreme flavors, in fact, directly contradicts the simple and slender diet (*victus tenuis*, 2.2.53 and 70) that Horace extols through the rustic sage Ofellus. Just like Ofellus’ simple fare, Horace’s eponymous persona craves his beans and humble vegetables (*porri et ciceris*, 1.6.115; *faba Pythagorae cognata*, 2.6.63). Horace’s simple diet of whole foods is enhanced naturally with bacon fat, but only just “enough” (*uncta satis pingui ... holuscula lardo*, 2.6.64). The proximity of *satis* and *pingui* in this passage undercuts the luxury of the fatty flavoring and suggests that flavors must be balanced.

⁷⁰ A. καὶ πῶς ἐγὼ Σθενέλου φάγοιμ’ ἄν ῥήματα; / B. εἰς ὄξος ἐμβαπτόμενος ἢ ξηροῦς ἄλας (fr. 158b, text from Henderson 2008).

⁷¹ Plin. *Epist.* 3.21.1-2.

⁷² *Ep.* 2.2.59-60: “You rejoice in my *Odes*; this guy likes my *Epodes*; and that guy likes my *Sermones* in the style of Bion with its **black salt**” (*carmine tu gaudes, hic delectatur iambis. / ille Bioneis sermonibus et sale nigro*), where “black” implies invective speech (Gowers 1993b: 143 n. 129; 155). See Bartsh 2015: 141-3 on Horace’s literary use of bitter ingredients and flavors.

On the other hand, strong flavors and seasonings appear in the dining scenes that showcase Roman luxury, like at the feast of Nasidienus in *S.* 2.8.⁷³ The narrative and visual descriptions of the dishes paints a vivid picture of the deceased animals in their opposing animate and inanimate states, which casts doubt on the feast's edibility. Nasidienus animatedly describes the first course of boar surrounded by bitter vegetables (*acria*, "sharp things," 7), which had been flavored with parsnip, fish sauce, and the dregs of Coan wine (*siser, allec, faecula Coa*, 9). Narrating the boar's capture "in a gentle wind" (*leni ... Austro*, 6) is lively and has a pastoral flavor; it also creates an abrupt discrepancy between the serenity of the hunting scene and the deceased animal by-product. Instead of being alive in the wild, the boar's body is posed on a platter surrounded by bitter vegetation as though to mimic its lush, natural environment. The dish has a façade of realism, but at its core it is fabricated, sterile, and put on display for the body's sensory pleasure, both gustatory and visual.

Served next is a surf-and-turf course that comprises pregnant moray eel surrounded by live shrimp swimming (*affertur squillas inter murena natantis / in patina porrecta*, *S.* 2.8.42-3). The dish of the pregnant eel, as Paul Allen Miller writes, is "the fusion of birth and death."⁷⁴ Once fertile with offspring, the eel will now never complete the life-giving function of birth; rather, it is surrounded by swimming shrimp (*squillas ... natantis*, 42), whose animation stands in opposition to the deceased eel. The word order *murena* sandwiched between *squillas* suggests movement around the lifeless eel: *squillas inter murena natantis* (42). The shrimp may be an

⁷³ Berg 1996: 142 discusses the two opposing food philosophies: the first "recommends a simple diet based on potherbs (*holus*)" and the second "advocates the painstaking selection, preparation, and presentation of delicacies."

⁷⁴ Miller 1998: 276 (2009: 346), who goes on to argue that the dinner scene is Bakhtin's "carnavalesque par excellence" in its celebration of "conviviality, the open body, and excess that leads to carnival's cycle of degradation and renewal" (1998: 274 = 2009: 344).

unnatural substitution for the larvae that the turgid eel will never birth, which heightens the grotesque inversions at play.

Rather than having the shrimp swim in water, the sea fare is served in a sauce (*his mixtum ius*, 45). Here follows a lengthy description of the sauce's contents, which is primarily acrid ingredients, and preparation (45-53). As we have seen, the word *ius* is a pun that means both sauce and law and seems to suggest the legalized formulations for satire's gastronomy rules. Nasidienus' sauce is a mixture of his own invention containing: oil (*oleo*, 45), fish juice (*garo*, 46), old wine (*vino quinquenni*, 47), white pepper (*pipere albo*, 49), and fermented vinegar (*aceto / quod Methymnaea vitio mutaverit uvam*, 49-50). Everything has been mixed together and cooked thoroughly (*incoquere*, 52). The sauce combines all of the strong flavors that Horace's slender diet lacks: the bitter flavors of wine and vinegar and the salty, fishy flavor of the *garum*.⁷⁵ The process of decoction (signaled by *incoquere*) juxtaposes the process by which Horace strives to prepare his preferred food.⁷⁶ Rather than serve complicated, boiled-down sauces, Horace's *victus tenuis* is characterized by "simple snacks" and whole foods.⁷⁷ If there is

⁷⁵ Catius' lengthy sauce recipe at *S.* 2.4.64-9 shares common ingredients with Nasidienus' sauce: olive oil (*olivo*, 64), wine (*mero*, 65), and smelly fish juice/pickling (*muria*, 65; *putuit*, 66); seasonings are also added, like chopped herbs (*sectis ... herbis*, 67), saffron (*croco*, 68), and olives (*baca ... olivae*, 69). Berg 1996: 148-51 identifies Nasidienus as the unnamed gourmand from whom Catius learned his sauce recipe.

⁷⁶ Decoction is a process more appropriately applied to the *Satires* of Persius, who coins the term *decoctius* ("more boiled down," 1.125) to reflect his poetry's "refined density" (Bramble 1974: 139).

⁷⁷ Bartsch 2015: 73; see 64-74 for a full treatment of Persius' satiric decoction.

to add any flavor to this food, it is just enough to make the healthy fare palatable, like the teachers who give students sweet cookies to learn their ABCs back in *S.* 1.1.⁷⁸

Nasidienus' feast is bursting with unusual, exotic flavors, especially acrid flavors of wine and vinegar, and fish juices that have been boiled down to integrate all of their elements. These strong flavors model the gustatory experience from a traditional Roman *cena*. By the end of *S.* 2.8, Nasidienus' meal devolves to a conglomeration of animal parts and dismembered limbs:

<i>deinde secuti</i>	85
<i>mazonomo pueri magno discerpta ferentes</i>	
<i>membra gruis sparsi sale multo, non sine farre,</i>	
<i>pinguibus et ficis pastum iecur anseris albae</i>	
<i>et leporum avulsos, ut multo suavius, armos</i>	
<i>quam si cum lumbis quis edit; tum pectore adusto</i>	90
<i>vidimus et merulas poni et sine clune palumbis,</i>	
<i>suavis res, si non causas narraret earum et</i>	
<i>naturas dominus. (Hor. S. 2.8.85-93)</i>	

Then the servants followed carrying on a large platter the mangled limbs of a crane sprinkled with lots of salt and flour, and the liver of a white goose fed on plump figs, and the dismembered limbs of hare, as if it would be much more appetizing than if one were to eat them with the loins. Then we saw the blackbirds served with burned breasts and wood pigeons without the rump – all appetizing things if our host had not narrated their origins and natures.

The meal that initially served whole animals on platters (boar, fish, and moray eel – so whole it was pregnant!) now hurriedly presents food deconstructed to body parts that are over-cooked (*adusto*, 20) and over-salted (*sale multo*, 87). Nasidienus serves goose liver (*iecur anseris*, 88), a body part that is known to produce bile (*bilis*), the humor associated with anger⁷⁹ and upset stomachs: “what was once sweet will turn to **bile** and the thick phlegm will cause distress in the stomach” (*dulcia se in **bilem** vertent stomachoque tumultum / lenta feret pituita*, *S.* 2.2.75-6).

⁷⁸ *S.* 1.1.25-6: “Just like the flattering teachers once would give cookies to the boys so that they could learn their first letters” (*ut pueris olim dant crustula blandi / doctores, elementa velint ut discere prima*).

⁷⁹ *S.* 1.9.66: “My liver burned with **bile/anger**” (*meum iecur urere **bilis***).

The dinner guests are literally being served up the organ that is the seat of anger, an appropriate emotion for satire.⁸⁰

The passage at *S.* 2.2.75-6 is a commentary against mixing “simple” foods (*simplex*, 73), which even if they sit in the stomach and mix with the other foods can cause a visceral response in the gut (*in bilem*, 75). This advice harkens back to Horace’s slender diet of whole foods that are appetizing on their own, and do not need to be mixed with complicated sauces or spices. This seems to be fitting advice in the arena of culinary philosophy, but very unfitting advice coming from a writer of satire. It seems that Horace’s own restrictions against mixing food in cooking applies to his poetics in so far as his own incorporation of genres into the boundaries of satire does not result in a violent humoral response: neither the presence of bile (*bilis*) nor phlegm (*pituita*). It seeks instead to strike a balance of the humors, much like a body in good health.

In *S.* 2.8, the narrator Fundanius calls the food luxurious or appetizing twice (*suavius*, 89; *suavis*, 92), yet any of its appeal is undermined by the host’s constant narration of where the food came from, how it was caught, and how it was cooked. The deconstructed body parts come so fast and strong – and with such unusual smells and seasonings – that the audience may begin to blur the distinction between all the bodies at the table: are they human or animal? According to 2.8, the one thing that can really destroy a good dinner party is too much talking – and not enough eating! The guests’ ears are so bombarded by the descriptions that they do not get the opportunity to use their tongues to taste it. In fact, the primary use of the mouth in *S.* 2.8 is by Nasidienus who uses it to speak.

⁸⁰ On satiric bile, see Bartsch 2015: 84-5.

As evident in the meals associated with self-proclaimed culinary genuises Catius and Nasidienus, salt, vinegar, and fish sauce carry negative connotations as excessive seasoning and undesirable flavors for what should be simple food. The bitter flavors of salt and vinegar are also representative of undesirable invective modeled by Lucilius. Horace describes Lucilius as rubbing the city down with “salt” (*sal* – also, “wit”) throughout his satires: “And yet on the same page he is praised because he rubbed down the city with **a lot of salt**” (*at item, quod **sale multo** / urbem defricuit, charta laudatur eadem*, S. 1.10.3-4). It seems Horace concedes that salt has a salutary effect⁸¹ and that this type of scathing satire can be praiseworthy (*charta laudatur eadem*, 4) – but his tone is dismissive. *Sal multum* it is not characteristic of Horatian satire. Rather, Horace’s preferred tool is laughter: “humor often cuts into important issues more forcefully and effectively than **hostile abuse**” (*ridiculum **acri** / fortius et melius magnas plerumque secat res*, 14-5). Horace intentionally draws a hard line between Lucilian satire by reviling acerbic speech and favoring laughter. Laughter is the ingredient of Horatian satire that makes the rest of his message palatable, much like rubbing a little sumptuous fat onto vegetables, or giving students sweet cookies to learn their ABCs.

Nevertheless, it seems that audiences may have presumed a closer connection between Lucilian and Horatian satiric aesthetics, to which Horace needed to respond. At the start of *Satires* 2, Horace directly responds to (presumably) audience criticism that his satires contain too much invective (or “bitterness,” *acer*): “Some think I seem too **severe** in my satire and stretch my work beyond what is right” (*sunt quibus in satira videar nimis **acer** et ultra / legem tendere opus*, 2.1.1-2). Horace uses the same terminology and imagery from S. 1.10 (*acer*, 14) to convey his distance from the satiric tactics of Lucilius. This is also a passage where Horace first uses the

⁸¹ Gowers 2012: 312.

word “satires” to name his poetry (*satira*),⁸² which also supplies a pun on the concept of sufficiency (*satis*) to underscore his satiric sensibilities. Several lines later Horace describes Lucilius as *sapiens* (17), “wise,” which in a culinary context originally meant “juicy” or “flavorful” (from *sapor*, “taste,” and *sapio*, “to taste”).⁸³ This is the same word used to describe Ofellus (*abnormis sapiens*, *S.* 2.2.3), the rustic sage who is the mouthpiece for the *victus tenuis*. The meaning of *sapiens* applies to both the literary and culinary discourse, thus connecting the worlds of food and the activity of intellectuals – literature. Lucilius, then, is a “wise” poet – he was a pioneer of a new generic form, after all; but Lucilius also creates “flavorful” poetry (especially its biting, salty flavors) that is rich, full, and meant to be savored by the consumer/reader. For the remainder of *Satires* 2, Horace continues the culinary metaphor and sensory language to establish a dichotomy between his own satiric aspirations (simple and slender – *tenuis*), and that of Lucilius (abundant – *pinguis* – and acrid – *acer*).

Salt, vinegar, and fish sauce are not the only enhancements that can be added to Horace’s food. There are other “cooks” that take the opportunity to sneak poison (*venenum*) into the food. Poison will have a bitter taste, much like the salt and vinegar of the previous section, and therefore have associations with Lucilius. But whereas excess salt will simply ruin a meal, poison can have more deadly effects.

Who Poisoned the Food?

This next section treats the presence of poison (*venenum*) throughout the *Satires*. In constructing his concept of satire, Horace plays on the different meanings of *venenum*. The word can mean

⁸² The Latin name for Horace’s *Satires* are *Sermones* (“conversations”).

⁸³ Gowers 1993b: 8, 132.

poison or potion, particularly that wielded by the witch-hag, Canidia; it is also the word used of invective speech characteristic of the scathing satires of Lucilius.⁸⁴ As we will see, in passages that concern food and dining, *venenum* tends to crop up in various forms. Horace plays on the associations of bitter tastes and poison to fashion an unpleasant gustatory experience for the characters and audience. Poisoned food may also be ill-tasting. It has been befouled so badly that it is downright inedible. Similarly, poetry replete with invective (*venenum*) is unreadable. Like the food, “poisoned” poetry can be deadly.

Canidia, Horace’s witch, is one of the primary wielders of poison in the *Satires* and *Epodes*. In fact, *venenum* is her weapon of choice.⁸⁵ The word *venenum* is typically used to mean snake venom,⁸⁶ but it also is associated with the poisons that witches concoct.⁸⁷ In Horace’s poetry Canidia is a threatening female figure: she transgresses into sacred space, collects magic ingredients for potions, casts love spells, commits infanticide, and antagonizes Roman males. In essence, she and her witch companions are the embodiment of *venenum* in both of its meanings as poison and invective speech, such as those uttered in her imprecations: “[the witches] manipulate human minds with spells and **poisons**” (*carminibus quae versant atque **venenis** /*

⁸⁴ It is commonplace in Latin literature for *venenum* to describe virulent speech, like in *S.* 1.7.1: “The foulness and **venom** of Rupilius Rex” (*Regis Rupili pus atque **venenum***); Catul. 44.11-12: “a speech filled with **invective** and pestilence” (*orationem ... plenam **veneni** et pestilentiae*); Ov. *Met.* 2.777: “her tongue is imbued with **invective**” (*lingua est suffusa **veneno***).

⁸⁵ Canidia appears in *S.* 1.8, 2.1.48, 2.8.9; *Epod.* 3.7, 5, 17. She is treated more broadly throughout Chapter 4 for her role in *S.* 1.8.

⁸⁶ Hor. *Carm.* 1.37.26-8: “And she [Cleopatra] bravely handled the poisonous serpents so that she could drink their black **venom** with her body” (*fortis et asperas / tractare serpentis, ut atrum / corpore combiberet **venenum***).

⁸⁷ Hence, the Roman witch can be called a *venefica*, “poisoner” (used of Canidia at *Epod.* 5.71, 17.58). The Greek equivalent to *venenum*, φάρμακον, carries both meanings of “medicine” and “poison.”

humanos animos, S. 1.8.19-20). In this vein, Canidia accompanies distasteful food as though to imply it has been poisoned by her, and therefore renders it noxious.

Canidia appears in relation to Lucilius in S. 2.1, a poem where Horace discusses his poetic agenda relative to his predecessor. Lucilius, he says, exhibited no filter in his satires and indiscriminately “entrusted his secrets to his books as though they were friends” (*ille velut fidis arcana sodalibus olim / credebat libris*, 30-1). The result is that Lucilius laid out his entire life on paper for all to criticize. Horace, on the other hand, adheres closely to aesthetic boundaries.⁸⁸ Regarding his use of invective, Horace states, “he who provokes me will be sorry and, as a marked man, will be sung about all throughout the whole city – as it is better not to touch him, I say” (*at ille / qui me commorit (melius non tangere, clamo) / flebit et insignis tota cantabitur urbe*, 44-6). Horace does not directly state that he will use invective in his poetry, but simply that his enemies “will be sung” (*cantabitur*, 46); Horace has many more measures of attack in his toolbox than simply invective, all of which are owing to his weapon – his pen (*hic stilus*, 39). He draws a comparison between his weapon of choice (*stilus*) and Canidia’s weapon (*venenum*): “Canidia threatens her enemies with Albucius’ **poison**” (*minatur ... Canidia Albuci quibus est inimica venenum*, 47-8).⁸⁹ Horace’s *stilus* is responsible for writing his poetry, which can

⁸⁸ Much like he states metaphorically in S. 2.1.35: “For the Venusian farmer plows each boundary” (*nam Venusinus arat finem sub utrumque colonus*).

⁸⁹ The scholia suggest that Albucius is Canidia’s father (*Canidia <Albuci filia>*) and the poisons belong to him (*Albuci venenum*), which he used to kill his wife (*uxorem suam dicitur peremisse*; Holder 1979: 289 *ad* Hor. S. 2.1.48). There is still confusion among scholars and translators who differ whether *Albuci* is subjective or objective genitive: Muecke 1993: “Canidia threatens Albucius’s poison to her enemies” (19); Fairclough 1969-74: “Canidia with the poison of Albucius” (131); Davie 2011: “Canidia (threatens) her enemies with the poison of Albucius” (33).

include many more registers than invective speech; Canidia's only weapon is her poison, a periphrasis for invective speech. Horace considers his pen his weapon, not the invective.

The close proximity of Canidia's *venenum* and Lucilius in *S.* 2.1 suggest an association between the two as composers of *carmina* (poems/spells) and as masters of *venenum* (invective/poison).⁹⁰ Lucilius we know is already associated in Horace's mind with harsh and bitter flavors (*sal, acetum*) that flavored his verse with flavorful acidity. Lucilius' tendency to invective is also expressed through the presence of *venenum*. One such instance of *venenum* within a veiled reference to Lucilius can be found in *S.* 1.7 – the shortest and most virulent of Horace's *Satires*:

*Proscripti Regis Rupilius atque venenum
hybrida quo pacto sit Persius ultus, opinor
omnibus et lippis notum et tonsoribus esse. (Sat. 1.7.1-3)*

I think it's known to all bleary-eyed men and barbers how the half-breed Persius avenged the foulness and **venom** of Rupilius Rex, who had been proscribed.

This poem stages the characters Rupilius Rex and Persius in a mock courtroom where they hash out their mutual antagonism with loud-mouth invective. It is a literary retelling of a historical courtroom drama overseen by Marcus Brutus in his Asian military camp (*Bruto praetore tenente / ditem Asiam*, 18-9) after the death of Julius Caesar (c. 43-42 BCE) – hence his final address at the poem's end: "Brutus ... why not just kill this guy Rex?" (*Brute ... hunc Regem iugulas?* 33-5).⁹¹

Davie also writes that "Albucius is probably the supplier rather than the victim of the poison" (145 n. 47-9). *Contra* Rudd 1966: "Albucius ... who succumbed to Canidia's poisons" (140).

⁹⁰ Schlegel 2005: 81.

⁹¹ Gowers 2012: 250-2.

Discourse of sharpness and bitterness abound in this poem – like *tonsoribus* (“barbers,” 3) who wield sharp scissors and razors, *sermonis amari* (“bitter speech,” 7), *acres* (“bitter,” 21), *salso multoque* (“much salt/wit,” 28), *Italo ... aceto* (“Italian vinegar,” 32) – which underscores the presence of Rex’s *venenum*, “invective speech.”⁹² Add to this the implied presence of Julius Caesar (whose cognomen means “the cutter”), alluded to by the recurrence of *Rex* (“tyrant” or “king”). The imagery of sharp flavors, wit, and poison is contrasted with the plethora of dull and blunted imagery, such as the myopic bleary-eyed audience (*lippis*, 3) and repetition of Brutus’ name (which means “dull” or “insensitive”: *Bruto*, 18; *Brutum*, 24, *Brute*, 33). Previously in Chapter 1, we saw that bleary-eyes is a condition associated with Horace (*hic oculis ego nigra meis collyria lippus / illinere*, 1.5.30-1; *pila lippis inimicum et ludere crudis*, 1.5.49) and indicative of his satiric, subject-oriented humor. Lucilius, on the other hand is representative of the uncontrolled wit characterized by “venom;” the invective characteristic of his poetry “flows” throughout this poem (*in ius / acres procurrunt*, 20-1; *ruebat / flumen ut hibernum*, 26-7; *Italo perfusus aceto*, 32), much like his “muddy flow” from *S.* 1.4. (*flueret lutulentus*, 11). So, in *S.* 1.7 Horace takes on Lucilius in a “literary-critical duel between two kinds of satire,” embodied by the conflicting imagery of sharpness and dullness.⁹³

As we saw in the previous section, the mouth can be used for both verbal utterances but also consumption of food. Similarly, *venenum* also creates confusion between these two roles of the mouth as being something that can be uttered (invective speech) and something that can be consumed (poison). In antiquity, there was a threat that poison could be cooked into food, using the food’s flavors to mask its pungent taste – a threat that even the city mouse in *S.* 2.6 realized,

⁹² Anderson 1982: 79-80; Gowers 1993b: 127-8, 2002, 2012: 250-2.

⁹³ Gowers 2012: 250.

hence he takes on the role of a rodent *praegustator* (*praelibans*, “pre-nibbling,” 109). The word *venenum*, then, frequently appears in scenes of dining where there is an implied threat that the food has been poisoned – especially by the witch Canidia.

In *Epod.* 3, the foodstuff garlic takes on characteristics of Canidia’s *venenum*: “surely it hasn’t deceived me that viper’s blood has been cooked into these herbs? Or rather has Canidia made the meal foul?” (*num vipernis his cruor / incoctus herbis me fefellit? An malas / Canidia tractavit dapes?* 6-8). Although not mentioned by name, *venenum* is implied by the presence of the viper (*vipernis*, 6), who is also associated with *venenum* as “snake poison.” Additionally, *incoctus* (“cooked in,” 7) serves as a reminder of the process of decoction in cooking sauce, *ius* – so odious to Horace. The poem later mentions other literary witches, Medea and Deianira, both infamous for the art of poisoning. Garlic, like poison, has harmful effects. An excess of garlic in food causes repulsive bad breath, as with Maecenas: “your girl pushes her hand to repel your kiss,” *manum puella savio opponat tuo*, 21).⁹⁴ Garlic acts an anaphrodisiac, prompting Maecenas’s *puella* to shun him because of his rancid garlic breath.⁹⁵ Garlic has been called a culinary symbol of iambic anger because of its connection to Canidia, who is Horace’s main antagonist throughout the *Epodes* (3, 5 and 17), Horace’s only corpus of iambic poetry.⁹⁶ In poisoning breath, garlic makes it so that an open mouth is repulsive, a response that Horace wants to engender in our associations with invective speech (*venenum*).

⁹⁴ Paradoxically, garlic was a known antidote to poison and evil (Gowers 1993b: 296).

⁹⁵ Gowers 1993b treats this poem extensively, especially at 280-310.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*: “If wine-drinking in the *Odes* is both the occasion and inspiration for lyric writing, garlic and other forms of filth can be said to be the ‘food’ or ‘odour’ of iambics” (308-9); garlic was also associated with passionate temperament because of its “bilious disposition” according to Gal. *de Alim. Fac.* 2.71 (294).

Canidia (along with her poisons) appears several times in *Satires* 1 and 2 and represents an interjection of iambic anger. In *S.* 2.8, she continues in her role of poisoner at the feast of Nasidienus where now she is the one with bad breath. In this poem, which marks the end of Horace's satiric corpus, she releases her fetid, poisonous breath onto the food as an expression of its inedibility:

*quem nos sic fugimus ulti
ut nihil omnino gustaremus, velut illis
Canidia afflasset peior serpentibus Afris.* (Hor. *S.* 2.8.93-5)

We fled him [Nasidienus], getting revenge by tasting nothing at all as though Canidia, worse than African serpents, had breathed upon the food.

The unexpectedness of Canidia's presence prefigures the abrupt departure of the guests, taking their own revenge on the host who serves and narrates an unappetizing menu. Horace continues to play with the imagery of poison (*venenum*) and its polyvalent meaning implied by the presence of Canidia: the *serpentibus Afris* suggests that the inedible food was poisoned with *venenum*, snake venom; Canidia as a known *venefica*, mixes ingredients to make *venenum*, potion or poison; but Canidia is also a figure from iambic poetry, known for its invective speech, also *venenum*.⁹⁷ This demonstrates the power Canidia wields over Horace's poetry and even his patron. Maecenas, who is silent but present at the feast, is put to flight with the rest of the guests; her presence abruptly ends not only the feast but the poem as well, leaving her name to occupy the last line of satires that Horace would ever write.⁹⁸

⁹⁷ Freudenburg 1995: 208 calls Canidia's appearance "abrupt and artificial," but it underscores the magical nature of the feast; the host Nasidienus plays the role of the archetypal witch-hag who concocts love spells to win his lover's attentions – here, Maecenas (209).

⁹⁸ Canidia also utters the final threats in *Epod.* 17.81, Horace's last iambic poem: "should I lament that the end of my art has done nothing against you?" (*plorem artis in te nil agentis exitus?*)

Canidia and her poisons are afforded a prominent place in Horace's final *S.* 2.8 and proem *S.* 2.1: "Canidia threatens her enemies with Albucius' **poison**" (*minatur ... Canidia Albuci quibus est inimica venenum*, 47-8). In effect, Canidia's appearances are the bookends to *Satires* 2. The prominence of Canidia throughout the *Satires* prompts Tara Welch to dub her Horace's "anti-dedicatee"⁹⁹ because she surpasses even Maecenas in the attention she is afforded. Maecenas, on the other hand, is noticeably absent from *Satires* 2, which contrasts with his prominent position in *Satires* 1. The undercurrent within *Satires* 1 is Horace's friendship with Maecenas and the invariable ways that he acts as his patron's protector: Maecenas is invoked in the proem (*Qui fit, Maecenas*, 1.1); he is Horace's traveling companion in *S.* 1.5; he appears in *S.* 1.6 as Horace's literary father in an extended treatment of Horace's initiation into his circle; and he is the object of Horace's protection in 1.9 against the social climbing pest. In contrast, Horace does not address Maecenas in *S.* 2.1 in preference to mentioning Octavian three times: "dare to speak the deeds of unconquered **Caesar** (*aude / Caesaris invicti res dicere*, *S.* 2.1.10-1); "**Caesar's** attentive ear" (*attentam ... Caesaris aurem*, 19); "**Caesar** as the judge" (*iudice ... Caesare*, 84).¹⁰⁰ Generally, in *Satires* 2 Maecenas is an object of distraction for Horace. He is a symbol of Horace's obligations in the city ("take care that Maecenas puts his seal on these letters," *imprimat his, cura, Maecenas signa tabellis*, 2.6.38); he is the disembodied voice that calls Horace away from his Sabine farm ("should Maecenas invite you to come as a late dinner guest as the lanterns are being lit," *iusserit ad se / Maecenas serum sub lumina prima venire / convivam*, 2.7.32-4); and at the feast of Nasidienus, Maecenas is an honored guest attended by his "shadows" (*umbras*, 2.8.22), which suggests his own relegation to the shadows, out of main

⁹⁹ Welch 2001: 185.

¹⁰⁰ The passages on Caesar's "attentive ear" will be treated more broadly in the Chapter 3: 149-50.

view for Horace's audience. Horace's poetry, then, finds an enemy in Canidia where it has lost its focus on friendship, particularly with Maecenas.

If Canidia's presence is so threatening, and she is such a staunch enemy of the poet, how can her *venenum* be counteracted? Let us return briefly to *S.* 2.1 for the antidote, where Horace suggests a way of making poison palatable – namely, by disguising its bitter taste: “Evil hemlock will carry away the old woman with **poisoned honey**” (*sed mala tollet anum vitiato melle cicuta*, 56). Sweetening bitter hemlock with honey renders it undetectable, although just as deadly. Horace seems to suggest that a similar idea can be applied to his verse, as he recognizes that the message within his satire might be poisonous or difficult to stomach. But Horace can mask his poetry's bitter taste with sweet flavors, like honey, to make it more palatable and trick the body.¹⁰¹ The sweetness of Horace's satire is laughter, which can counteract satire's invective roots that still remain integral to the genre.¹⁰² The prominence of laughter in Horace's *Satires* is best summed up in the phrase “laughing while speaking the truth” (*ridentem dicere verum*, *S.* 1.1.24), which encapsulates Horatian satire's efforts to sweeten a savory, if not poisonous, message. Laughter can also be the best response to Canidia's potent poisons and insertion into satire. When she is being expelled from Priapus' garden in *S.* 1.8, Horace remarks, “You could

¹⁰¹ Cf. Lucr. 1.935-50 on his “sweet verse” (*suaviloquenti / carmine*, 945-6) and “honeysweet muse” (*musaeo dulci ... melle*, 947). Clay 2003 shows how Lucretius uses the literal meaning of “suasion” as sweet throughout this passage to make his bitter didactic poetry more palatable (183-5), and plays into the theme of the senses (taste and hearing) in Books 2 and 4 (194-6). See also Bartsch 2015: 138-41 and Gowers 1993b: 152-3 for the added sweetness to satire. Bees make honey, which can inform the intertext with Sen. *Ep.* 74, below.

¹⁰² *rideo* (“to laugh”) appears 16 times throughout the *Satires* 1 and 2; *risus* (“laughter”) appears nine times; *iocosus* (“joking”) appears seven times. Cf. laughter in the *Epodes* occurs two times, exclusively in the Canidia poems (*iocose Maecenas*, 3.20; *rideant*, 5.57).

witness Canidia's teeth and Sagana's tall wig fall away ... **with a hearty laugh and smile**"

(*Canidiae dentes, altum Saganae caliendrum / excidere ... cum magno risuque iocoque videres*, 48-50). It is namely this attention to balancing satire's literary flavors – mixing the right concoction of sweet, bitter, and savory (or laughter, invective, and truth) – that make Horace's poetry just the right mixture (*ius*).

The "Barking Stomach" (*stomachus latrans*)

Thus far we have observed the flavors and poisons that can be mixed into Horace's satiric food/poetry to extol his idealized *victus tenuis* and emphasize his departure from biting, poisonous Lucilian satire. Now, let us follow the food's journey post consumption down the gullet and into the stomach where digestion occurs. In keeping with the connection between culinary and literary metaphors, digesting food has much in common with digesting (i.e., reading and comprehending) Horace's poetry. We will soon find that the stomach, where all the food is mixed and prepared for digestion, has ultimate control over appetite, craving, and gustation.

The stomach (*stomachus, venter*) has a mind of its own throughout the *Satires*, often colored with anthropomorphic language. It can be sick (*mala copia quando / aegrum sollicitat stomachum*, 2.2.42-3), tired (*qualia lassum / pervellunt stomachum*, 2.8.8-9), and angry (*quae prima iratum ventrem esca?* 2.8.5). Like a hungry dog, the stomach can utter sounds by barking (i.e., grumbling) for food: "bread with salt will easily mollify a **barking stomach**" (*cum sale panis / latrantem stomachum bene leniet*, 2.2.17-8). Horace even makes the gullet (*gula*) speak as metonymy for appetite and even gluttony: "'I want to see a big fish splayed out on a big dish,' says the **gullet**, fit for the snatching Harpies" (*porrectum magno magnum [sc. mullum] spectare cantino / vellem' ait Harpyiis gula digna rapacibus*, 2.2.39-40). The animation of the stomach

and gullet represents their supremacy among the other body parts and organs; physical appetites are in control of the body, especially when hunger arises. The stomach is the control center in the dining experience by informing the diner how completely or incompletely food is digested. A stomachache can signal a bad meal – perhaps from spoiled food, or an unfortunate mixture of foods that ought not to have been mixed in the first place. The stomach remembers negative culinary experiences long after food has been consumed, even if it must rewrite the experience retroactively.¹⁰³ What might have tasted good at the time is rendered unappetizing after digestive trouble. The stomach can “turn” at even the slightest smell of food that incites a bad memory,¹⁰⁴ eliciting repulsion, perhaps a vomit reflex, and prompting the eater to avoid future encounters.

The power of the stomach has long been recognized in ancient literature in Hesiod’s characterization of humans as “mere bellies”,¹⁰⁵ and in the animation of the city through the body politic, Cato has been attributed with calling Rome “a belly without ears” to reflect its relentless consumption.¹⁰⁶ Certainly the satiric genre has adopted the image of the stomach for

¹⁰³ In Petronius’ *Satyricon*, Habinnas often forgets his own name but, thanks to his stomach’s keen memory, he can describe every course and detail of a meal, including a vomit-inducing encounter with bear meat (66).

¹⁰⁴ S. 2.2.41-4: “Although the boar and fresh turbot reek, a bad mixture agitates the sick stomach that, when full, prefers turnips and bitter elecampane” (*quamquam / putet aper rhombusque recens, mala copia quando / aegrum sollicitat stomachum, cum rapula plenus / atque acidas mavult inulas*).

¹⁰⁵ Hes. *Th.* 26: “Shepherds who dwell in the fields, worthy of reproach, mere bellies” (ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ’ ἐλέγχεα, / γαστέρες οἶον). This has often been interpreted as a reference to gluttony, where the shepherds “live only to fill their stomachs, uninterested in anything but food” (Katz and Volk 2000: 122, although they go on to read the stomach as a locus of inspiration from the gods, 128-9).

¹⁰⁶ Plu. *Mor.* 198D, 5-7: “Cato the Elder, criticizing the waste and extravagance among the people, said it was difficult to speak to a belly that did not have ears” (Κάτων ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐν τῷ δήμῳ τῆς ἀσωτίας καὶ πολυτελείας

its associations with gluttony as part of its critique on human vice.¹⁰⁷ The satiric stomach demands obedience (“obedient to the gullet,” *gulae parens*, Hor. *S.* 2.7.111) to be filled, lest it becomes angry (*stomachor*).¹⁰⁸ By anthropomorphizing the stomach and making it a force to be obeyed, Horace plays with the association between the stomach and anger (both *stomachus* in Latin), an emotion thought to be localized in a person’s viscera and stomach in particular.¹⁰⁹ The pun operates on a deeper level as well, since anger is an emotion common to satire; but, as I will argue, the stomach is also the seat of laughter for Horace. The final section of this chapter explores the connection between the stomach and the poet of satire.

καθαπτόμενος εἶπεν ὡς χαλεπὸν ἐστὶ λέγειν πρὸς γαστέρα ὅτα μὴ ἔχουσιν). A variant of this saying is also found in Plu. *Cat. Ma.* 340A.

¹⁰⁷ Lucilius too refers to humans as bellies: “Live, you wastrels and gluttons! Live, you bellies!” (*vivite lucrones, comedones, vivite ventres!* fr. 75M = 70W = 2.8C). Persius paints the stomach as a sort of muse: “the stomach is the master provider for art and talent” (*magister artis ingenique largitor / venter*, Prol. 10-11). And certainly we cannot forget Juvenal’s iconic image of gluttony personified in the glutton who expired in the bathtub due to an undigested meal (1.142).

¹⁰⁸ According to *S.* 2.7.104, Obedience to the stomach is not always advisable (“why is obedience to the stomach so ruinous for me?” *obsequium ventris mihi perniciosius est cur?*), as it can bring with it financial ruin, lazy bodies, and moral turpitude.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. *Carm.* 1.6.6, where Horace uses *stomachus* to refer to the “grave **anger** of Achilles” (*gravem / Pelidae stomachum*). Also at *S.* 1.4.55 Horace uses the verb *stomachor*, “to be angry”: “If you should break up [the words], any father would **rage** in the same manner of someone impersonating him in a play” (*quem si dissolvas, quivis stomachetur eodem / quo personatus pacto pater*). These references to stomach-anger may be an epic allusion (Muecke 1993: 230; Rudd 1966: 220 n. 45).

The Poet's Stomach (S. 1.5)

One stomach in particular is of particular interest in in a culinary/literary metaphor: the stomach of the poet. Let us travel back with Horace on his journey to Brundisium where, when he first sets out, Horace complains of stomach trouble:

*hic ego propter aquam, quod erat deterrima, ventri
indico bellum, cenantes haud animo aequo
exspectans comites.* (Hor. S. 1.5.7-9)

Here I wage war on my stomach thanks to the water, which was very dirty. I look on with a disagreeable disposition while my friends dine.

In drawing attention to his stomach so early in his journey, Horace reveals that S. 1.5 will be a discourse on bodily passions, discomfort, and dysfunction. Horace's persona will later suffer with a flare up of bleary-eyes (*lippitudo*) and a nocturnal emission.¹¹⁰ Rather than stuff his stomach full in S. 1.5, Horace restrains himself from eating and instead is forced to watch his companions enjoying their food "with a disagreeable disposition": *cenantes haud animo aequo / exspectans comites* (8-9). It seems that the focus on bodies throughout S.1.5 is intended to be humorous. This is evident in how he relates his stomach struggles with military language ("I wage war," *indico bellum*, 8), to elevate his lowly dysfunctional body into an epic battle. The *aqua deterrima* (7), so damaging to his intestinal balance, could also be a satiric reinterpretation of Hesiod's prologue to the *Theogony*, where the water imbues the poet with inspiration from the Muses. In the *Satires*, the poet's water is "dirty," "degraded," common water that is harmful to the stomach and the poet, yet still is the source of a perverse sort of inspiration.

Later in the poem we see Horace has a companion in illness in his friend Vergil who suffers from a stomach ache: "Vergil and I both went to sleep, since playing ball is hostile to the bleary-eyed and **dyspeptic**" (*dormitum ego Vergiliusque; / namque pila lippis inimicum et ludere*

¹¹⁰ The nocturnal emission in S. 1.5 is treated extensively in connection to faulty vision in Chapter 1: 60-4.

crudis, 48-9). In antiquity, Vergil was considered to be subject to “delicate digestion,”¹¹¹ as related by Suetonius: “he suffered from **stomach pain**, a sore throat, and headaches most of the time.”¹¹² Perhaps being such close friends with Vergil, Horace would have been familiar with his habits, including his tendency to illness, and was inspired to include some realism into the poem. Characterizing Vergil as *crudus* could be a friendly jibe, especially on the heels of Horace’s stated admiration of his friends: “While I’m sane I would compare nothing equal to an agreeable friend” (*nil ego contulerim iucundo sanus amico*, 44).

But the significance of stomachaches and sickness penetrates deeper when we observe that the primary sufferers of these bouts of bodily dysfunction are poets. In fact, poets and writers are often recorded as suffering from bodily ailment. Tradition states that Homer was blind, and in the previous chapter we witnessed bleary-eyed Cicero (*lippus*), and other historical authors, whose eyes suffered from constant writing.¹¹³ As further examples, according to their *vitae* Terence had a “slender figure” (*gracili corpore*)¹¹⁴ and Pacuvius suffered from a “long-term illness” (*morbo corporis diutino*) from which he eventually died.¹¹⁵ Furthermore, Suetonius relates that Persius died of “stomach pain” (*vitio stomachi*) at the age of 30,¹¹⁶ a deliberately bad

¹¹¹ Gowers 2012: 199.

¹¹² Suet. *Vit. Verg.* 29-30: *nam plerumque a stomacho et a faucibus ac dolore capitis laborabat*. We should keep in mind that this characterization of Vergil may derive in part from this literary portrayal by Horace, and therefore there is risk of making a circular argument.

¹¹³ Chapter 1: 46.

¹¹⁴ Suet. *Vit. Ter.* 97: *fuisse dicitur mediocri statura, gracili corpore, colore fusco*.

¹¹⁵ Suet. *Vit. Acc.* 1-2: *morbo corporis diutino adfectus*.

¹¹⁶ Suet. *Vit. Pers.* 58: *discessit autem vitio stomachi anni aetatis XXX*. See Bartsch 2015: 53-63 for discussion of Persius’ literary stomach, where she draws parallels with the same Senecan *Letter* 84, below.

pun on *stomachus* to give Persius an appropriate death for a satirist – anger. Horace too has latched onto the stomach as the ideal locus of ailment for poets, not because of anger, but because the stomach’s role in digestion has connections to literary “digestion.”

In *Letter* 84, Seneca extols moderation and likens the process of literary mimesis to alimentary digestion.¹¹⁷ Seneca begins by telling the reader to act like the bees, the flying insects that are appropriately a favorite topic in literature:

Nos quoque has apes debemus imitari et quaecumque ex diversa lectione congressimus separare (melius enim distincta servantur), deinde adhibita ingenii nostri cura et facultate in unum saporem varia illa libamenta confundere, ut etiam si apparuerit unde sumptum sit, aliud tamen esse quam unde sumptum est appareat. (Sen. *Ep.* 84.5-7)

We also should act like bees by collecting whatever we have set aside from varied readings (for things are better preserved by keeping them separate). And then, applying our the care and ability of our innate character, we pour those libations into one flavor, so that, even if it is clear where something was from, nevertheless it should appear to be something else other than its original form.

Like bees that gather honey from disparate flowers, Seneca beseeches his readers to gather texts from a variety of places (*ex diversa lectione*) – perhaps meaning different authors, genres, and styles. The texts should be kept separate (*distincta*) for the sake of thorough study, consideration, and savoring; and only then can the material be brought together to create a final product that is “one flavor” (*unum saporem*) and something completely new (*aliud ... quam unde sumptum est*).

Seneca, like Horace, portrays text as food that must be combined to create a single and pleasing flavor (*sapor*). In the *Satires*, mixing incongruent foods together, like wine and lettuce, can lead to an “acid stomach” (*nam lactuca innatat acri / post vinum stomacho*, 2.6.59-60). Horace reviles the concept of a boiled-down sauce (like that of Catius at 2.4.63-9 and Nasidienus at 2.8.45-53), because it does not follow the aesthetic principles of a balanced mixture and the

¹¹⁷ Bramble 1974: 52; Bartsch 2015: 41-52.

bitter ingredients are not appropriate for Horatian satire. Much like Horace's culinary metaphors, Seneca's alimentary metaphor is the ideal description for satiric poetics in particular, which is defined by collecting imagery, motifs, and vocabulary from other genres to create an entirely *new* literary form. Seneca's discussion continues to compare the body's digestive process with literary consumption of text:

Quod in corpore nostro videmus sine ulla opera nostra facere naturam: alimenta, quae accipimus, quamdiu in sua qualitate perdurant et solida innatant stomacho, onera sunt; at cum ex eo quod erant, mutata sunt, tum demum in vires et in sanguinem transeunt. Idem in his, quibus aluntur ingenia, praestemus, ut quaecumque hausimus, non patiamur integra esse, ne aliena sint. Concoquamus illa. (Sen. Ep. 84.6-7)

This is what we see nature doing in our body without any work on our part. Food is a burden that we take in as long as it remains in its original state and travels as a solid in the stomach; but after it has been changed from its original form, at last it crosses into the body and into the blood. Similarly let us ensure the same process for the things by which our minds are nourished, that we not allow whatever we have taken in to be whole/original lest they be not part of us. We must digest it.

The stomach is the epicenter of digestion, responsible for breaking down food and absorbing it into the body (*in sanguinem transeunt*). In another culinary metaphor, digestion is boiled down to the verb *concoquo*, “to cook together,”¹¹⁸ similar to the process of cooking sauce, *ius*.¹¹⁹ The stomach, then, is one big mixing pot of foods that need to be digested.

Seneca's advice about digesting literature is aimed at readers of texts – but what about writers? Writers and poets in particular have a greater responsibility when it comes to creating a well-balanced text that has “one flavor” (*unum saporem*) and is easily digestible for the audience. So, when Horace and his poet friends have stomach aches, it conveys the challenges of this very process of literary mimesis. In the case of *Vergilius crudus* (S. 1.5), Horace may be deriding his fellow writer's attempts at adapting the Greek genres (epic and bucolics) for renewal

¹¹⁸ s.v. *OLD* 2a (“to digest”), 2b (“to promote or assist the digestion”), and 2c (“to absorb into the mind”).

¹¹⁹ Cf. S. 2.8: “While it is cooked” (*dum coquitur*, 48); “to cook together” (*incoquere*, 52).

into Roman literature.¹²⁰ And like the cows from his *Eclogues*, Vergil “chews the cud” by ruminating on his literary models and suffers from bovine-inspired indigestion (*cruditās*). Vergil’s redeployment of bucolic and epic material has not yet been fully “digested,” thus causing his gastrointestinal indigestion.

The negative outcome of incomplete literary digestion is described in the final imagery of the *Ars Poetica*: “the frenzied poet ... belches his verses and wanders around while looking upward” (*vesanum ... poetam ... dum sublimis versus ructatur et errat*, 455-7). This passage juxtaposes imagery from the high and low language registers: the lofty poet with his head raised high (*sublimis*),¹²¹ and the stomach of the poet as the origin of his verses (*ructatur*). The mouth also operates within both registers, with its ideal function (uttering poetry) lowered to its base, corporeal function (uttering belches). The burping poet suffers from a literary indigestion where he does not sing complete and well-ordered poetry, but whatever arises from the undigested mixture in his stomach.

As a final observation, the stomach takes on many functions for Horace. It lords over the body as an animated entity, dictating what the body desires; and it is the mixing pot where digestion occurs – both alimentary and literary. Furthermore, the stomach is an iconic symbol for anger inherent in the vitriolic genres, although perhaps more readily associated with Horace’s predecessor, Lucilius. In the context of Horatian satire, on the other hand, the stomach is the locus of laughter: laughter at the butts of his derision; laughter at his puns; laughter at his comic

¹²⁰ Gowers 2012: 199.

¹²¹ Recall the exalted ending of *Carm.* 1.1.36: “I will strike the stars with my lofty head” (*sublimi feriam sidera vertice*). The language of heads and mouths is an expression of the lofty genres epic, tragedy, and lyric, versus the lower genres – iambics, satire, epigram, and the novel – associated with the stomach, anus, and genitals (Bakhtin 1984b: 18-30).

interpretation of epic and tragic themes; and laughter at the satirist himself. When Horace bids his audience to laugh, he means a hearty laugh that originates at the bottom of the belly, travels up the throat, and out the mouth – the opposite journey that food usually takes.

The Sounds of Satire

In this chapter, we have witnessed how a comingling of the senses can enhance the sensory and satiric flavors Horace conveys to his audience to create a sweet lesson within a traditionally biting and even poisonous genre. Sounds heard with the ears can enhance or destroy a luxurious dining experience: a verbal report (*fama*, *S.* 2.2.94) of exotic food can entice the taste buds, making food all the more desirable to acquire and eat without concern for expense; and an unwelcomed abrupt noise (*strepitus*, 2.6.12; *personuit*, 2.6.115) is a convenient plot device used to bring an end to a sumptuous yet unsecure meal in the city. But the sense of hearing is also at play in the *Satires* outside of a culinary context – perhaps even more so. Within a poetic corpus that exhibits verbal brevity and reticence in its satiric personae, hearing arguably becomes the most important sense. It is, after all, the most prominent sense used by the audience, who are listeners (or rather, readers) of Horace's *Satires*. In the next chapter on hearing in the *Satires*, we closely observe *S.* 1.9 where Horace's persona is approached by the insidious and relentless pest, who does not let him get a word in edgewise. So, all Horace can do is listen.

CHAPTER 3

HEARING

Introduction

The Latin title of Horace's *Satires* is *Sermones*, or "conversations," to reflect the dialogue structure that Horace adopts throughout and particularly prominent in *Satires* Book 2. Horace's *Sermones* embodies the paradoxical nature of satire: what strives to be colloquial discourse that mimics everyday conversation is transformed into a metrical form that employs dactylic hexameter – the meter of lofty epic poetry. The sense most stimulated when engaged in dialogue is hearing. The interlocutors listen to one another's words in order to formulate an appropriate response. In the genre of satire, the dialogue allows a plurality of voices and perspectives to be heard, even from individuals that tend to be marginalized by Roman society.

On such example is the *sermo* that takes place between Horace and his slave Davus in *S.* 2.7. The poem is set during Saturnalia, a festival in December that celebrates changing roles, blurring class distinctions, and inverting social hierarchy.¹ The word Saturnalia also makes one of Horace's favorite puns on the words for sufficiency (*sat*) and satire (*satira*) to reflect his constant thematic concerns. In keeping with Saturnalian role reversal, slave and master switch places and Davus seizes his opportunity to voice his criticisms about Horace's behaviors:

¹ Sharland 2009: 266 calls the Saturnalia festival a "proto-Carnival" or "predecessor" of Bakhtin's Carnavalesque wherein "a lowly character (in this case Davus) has been elevated to the position of the 'king' figure, and is allowed to 'reign' temporarily. At the same time the usual authority figure (in this case, Davus' master, the satirist Horace) has been demoted and for the time being is subject to the power of the new 'king' figure." Bakhtin 1984b: 123 especially emphasizes the Carnival's tendency to bring together opposing forces, like the lofty and lowly, sacred and profane, wise and stupid.

*Romae rus optas, absentem rusticus urbem
tollis ad astra levis. si numquam es forte vocatus
ad cenam, laudas securum holus ac, velut usquam 30
vinctus eas, ita te felicem dicis amasque
quod nusquam tibi sit potandum. iusserit ad se
Maecenas serum sub lumina prima venire
convivam: 'nemon oleum fert ocius? ecquis
audit?' cum magno blateras clamore fugisque. (Hor. S. 2.7.28-35)*

When you are in Rome you desire the country; and when in the country, you ficklely elevate the absent city to the stars. If by chance you were never called to dinner, you would praise your carefree vegetable and, as though you would go anywhere else in chains, you say you are so lucky and love that you don't have to drink anywhere else. But should Maecenas call you as the last lights are being lit to come as a late dinner guest, you babble with a great shout, "Can someone hurry and bring me the oil? Is anyone listening?" And you run off.

Davus accuses Horace of being a hypocrite ("fickle," *levis*, 29). Horace very conspicuously praises the country and his slender diet (*victus tenuis*, S. 2.2.20, 53; *ervum tenue*, S. 2.6.117); but when Maecenas calls, he drops everything to become a "late dinner guest" (*serum ... convivam*, 34-5) in the city. By focusing his time and attention on Maecenas and his duties in the city, Horace has not been modeling his prior recommendations for leading a blessed life through simple eating (S. 2.2, 2.6).

Although Horace is a free-born Roman, Davus uses pseudo-Stoic moralizing to demonstrate that he is in fact not truly free, by addressing him a slave ("O so many times a **slave!**" *O totiens servus!* S. 2.7.70).² Davus refers to Horace's other obligations as measures of his enslavement: "Am I to call you my master who is **subject to so many and great commands** by matters and men?" (*tune mihi dominus, rerum imperiis hominumque / tot tantis minor?* S. 2.7.75-6).

Horace's relationship with Maecenas, however, is the greatest form of enslavement whereby he is like a puppet made to dance and move at his patron's request: "You who give me orders are miserable as the **slave** of others and **you are controlled** with strings like a wooden puppet by

² This is a variation on the Stoic Paradox, related in Cic. *Parad.* 5: "Only the wise man is free and every fool is a slave" (*solum sapientem esse liberum et omnem stultum servum*).

someone else” (*tu, mihi qui imperitas, alii servis miser atque / duceris ut nervis alienis mobile lignum*, *S.* 2.7.81-2).³ Both of these accusations are colored with language of mastery (*dominus*, *imperitis*, 75; *imperitas*, 81) juxtaposed with language of servitude (*minor*, 76; *servis*, 81; the intentional passive of *duceris*, 82, conveys subservience). This underscores not only Davus’ take on the Stoic paradox, but also serves as a reminder that the poem’s narrative structure is an exchange between a master (*dominus*) and slave (*servus*) – however unorthodox the exchange may be.

Although *S.* 2.7 is expressed entirely in dialogue, the conversation is rather one-sided. Horace does not verbally reply, calling into question whether it can be considered a true *sermo*. As though to fill the void made by his master’s silence, within his own lengthy speeches Davus occasionally mimics Horace’s own responses to his criticisms:

“*nemon oleum fert ocius? ecquis / audit?*” *cum magno blateras clamore fugisque*’ (*Hor. S.* 2.7.34-5)

‘You babble with a great shout, “Can someone hurry and bring me the oil? Is anyone listening?” and run off.’

“*non sum moechus*” *ais.*’ (*Hor. S.* 2.7.72).

“I’m not an adulterer,” you say.”

“*liber, liber sum*” *dic, age: non quis.*’ (*Hor. S.* 2.7.92).

‘Come on, say it: “I’m free.” You can’t.’

In answering for Horace, Davus voices both parts in the dialogue. When parroting Horace’s responses, Davus uses speech words to imply Horace is speaking (“you babble with a great shout,” *cum magno blateras clamore*, 35; “you say,” *ais*, 72; “say it,” *dic*, 92); but ultimately

³ Cf. *S.* 1.8, where Horace’s persona becomes another type of *lignum* and also under the watchful eye of his patron: “Once I was a little fig tree, a useless piece of wood” (*Olim truncus eram ficulnus, inutile lignum*, 1). See Chapter 4: 172-3.

these words draw attention to how little Horace actually does speak. In fact, Horace's only responses are non-auditory body language, as Davus refers to when he says, "Stop trying to frighten me with your expression. Hold back your hand and your anger" (*aufer / me vultu terrere; manum stomachumque teneto*, S. 2.7.43-4).⁴ When given the opportunity, Davus perhaps overzealously adopts the role of speaker and does not allow Horace the opportunity to respond.

Davus, then, gladly embraces the freedom afforded him by the Saturnalian context to speak his mind, as Horace initially bid him to do: "Come on, use your December **freedom** ... speak!" (*age, libertate Decembri ... utere. narra*, S. 2.7.4-5). The theme of freedom, *libertas*, works on multiple levels: it is at the forefront of the moral paradox "only the wise man is free"; it underscores the inherent social divide in a conversation between a free Roman and member of the enslaved class; and it reminds us of the "freedom of speech" (*libertas*) afforded to the critiquing satirist.⁵ While Davus was once relegated to the role of listener, as he admits in the beginning of the poem ("I've been listening for a long time now, *iamdudum ausculto*, S. 2.7.1),⁶ now he fully embraces his new role as the speaker. Davus temporarily becomes the master, who gives orders, and the satirist, who presumes to "speak" for other people in his poetry. And so, just as master and slave have switched places, so too do satirist and audience. Through his adoption of silence, Horace steps into the role of listening audience. By relinquishing the

⁴ Cf. S. 1.9.64-5, where Horace signals to Aristius Fuscus to save him from the pest by "nodding and rolling my eyes" (*nutans, / distortuens oculos*).

⁵ Especially of Lucilius who spoke "with much free speech" (*multa cum libertate*, S. 1.4.5).

⁶ As a slave, it is possible Davus may have even been eavesdropping on all of the *sermones* that preceded, making him a secret member of the audience (Evans 1978: 309-10; Sharland 2009: 262). Cf. Juv. 1.1: "Am I always only a **listener**, and will never get to respond?" (*semper ego auditor tantum, numquamne reponam?*)

primary narrative voice to another individual, Horace sets himself up to be criticized and allows the audience a peek behind the satirist's mask.

This chapter concerns the sense of hearing in Horace's *Satires* and all that it entails: the words uttered, the sounds heard, the people who hear, and the ears through which they hear. A primary manifestation of the importance of hearing is through Horace's eponymous persona playing the silent and listening party. In fact, Horace's *Satires* generally reflect a movement toward perception (in listening, seeing, and tasting) over speaking. In Chapter 1, we have already seen similar silencing tactics applied to the persona through his blunted vision (*lippus*) as a form of visual silence: the persona undergoes a literary blinding to reflect the satirist's rejection to cast his critical gaze. The trend of the persona's verbal silence is a feature within other satires as well, such as Horace's speechlessness when he is first introduced to Maecenas (*S.* 1.6); when Horace tries to shake the loquacious pest with his curt responses and physical gestures (*S.* 1.9); and when Horace ignores his city business to escape to the country (*S.* 2.6). Additionally, in *S.* 2.8, Horace engages in a dialogue with a friend Fundanius who spends the entirety of the poem describing for his silent interlocutor the ruinous dinner at Nasidienus' house. In many of these instances, the persona does not utilize verbal speech, choosing to remain "with closed lips" (*compressis labris*, *S.* 1.4.138). Instead, the satiric persona *listens* like a member of the audience would. In the present study, I observe how Horace the poet fashions his literary persona through his inability or unwillingness to communicate verbally. Instead, Horace transmits his satiric message through other non-auditory methods: specifically, through the perceptible movements (and smells!) of the physical body. Throughout this chapter I will address why Horace shuns verbal speech throughout *Satires*, and how and why the ears and listening take precedence over the mouth and speech.

Important in the construction of this chapter is Suzanne Sharland's Bakhtinian reading of the *Satires* titled *Horace in Dialogue* (2009). Her study focuses on the dialogue poems, which by their very nature focus on the speakers and listeners, both internal to the dialogue and external (i.e. satirist and audience): "Although many other scholars have paid lip service to the 'conversational' nature of *sermo*, little attention has been given to the *Satires* precisely as *conversations*."⁷ She reads Horace's dialogues,⁸ or rather "diatribes," against the dialogic theoretical frameworks of Jan Mukarovsky and Mikhail Bakhtin. In particular, Sharland emphasizes Bakhtin's concept of dialogic polyphony, whereby the satirist has constructed a dialogue with a "cacophony of different *imagined* voices."⁹ I too assign importance to the very utterances made by the satirist's personae and the impact they have on his satiric message; and, influential to my perspective, Sharland reads the connections (and reversals) that occur between *Satires* 1 and 2 which can shed new light on old readings.

Additionally, I adopt the premise behind Catherine Schlegel's *Satire and the Threat of Speech* (2005) that Horace, informed by the violence of the triumviral period in which he was writing, deliberately toes the line between employing "verbal violence" and a mitigating narrative voice throughout *Satires* 1.¹⁰ Although we now judge Horace's *Satires* to be milder in comparison to his satiric successors, Persius and Juvenal, Schlegel shows how *Satires* 1 recognizes the "conflict-based nature of satire, even if the poet is not participating in the conflict."¹¹ Horace accomplishes this largely through shunning verbal speech and inverting the

⁷ Sharland 2009: 3.

⁸ *S.* 1.1, 2, 3; 2.2, 3, and 7.

⁹ Sharland 2009: 44, my emphasis.

¹⁰ Schlegel 2005: 4.

¹¹ *Ibid.*: 7.

relationship between speaker and listener, i.e. satirist and audience.¹² I expand upon Schlegel's initial premise by arguing that Horace still communicates, albeit non-verbally via the physical body.¹³ I also apply Schlegel's observations regarding Horace's stunted speech and "moderating persona" beyond *Satires* 1 to recognize Horace's preference for listening over speaking throughout *Satires* 1 and 2.¹⁴

Furthermore, the work of Anthony Corbeill on the humor and significance derived from the physical body (*Controlling Laughter*, 1996) and gesture (*Nature Embodied*, 2004) in Ancient Rome have been instrumental in the formation of my understanding how Horace manipulates the physical body in his *Satires*. Corbeill expands upon Donald Lateiner's *Sardonic Smile* (1995), who has shown that in Homeric epic body gestures and the face in particular can present "microdisplays" that betray a character's thoughts and emotions, or that a character can manipulate for purposes of deception.¹⁵ Shifting this paradigm to a context of Roman oratory, Corbeill analyzes the ways that physical movement and gesturing might have been perceived by audiences or onlookers with a focus on certain areas of import, such as hands,¹⁶ mouths,¹⁷ eye movements and glances¹⁸ – to name a few. In sum, Corbeill shows how the body can "speak"

¹² *Ibid.*: 9.

¹³ Stevens 2013 similarly reads Catullus' natural silence throughout his poetry focusing on the other ways that Catullus communicates, sometimes through the non-auditory senses, and other times through his "richly sense-perceptual poetry" (16).

¹⁴ Schlegel 2005: 6.

¹⁵ Lateiner 1995: 88; he elaborates, saying "the face anchors personal identity, dignity, and perceptible mood."

¹⁶ Corbeill 2004: 20-4.

¹⁷ Corbeill 1996: 101-2.

¹⁸ Corbeill 2004: 146-50.

and that gesture in ancient Rome was an important way to convey information or the mindset of an individual.¹⁹

This chapter will first discuss how Horace's personae tend to shy from verbal speech throughout the *Satires*, especially in *S.* 2.6 and 1.6. In the case of *S.* 1.9, the narration replaces the persona's audible communication with silent body language; but all of the persona's communication attempts, whether verbal or physical, fall upon deaf ears, raising questions about the effectiveness of both the speakers/satirists and listeners/audience. The final section observes the organ that enables hearing, the ear, and how Horace constructs himself as a faulty listener through his defective ears. This conflict can only find resolution in the symbiosis between poet and his audience, for whom he strives to create non-offensive, "good poetry" (*carmina bona*).

The Silent Satirist

Rejection of Speech (S. 1.6, 2.6)

In *S.* 2.7, we see Horace engaged in a dialogue in which he does not equally participate. This is not a new role for him. In fact, there are several other exchanges where Horace is notably reticent and is relegated to the role of listener. By observing *S.* 2.6 alongside 1.6 we will see that the persona's verbal speech is particularly stunted in the presence of Maecenas or even at the mere mention of him. Maecenas, then, becomes a source of anxiety for Horace, around whom Horace expresses one of his most glaring contradictions: a silent satirist.

S. 2.6 portrays Horace balancing his time between life in the city and country. When he is in Rome, Horace is bombarded by requests related to business, which makes him long for the

¹⁹ *Ibid.*: 5.

country. This poem provides a glimpse into Horace's daily routine in the city by voicing the demands on his time:

at simul atras
ventum est Esquilias, aliena negotia centum
per caput et circa saliunt latus. 'ante secundam
Roscius orabat sibi adesses ad Puteal cras.' 35
'de re communi scribae magna atque nova te
orabant hodie meminisses, Quinte, reverti.'
'imprimat his, cura, Maecenas signa tabellis.'
dixeris 'experiar: 'si vis, potes' addit et instat. (Hor. S. 2.6.32-9)

As soon as I come to the black Esquiline, a hundred other annoyances assail my head and around my side. "Roscius asked that you be at the Puteal at second hour tomorrow." "The scribes ask that you remember to come back today concerning a great and new public matter." "See to it that Maecenas puts his seal on these papers." If you say, "I will try," he adds and insists, "If you want you can do it."

Horace pessimistically calls the Esquiline "black" (*atras ... Esquilias*, 32-3),²⁰ perhaps to convey negative associations with his urban duties. His days are filled with non-stop business, like attending meetings early in the morning,²¹ advising on public matters, and overseeing Maecenas' affairs.²² A plethora of voices (34-9), supposedly from individuals making demands of Horace, flow in quick dialogic succession without connective syntax; they represent the flood of requests upon Horace's time and energy. The voices are disembodied, conveying the anonymity and incessant nature of the demands. Horace's response is a curt "I will try," encompassing a single word in Latin (*experiar*, 39) that juxtaposes the lengthy requests being made of him.

²⁰ The Esquiline was a former cemetery currently undergoing renovations by Maecenas, hence *ater* also conveys a fatal sense of gloomy. See Chapter 4: 161-4 for more on the Esquiline's aesthetic qualities.

²¹ The second hour (*ante secundam*, 34) is the equivalent to 8:00 am. Cf. *S. 1.6.122*, Horace's preferred routine of sleeping "until the fourth hour" (10:00 am) (*ad quartam iaceo*).

²² In light of the dating of this poem to late 31 or early 30 BCE, Muecke 1993: 201 suggests that Maecenas may have been placed in charge in Octavian's absence with permission to use his signet ring, and that Horace acted as his private secretary. See D.C. 51.3.5-6 and Plin. *Nat.* 37.4.10.

Later in the poem more voices bombard Horace in a similar structure with question about Maecenas and Caesar Octavian. The voices ask, “Have you **heard** anything about the Dacians?” (*numquid de Dacis audisti?* 53), or “Will Caesar give the soldiers their lands promised from Sicily or Italy?” (*militibus promissa Triquetra / praedia Caesar an est Itala tellure daturus?* 55-6). The driving force behind these questions is the belief that Horace has the “ear” of the great men in Rome and as such he becomes an object of people’s envy (*invidiae*, 48). They call him a “lucky son-of-a-gun!” (*fortunae filius!* 49) for spending time with Maecenas at the games and at the Campus Martius. With Maecenas’s reputation as “an elusive and enigmatic figure” and second most powerful man in Rome after Octavian, it is natural that Horace’s contemporaries would want to know more about him.²³ Horace’s connection to Maecenas also means access to Octavian, prompting people to believe his physical proximity has granted him access to information – he is, after all, “in close contact with gods” (*deos quoniam propius contingis*, 52).

It becomes clear this passage critiques the high value that has been placed on information heard and overheard through spoken report (*rumor*, 50). The people who pester Horace whether he has *heard* anything (*audisti*, 13) become greedy information seekers. In response, Horace opts out of giving them information and only provides short answers by claiming to know “nothing at all” (*nil equidem*, 53). He justifies this response because no information is entrusted to him in the first place, thanks to his “leaky ear” (*rimosa ... aure*, 46). Information that is put into his ear does not stay there but has a tendency to slip out, a periphrasis for his inability to

²³ DuQuesnay 1984: 26.

keep a secret. Knowing this, Horace claims that Maecenas only shares with him “frivolities” (*nugas*, 43),²⁴ like this:

*‘hora quota est?’ ‘Thrax est Gallina Syro par?’
‘matutina parum cautos iam frigora mordent’
et quae rimosa bene deponuntur in aure.* (Hor. S. 2.6.44-6)

“What time is it?” or “Is the Thracian Chicken a match for Syrus?” or “The morning frost is now biting those who are ill-prepared,” and whatever else can be safely entrusted to a leaky ear.

In another quick dialogic succession, Horace portrays Maecenas in the same light as the previous demands that burden his ears. Thanks to his leaky ear, Horace may very well be “the only person alive with an uncommon and profound capacity for **silence**” (*unum ... egregii mortalem atlique **silenti***, 57-8). The emphasis on Horace’s silence (*egregii ... silenti*, 57-8) and curt responses (*nil*, 53) is a foil to the information culture driven by acquiring the most up-to-date news and where rumor (whether true or not) dictates social interaction.²⁵

I see many parallels between the persona’s leaky ear in S. 2.6 and bleary eyes in S. 1.5. They speak to a trend in Horatian satire of mutilating the persona’s body in order to undercut the abilities of the satirist.²⁶ In S. 2.6, Horace undermines what initially seems like a virtuous tendency to silence by feigning inadequacies as an interlocutor and confidant. This poem, like the journey to Brundisium, transmits anxiety and uncertainty about the nature of Horace’s relationship to his patron. Maecenas is one voice among many that demand Horace’s ear; yet

²⁴ Cf. S. 1.9.2, Horace’s own activity while strolling on the *Via Sacra* “thinking on some **trifles** – I don’t know what” (*nescio quid meditans **nugarum***), as though he is only capable of superficial ideation.

²⁵ Cf. S. 2.2. 94-5, where the reputation (*fama*) of a dish could compel people to ruinously acquire exotic dishes and attach empty significance to them: “should you give credence to some bit of reputation that fills the human ear, more welcome than poetry?” (*das aliquid famae, quae carmine gratior aurem / occupat humanam?*). See Chapter 2: 84, 98 n. 61.

²⁶ See Chapter 1: 40-9.

this passage implies that he does not trust Horace to keep private his personal business around Rome. Frances Muecke calls Horace's leaky ear a "smoke-screen,"²⁷ ostensibly concerned about the historical accuracy of this glimpse into Horace's and Maecenas' relationship. By all accounts, Horace the poet and satirist was a confidant of his patron Maecenas, and elsewhere extols confidentiality among friends as a virtue.²⁸ Yet the ears of the Horace's semi-autobiographical persona are not up to the task of keeping those secrets. He claims to be untrustworthy. It is ironic that a man who has the *ear* of the most powerful men in Rome cannot manage to control his own. It seems, then, that Horace gives his persona the leaky ear as a justification to his silence all along – a silence that is really due to discretion. In the next section, we shall return to Horace's leaky ear as one example in a continuous discourse about ears, both defective and effective, throughout the *Satires*.²⁹

To summarize, there are three major sources of the verbal speech that bombards Horace in *S.* 2.6: business requests (34-9), Maecenas' "frivolities" entrusted to his leaky ear (44-5), and people seeking information about the great men (51-6). Speech, then, becomes associated with duty and business; it also places Horace in the role of a passive *auditor* – a listener, subject to the

²⁷ Muecke 1993: 203.

²⁸ Cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.18: "You will protect a secret entrusted to you" (*arcanum ... commissumque teges*, 37-8). Ennius *Ann.* 274-6 (Skutsch 1985; full passage at 268-86) also gives advice for patron-client friendships regarding discretion: "He would blurt out both good and bad things to say, if he wished, and kept them safe with someone with whom he shared great pleasure and joy in private and public" (*malaque et bona dictu / evomeret si vellet tutoque locaret; / quocum multa volup [ac] gaudia clamque palamque*). Skutsch 1985: 453 points to verbal parallels between this passage Horace's musings of Maecenas, especially at *S.* 1.3; pace Connors 2005: 131.

²⁹ Cf. Octavian's "attentive ear" at *S.* 2.1.18-19: "Flaccus' words will not go through Caesar's **attentive ear**" (*Flacci / verba per attentam non ibunt Caesaris aurem*).

demands of his patron and duties. The emphasis on listening, even if it is through leaky ears, displays a movement away from speech and toward listening. This characterization of Horace as a silent listener seems incongruous for a satirist; but it is in fact in line with Horace's satiric aesthetics that instead focuses on brevity of his narrative and verses. Horace's paucity of speech is a trend we have seen throughout Horace's *Satires* and has been addressed in every chapter thus far, encapsulated by the phrase *iam satis est*. Yet another character exhibits a symmetrical tendency to silence: Horace's patron, Maecenas. Both patron- and client-to-be are notably taciturn in the narration of their first meeting in *S.* 1.6:

optimus olim
Vergilius, post hunc Varius, dixere quid essem. 55
ut veni coram, singulatim pauca locutus –
infans namque pudor prohibebat plura profari –
non ego me claro natum patre, non ego circum
me Satureiano vectari rura caballo,
sed quod eram narro. respondes, ut tuus est mos, 60
pauca; abeo, et revocas nono post mense iubesque
esse in amicorum numero. (Hor. S. 1.6.54-62)

Some time ago my good friend Vergil, and after him Varius, told you what I was. When I came face-to-face with you, I spoke a few words one at a time, for my inarticulate embarrassment prevented me from saying more – I told you that I wasn't born from a famous father, that I was not carried around the countryside on a Tarentine riding horse, but I told you what I was. You reply a few words, as you usually do. I depart, and you call me back nine months later and bid me to join your circle of friends.

In one of the rare instances where Horace openly discusses Maecenas, the men have an honest but brief conversation about Horace's background. What might have constituted a longer conversation in real life is reduced to a three-word explanation: "I told you what I was" (*quod eram narro*, 60) – namely, that his father was a freedman and that he was not born into the equestrian class. The literary persona speaks "a few words, one at a time" (*singulatim pauca locutus*, 56) and is struck with an "inarticulate embarrassment" (*infans ... pudor*, 57). *Infans* transmits the sense of "childish," literally meaning an inability to speak (*in + for, fari*), which is balanced at the end of the same line by another compound verb with the same step, *profari* (*pro*

+ *for, fari*). Alliteration of “p” sounds throughout the line mimics a stammer, further emphasizing Horace’s hesitation and hindered communication: *pudor prohibebat plura profari* (57).³⁰

After Horace’s stammering initial first words, he is equally met with Maecenas’ own paucity of speech: “you reply **a few words**, as you usually do” (*respondes, ut tuus est mos, pauca*, 60), replicating Horace’s own *pauca locutus* (56) from above. It seems that Horace has found someone who holds similar standards in both conversation and moral virtue. Maecenas is able to look past the ostensible deficits in Horace’s background (conveyed by the repetition of *non ego ... non ego*, 58) and accept Horace based on his virtues: “I consider it a big deal that I pleased you who can discern an honest man from a disgraceful man, not according to his noble parentage, but by his life and his pure heart” (*magnum hoc ego duco / quod placui tibi, qui turpi secernis honestum / non patre praeclaro, sed vita et pectore puro*, 62-4). Horace again adopts a repetition of “p” sounds in this passage: *non patre praeclaro, sed vita et pectore puro*. Horace’s *pectore puro* becomes an appropriate substitute for his lack of *patre praeclaro* in the line and in Maecenas’ eyes. The line, then, reimagines Horace’s embarrassment (*pudor*) from line 57. Although Horace elsewhere casts doubt on the nature of his relationship with Maecenas, especially at *S.* 2.6,³¹ here they seem to be a perfect match for one another represented in their similar tendency to silence.

³⁰ Armstrong 1986: 260; Brown 1993: 157; Gowers 2012: 234.

³¹ Additionally, *S.* 1.5, 1.9, and 2.8 are explicit in their measures of separation between Horace and his patron. McNeill 2001 contends that the two men were likely close in real life, but that it is reasonable to assume they moved in other social circles. He reads *S.* 2.8 as full of Horace’s anxieties about not being invited along with Maecenas to Nasidienus’ party, which takes measures to deemphasize their friendship (18-21). As I argue in the Introduction, I believe a version of Horace is in fact “present” at the dinner party in the characterization of Balatro (17-21).

As we have seen from *S.* 2.6 and 1.6, Horace places a value on limited speech. His eponymous persona embodies silence. Horace then duplicates his persona's tendency to silence in Maecenas, conveying their like-mindedness as two friends who hold the same aesthetic values when it comes to verbal communication and measuring an individual by essential qualities. Horace is cast into the role of a listener – someone who hears the requests and questions of others. But he undercuts his own capacity to listen through his leaky ears. In this next section, we will explore further Horace's faulty hearing as a physical manifestation of *flaccus*, or “flop-eared.”

The Flop-Eared Persona (S. 1.9)

The emphasis on ears and audience is also apparent in *S.* 1.9. We have already seen how Horace's “leaky ear” in *S.* 2.6 prevents him from being privy to vital information, and therefore unable to tell it to others. His leaky ear is essentially an excuse for his persona's preference to be silent and for his poetry to be brief. *S.* 1.9 is another poem that provides a glimpse into Horace's urban activities. On the Via Sacra, the persona unwillingly converses with a verbose social climber seeking to gain access to Maecenas through him.³² The persona is especially silent in this one-sided dialogue to contrast the verbosity of his unwanted companion. The pest³³

³² “This vignette can be understood not as an autobiographical report, but as an invented scenario through which Horace can praise Maecenas and his circle” (Welch 2001: 168).

³³ He is the “pest” in Rudd 1982: 74; the “bore” in Shackleton Bailey 1982: 20; *ille* in Henderson 1999: 206, adopting Horace's own verbal descriptor; Schlegel 2005 calls him the “interlocutor” (109) or “companion” (108), but she does this to avoid the biases inherent in the names “pest” and “bore” which only strengthens our assumption that “he is hopelessly outside” and that we are thankful that “we are not he, so we name him Bore” (117); and

is described with words that characterize his talkative, intrusive nature: “he blathered on about anything whatsoever” (*cum quidlibet ille / garriret*, 12-13). He is “garrulous” and appropriates the image of consumption to describe his verbal greed, where talking and eating are both actions that are performed with the mouth.³⁴ The two actions of the mouth – eating and speaking – collide in the old woman’s prophecy that paints excessive speech as a sort of gluttony: “a **chatterbox** will **devour** him at some point or another” (*garrulus hunc quando consumet cumque*, 33). The pest even boasts the length of his poetry, saying, “For who can write more verses faster than me?” (*nam quis me scribere plures / aut citius possit versus?* 1.9.23-4). Boasting about prolific poetic production should make the audience smile, as we know Horace’s ill opinion of this particular trait in a poet from Crispinus in *S.* 1.1. The pest is relentless and refuses to leave Horace alone (“I will follow you the whole way,” *usque sequar te*, 19), despite the literary persona’s attempts to shake him: “do you want something else?” (*numquid vis?* 6) and “do you have a mother or relatives you need to visit?” (*est tibi mater, / cognati, quis te saluo est opus?* 26-7).

We might expect the satirist to unleash his best invective against such a person, but “we find only restraint” in Horace.³⁵ Catherine Schlegel argues that this poem demonstrates the effects of harmful speech – the very kind that Horace refused to employ in *S.* 1.4 which is associated with Lucilius. Horace allows his persona “to be conquered” by his interlocutor’s speech and “submit

Gowers 2012 adopts a variety of terms from “pest” (280-3) to “garrulous bore” (281). I primarily refer to him as the “pest,” acknowledging Schlegel’s argument that this name predisposes us to make assumptions about his character.

³⁴ See Chapter 2: 96-7 on the significance of mouths as a locus of food consumption and uttering words, especially poetry.

³⁵ Welch 2001: 170.

to verbal tyranny rather than engage in it.”³⁶ In this way, *S.* 1.9 becomes grounds for Horace’s literary competition with Lucilius. I argue, however, that Horace *does* engage with his interlocutor, not in a battle of words, but in a battle between verbal and non-verbal communication (words v. body) made manifest with his body. Since the persona’s words go unheard by the pest in *S.* 1.9, Horace conveys the persona’s thoughts and feelings to the audience through his physical body. The intended audience for Horace’s body language is not the pest, but is done for the benefit of the reading audience, who are ultimately made into judges regarding which side wins: words or body.

In *S.* 2.7 we saw Horace engaged in a one-sided dialogue with Davus where the persona’s speech was thwarted in the context of the Saturnalian festival. This narrative tactic facilitated self-oriented humor through giving a voice to Davus, a former audience member (*iamdudum ausculto*, *S.* 2.7.1). Here too Horace’s persona communicates through his physical body, namely a threatening look as a non-verbal response (*aufer / me vultu terrere*, 43-4). Similarly, the persona from *S.* 1.9 primarily communicates his thoughts through body language: he sweats, rolls his eyes, grabs his hands and ears, and his ears droop like a donkey.

From the poem’s very beginning there is an emphasis on bodies as they travel in different ways along the Via Sacra. Horace’s persona “saunters,” (*ibam*, 1) while he thinks about “some nonsense or another” (*nescio quid meditans nugarum*, 2) – perhaps some *nugae* that Maecenas said,³⁷ or something that would find its way into his verses later.³⁸ He is then accosted by a man

³⁶ Schlegel 2005: 109, who furthermore argues that “Horace enlists his silent hearer’s sympathy in such a way that we are acutely eager to render Horace the service of hearing, which his persona is denied in the drama”; and the audience learns that Horace is seeking “our silence so that the poet may speak” (110).

³⁷ Cf. *S.* 2.6.43: “Someone to whom, when making a journey, he would entrust his **trifling thoughts**” (*iter faciens et cui concredere nugas*).

who quickly “runs up” to him (*accurit*, 3) and snatches his hand (*arreptaque manu*, 4) in an overly familiar gesture of friendship. This is a person whom Horace knows only by name,³⁹ but introduces himself as a fellow poet of prolific verses: “He said, ‘You know me – I’m an intellectual’” (*ille / ‘noris nos,’ inquit, ‘docti sumus,’* 6-7) and later “for who could write more verses faster than me?” (*nam quis me scribere pluris / aut citius possit versus?* 23-4). From the first moments of their meeting, the pest shows himself not averse to interrupting the persona’s contemplative moments and invading personal space. He deliberately follows a trajectory to accost Horace, the close friend of Maecenas, to infiltrate his literary network.

W. S. Anderson shows how Horace employs martial language to describe the pest’s eagerness to meet Maecenas, portraying his aspirations as planned, well executed, and even borderline violent.⁴⁰ For example, the pest “pursues” the persona (*assectaretur*, 6; *usque sequar*, 20), launches verbal attacks (*repetit*, 44), and literal ones (*expugnabis*, 55): he describes how he will relentlessly pursue Maecenas into the street and lead him away (*occurram in triviis; deducam*, 59). Horace’s responses are equally colored with martial language, but from the perspective of the defensive party undergoing attack rather than the offensive side making an attack: “I managed to interrupt” (*occupo*, 6); “I made my stand” (*consistere*, 8). He also wishes for his own demise (*confice*, 29; *inteream*, 38; *dispeream*, 47), in addition to pondering an omen about his ultimate demise (31-4). Essentially, his encounter with the pest is worse than death.

³⁸ Cf. Catul. 1.3-4: “You used to think my **trifles** to be of some value” (*tu solebas / meas esse aliquid putare **nugas***).

³⁹ Horace does not give his name, but dismissively refers to him as “that man,” *ille* (S. 1.9.6, 12, 13, 21, 41, 61, 74).

⁴⁰ Anderson 1982: 84-102; Gowers 2012 echoes many of these references and adds some of her own. Due to its physical nature, military metaphor may be understood as another form of body imagery. Henderson 1999: 204 also remarks about the emphasis on the persona’s overt body language (his “innuendo and squint”) throughout S. 1.9.

Horace's body has an averse involuntary reaction to the pest and his brush with death: he sweats profusely "to his very ankles" (*cum sudor ad imos / maneret talos*, 10-11).⁴¹ Sweating can be an expression of anxiety; it is likely his sweat would not only have been visually perceptible, but perhaps also perceptible to the nose.⁴² In order to ignore his pursuer, the persona plays at having something important to share with his slave, whispering in his ear "something – I don't know what" (*in aurem / dicere nescio quid puero*, 9-10). We do not know what he said, but by its description (*nescio quid*) it is possible Horace would say anything, however nonsensical it may be, to divert the pest's attention. The persona identifies the *puer* as the closest ear for Horace to test his deflection tactic. This is also the first reference to the ear in *S.* 1.9, which becomes an important image to characterize the role of the listener and the impact that words have on the ear. In addition to a lack of directed speech, the persona speaks very little at all in this section. Horace utters a curse under his breath "quietly" expressed in the oxymoronic phrase, *aiebam tacitus* (12), and responds nothing to the pest (*illi / nil respondebam*, 13-14) which has been his custom in earlier poems.⁴³

Throughout this entire exchange, the pest is not completely oblivious. He can read the body language that Horace is putting out there: "**I've seen for a long time now** that you desperately want me to go" (*'misere cupis,' inquit 'abire, / iamdudum video,'* 14-15). He sees Horace's nervous sweats and pseudo-directives to his slave, fully understanding their meaning as a desire to escape. If the goal of Horace's body language is to be understood, Horace effectively

⁴¹ Cf. Thphr. *Sud.* 36: "It is strange that those who are anxious sweat on their feet, and not on their face" (ἄτοπον δ' ὅτι οἱ ἀγωνιῶντες τοὺς πόδας ἰδρῶσι, τὸ δὲ πρόσωπον οὐ).

⁴² Theophrastus discusses the two conditions of sweat as salty (ἁλμυρός, 1) and malodorous (κακῶδός, 1).

⁴³ *S.* 1.1.121: "I will not add another word" (*verbum non amplius addam*); *S.* 1.6.56: "I spoke few words one at a time" (*singulatim pauca locutus*); *S.* 2.6.53: "[I responded], 'nothing at all'" (*'nil equidem'*).

communicates his desire and mental state; nevertheless, the pest disregards them. The phrase *iamdudum video* (15) reappears with a verb change in a similar context in *S.* 2.7 through Davus' opening lines *iamdudum ausculto* (1): "**I have been listening for some time now.**" The sensory action has been changed from seeing in *S.* 1.9 to hearing in *S.* 2.7 to suit the poems' respective contexts. Davus was a perpetual listener (or eavesdropper, or audience member) to the daily routine and previous satires of Horace; and, judging by the pointedness of his critiques of Horace in *S.* 2.7, he was a good listener. In the case of *S.* 2.7, Davus' change in status from a listener to a speaker is all the more powerful because of his long-standing role as a listening audience member. The pest, on the other hand, is incapable of listening. He is motivated by speech, evident by his incessant attempts to converse with Horace throughout *S.* 1.9, and also his self-proclaimed prolific poetic aesthetics (*nam quis me scribere pluris / aut citius possit versus?* 23-4). Additionally, the pest *sees* Horace's non-verbal responses because he does not have much opportunity to *hear* them in the first place due to the persona's silence.

As soon as Horace realizes that he will be unable to shake the pest, he expresses his frustration by likening himself to an ass with floppy ears: "**I cast down my ears** like an ass with a grumpy disposition when a very heavy load is put on his back" (*demitto auriculas, ut iniquae mentis asellus, / cum gravius dorso subiit onus*, 21-2). The ass, along with its relative the mule, supplies an important image of degradation throughout the *Satires*, primarily scorned as an object of derision for its low-breed pedigree. The mule is not a horse, which has regal associations with the equestrian class and stateliness; instead, it is a frumpy quadruped with short legs, and has a reputation for lumbering rather than galloping.⁴⁴ Asses and mules have long appeared in literature in comic contexts and sometimes functioned as a symbol of abuse across

⁴⁴ Just like Horace's satiric "walking Muse" at *S.* 2.6.14: *Musa ... pedestri*.

genres,⁴⁵ including *S.* 1.5 where Horace comically depicts a lowly mule being struck in its loins with a club.⁴⁶

Additionally, there are similarities between Horace's own humble background (*libertino patre natus*, *S.* 1.6.45, 46) and the lowly pedigree of the mule. He uses the horse-mule dichotomy in his poetry to reflect his humble beginnings. In connection to his own parentage, Horace explains to Maecenas that he was not an *eques*, at least not from birth: "I told you that I wasn't born from a famous father, that I was not carried around the countryside **on a Saturian steed**" (*non ego me claro natus patre, non ego circum / me Satureiano vectari rura caballo*, *S.* 1.6.58-9).⁴⁷ Horses (here a nag, *caballus*) represent the wealth and prestige of the equestrian class, which Horace would achieve later in life, but not during his formative years.⁴⁸ In light of his social status, Horace portrays himself as a bastardized *eques* who does not ride a stallion, but instead selects the lumbering mule as his mode of transportation: "Right now, if it pleases me, I can go to Tarentum **on a gelded mule** whose loins are rubbed by a traveling bag and shoulders by an equestrian" (*nunc mihi curto / ire licet mulo vel si libet usque Tarentum, / mantica cui lumbos onere ulceret atque eques armos*, *S.* 1.6.104-6). He also cannot resist the opportunity to

⁴⁵ Cf. Catul.: "Do you know nothing, you **mule**?" (*mule, nihil sentis?* 83.3); "he has a gaping mouth like the open hole of a pissing **mule**" (*rictum qualem diffissus ... meientis mulae cunnus habere solet*, 97.7-8).

⁴⁶ *S.* 1.5.21-3: "A hot-head jumped out and struck the head and loins of the **mule** and sailor with a willow club" (*cerebrosus prosilit unus / ac mulae nautaeque caput lumbosque saligno / fuste dolat*).

⁴⁷ Cf. *S.* 2.7.53-5: "But when you've thrown off your regalia, your **equestrian** ring, and Roman dress (*cum proiectis insignibus, anulo equestri / Romanoque habitu*).

⁴⁸ Rudd 1966: 278 calls Horace's rank as an *eques* "probable." Armstrong 1986: 256-7 argues that Horace was a member of the equestrian order "beyond question," as both the post of military tribune and *scriba quaestorius* would have entailed a rank of *eques*. I follow Armstrong's argument that here in *S.* 1.6, Horace is explaining that he is a low-ranking, but genuine, *eques* (260). Freudenburg 2001: 59-61.

make reference to the mule's lower body stratum: his loins and his castrated member. Mules are sterile, and usually castrated (as expressed by *curto*, "cut," 104), making both Horace and the mule *impotent* half-breeds, which further forges a connection with Horace through the pun on his cognomen, *Flaccus* ("limpy" or "flabby"). Additionally, *flaccus* can mean "flop-eared," an adjective used specifically in reference to the ears of animals or people.⁴⁹ Thus the image of the persona's donkey-drooping ears in *S.* 1.9 supplies further meaning to Horace's sense of *impotentia*, expressed through his ears.⁵⁰

Therefore, the connection with the ass and mule is simply another measure by which Horace debases his persona throughout the *Satires*. The image of Horace-as-donkey casting down his ears truly captures the absolute sense of powerlessness felt by the persona in his interaction with the pest. The heavy load placed on the back of the ass (*gravius ... onus*, *S.* 1.9.22) symbolizes the burden of speech that the persona is being subjected to and his inability to escape what could be his death according to prophecy: the talkative man (*garrulus*, 33). The prophecy overlooks common ailments of the body that could be Horace's downfall, such as death by "deadly poisons" (*dira venena*, 31), a "hostile sword" (*hosticus ... ensis*, 31), "sickness" (*dolor*, 32), or "slow-moving gout" (*tarda podagra*, 32). Rather, the omen points specifically to a fatal

⁴⁹ Parker 2000: 455. Occurrences of *flaccus* include Var. *R.* 2.9.4, on the physical description of dogs "with large heads and floppy ears" (*capitibus et auriculis magnis et flaccis*); and Plin. *Nat.* 11.136: "Only man has immovable ears, from which the surname 'Flaccus' derives" (*ures homini tantum immobiles. ab his Flaccorum cognomina*).

⁵⁰ Freudenburg 2001: 96-7; Corbeill 1996: 57-98 discusses the peculiar naming practices of *cognomina*; Roman oratory in particular employs puns on names in contexts of both censure and praise: "If a person does not meet the expectations of society he can be attacked verbally, his name providing the corroborating evidence for wrongdoing" (84). *Contra* Parker 2000: 456 writes that the adjective *flaccus* "simply would not have conjured up the connotation 'impotent' in the mind of any Roman" as Roman naming conventions in reference to the body was so common.

violation of Horace's sense of hearing. As we shall see played on in the next section, the emphasis on ears and hearing throughout the poem also signals that Horace himself is not being heard by the pest, ironically transmitted through the imagery of his own downcast ears. And so, in return, Horace takes further measures to cut off communication with the pest, and focus his efforts onto another listener: the audience.

Defective Ears, Defective Speech

Throughout the *Satires*, ears occur in pivotal contexts as a signal that Horace fails to communicate, is prevented from communicating, or communicates deficiently in some way. His dysfunctional leaky ear (*rimosa ... aure*, *S.* 2.6.46) functioned as a justification for his lack of speech regarding his knowledge of Maecenas' and Octavian's affairs; and he likens himself to a flop-eared ass (by association, *flaccus*) to emphasize the burden of too much speech and that his audience fails to understand him. In *S.* 2.1 (one of the two instances in his poetry where Horace uses his cognomen, *Flaccus*),⁵¹ Horace draws a comparison between his faulty ears and Octavian's pricked ears.⁵²

In this dialogue with jurist Trebatius, he asks whether Horace has considered "singing the deeds of unconquerable Caesar" (*Caesaris invicti res dicere*, *S.* 2.1.11). In a common *recusatio* format, Horace responds that he does not have the skill to sing of battles (*vires / deficiunt*, 12), and that furthermore he would not want to misstep in his attempts: "Unless the time is right, **Flaccus' words** will not go through **Caesar's attentive ear**, and if he is stroked the wrong way,

⁵¹ Also once at *Epod.* 15.12: "If there is any manliness in (limpy) **Flaccus**" (*si quid in Flacco viri est*).

⁵² Muecke 1993: 104 agrees there is a pun on droopy v. pricked ears. *Contra* Parker 2000: 460-2 reads *Flaccus* in this poem not in connection to ears, but rather simply that Flaccus is a comical inversion of Octavian's cognomen, Caesar, to underscore their different social status, which Muecke also recognizes.

he will kick out on all sides out of protection” (*nisi dextro tempore **Flac**ci / **ver**ba per **attentam** non ibunt **Caesaris aurem**, / cui male si palpere, recalcitret undique tutus*, *S.* 2.1.18-20).

Octavian’s ear attentively listens to Horace’s words, literally stretched out (*attentam*, 19, from *ad* + *tendo*) in a pose of keen interest. Octavian cares about the content of the verses Horace spins about him. Kirk Freudenburg sees an animal metaphor in Octavian’s “extra sensitive” pricked ears, like a “high-strung horse” that is “ready to kick out at anyone who pets him badly,” which juxtaposes Horace’s associations with the ass and mule.⁵³

But there are more conflicts at play here that dictate the content of Horace’s poetry, namely between words and ears, speaking and listening, satirist and audience. When it comes to the “pricked ears” of his attentive and scrutinizing audience, Horace will exhibit verbal caution. Words will not travel (*non ibunt*, 19) from his mouth if there is a risk of them being received badly by his most important listening audience member: Caesar Octavian. Octavian’s sensitive ears can prevent Horace from communicating freely in the medium of his satire. In a way, then, Horace and his poetry are subject to the power and approval of both great men in his life, Maecenas and Octavian.

Horace’s verbal communication throughout *S.* 1.9 is stymied. But there is one issue about which Horace very eloquently communicates: the nature of Maecenas’ circle. The central conflict of the poem is revealed after the poet finally gets to the point by asking, “How does Maecenas stand with you?” (*Maecenas quomodo tecum?* 1.9.43). The persona elegantly replies with his truth about Maecenas:

*non isto vivitur illic,
quo tu rere, modo; domus hac nec purior ulla est
nec magis his aliena malis; nil mi officit, inquam, 50
ditior hic aut est quia doctior; est locus uni*

⁵³ Freudenburg 2001: 96.

cuique suus (Hor. *S.* 1.9.48-52).

We do not live in the way you think. There is no house purer than this nor more free from these evils. It doesn't bother me, I say, whether this man is rather rich or wise. Each man has his own place.

The poet's voice seems to speak through his persona to dispel any misconceptions the pest (and audience) have about this elusive figure, Maecenas. His *domus* is *pura*, which recalls language from *S.* 1.6 where Maecenas is said to judge a man on his "life and his purity of heart" (*sed vita et pectore puro*, 62). The house is also free from "these evils" (*his ... malis*, 50), which could refer to the undesirable characteristics of the pest standing before Horace: his bothersome nature, believing he can win over Maecenas by bribing his slaves (*muneribus servos corrumpam*, 57), and his prolific production of verses, and logorrhea. The pest is the very type of person that does not belong among Maecenas' friends. Maecenas and his house, then, become a metaphor for moral behavior and ultimately poetic values.⁵⁴

Despite the genuine tone of his declaration, which is in keeping with depictions of Maecenas elsewhere in his poetry, especially *S.* 1.6, the pest does not believe what Horace is saying. He calls it a "hardly believable" tall-tale (*magnum narras, vix credibile*, 52). So, both Horace's frank speech *and* his attempts at non-verbal communication fail to impact his internal audience. It certainly seems that nothing can penetrate the ear of the garrulous pest, and Horace's words are misheard, and misunderstood, again. For the remainder of *S.* 1.9, Horace continues to be misunderstood when he tries to communicate to his friend, Aristius Fuscus – or rather, he does not get the desired response. Horace tries to convey that he wants Fuscus to save him through body language: he grabs his hand (*pressare manu lentissima bracchia*, *S.* 1.9.64) – much in the

⁵⁴ Welch 2001: 177.

same way the pest originally accosted Horace (*arreptaue manu*, 4);⁵⁵ he nods (*nutans*, 64); and rolls his eyes (*distorquens oculos*, 65). Fuscus knows exactly what Horace is trying to communicate, but he “pretends to not understand with a laugh” (*ridens dissimulare*, 65), and flees the scene to leave Horace “under the knife” (*sub cultro linquit*, 74). Fuscus is essentially deaf to Horace’s silent, but understood, entreaties. Just as the pest recognized Horace’s earlier non-verbal message (*‘misere cupis’ inquit ‘abire / iamdudum video,’* 14-5), now too Fuscus consciously rejects doing what he asks as though he were playing a bad joke (*male salsus*, 65). Horace, then, is a person (and satirist) whose message is understood but whom no one obeys.

The final reference to ears in *S.* 1.9 continues the connection between ears and faulty hearing and speaking. When the plaintiff appears by chance, he berates the pest for not attending court, and asks Horace: “Can I name you as a witness to the arrest?” (*licet antestari?* 79). In response, Horace does not give a verbal assent but produces his ear (*oppono auriculam*, 77) to be touched. Emily Gowers argues this is a gesture to affirm that he will appear in court as witness.⁵⁶ Horace’s final act in the poem is a clear rejection of speech. His other attempts to communicate in *S.* 1.9 have failed, both verbal requests and physical gesturing. After this, the *sermo* dissipates as it is drowned out by the noises of the court: *clamor utrimque, / undique concursus* (77-8).

In drawing attention to ears throughout this poem, Horace asserts himself in the role of a listener. Unlike his predecessor Lucilius, whose *libertas* allowed him to wield the type of speech he wanted, Horace recognizes that there could be consequences for his words. He risks being punished by his patrons for saying something unflattering (with a kick – *recalcitret undique*

⁵⁵ Henderson 1999: 218 points to the language echoes between the poem’s beginning and end that “bring the narrative full circle (*accurrit, quid agis, dulcissime, arrepta, adsectaretur, in aurem ~ adversarius, quo tu turpissime, auriculam, rapit, concursus*)”; he also compares Horace’s and the pest’s body language (224).

⁵⁶ Gowers 2012: 302; I have used her suggested translation of line 79.

tutus, S. 2.1.20), or potentially worse, he could be misunderstood altogether (like he is continually in S. 1.9).

The pest is the consummate social climber, which is the exact same role Horace played in S. 1.6 during his first introduction to Maecenas. Now, Horace acts as protector of the very social network outside of which he once stood. This bit of autobiography adds an extra layer of nuance to Horace's portrayal of the pest. In a critique of social climbing, the audience sees Horace acting against his own interests by marginalizing a former version of himself, who was once on the outside looking in. As Horace's satire reminds us, "Change the name and the story is about you" (*mutato nomine de te / fabula narratur*, S. 1.1.69-70). But Horace does not need to change the name since he never provided a name for the pest in the first place, as though to say it could be anyone – himself included. Throughout this poem Horace critiques the social matrix of patron relationships, and ultimately undermines his position in Maecenas' circle. Yet there is a moment where Horace breaks out of the narrative, perhaps even allowing his satiric mask to drop for a moment, to uphold Maecenas' values and their friendship as something out of the ordinary and worth protecting.

Carmina bona

Although the persona expresses anxiety about communicating freely on issues regarding Octavian or the Empire for fear of punishment, at the same time he believes his satire will save him, precisely because of the nature of his *verba* that enter into Caesar's pricked ear. Namely, Horace is a writer of *carmina bona*, which he explains in S. 2.1. In a dialogue with Trebatius, Horace declares that he is following in Lucilius' footsteps, but the nature of their respective *carmina* differs:

'si mala condiderit in quem quis carmina, ius est

iudiciumque. 'esto, si quis mala; sed bona si quis
iudice condiderit laudatus Caesare? si quis
opprobriis dignum latraverit integer ipse?' 85
'solventur risu tabulae, tu missus abibis.' (Hor. S. 2.1.82-6)

"If someone should compose malicious verses against another, there is legal consequence and trial." "So be it if they are malicious; but what if someone composes good verses, lauded by judge Caesar? And what if someone, himself blameless, should bark at another who deserves abuse?" "The charges will be dismissed with a laugh, and you will be let off and depart."

Horace plays with the difference between two types of "poems," *carmina bona* and *mala*, throughout his poetry. *Mala*, "bad," conveys the sense of "malicious," "libelous" invective against an object,⁵⁷ but also connotes bad writing which reflects Horace's criticism of Lucilius' "muddy flow" in S. 1.4 (*cum flueret lutulentus*, 11; *garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem*, / *scribendi recte*, 12-13). Similarly *bona* means "good" in the sense of well-written, but also implies not being unduly cruel or damaging to the object – again another criticism against Lucilius whose harsh satire is akin to rubbing salt in a wound (*quod sale multo / urbem defricuit*, S. 1.10.3-4). Horace's *carmina* are *bona* because they are pleasing to the ears: his verses are well constructed, he does not abuse anyone who does not deserve it, and his goal is always a laugh.

S. 1.9 and 2.7 are both dialogue poems that feature Horace's persona communicating – or trying to communicate – with an interlocutor. Furthermore, they are both the penultimate poems within their respective Books of Horace's *Satires*. Instead of speaking, Horace relegates himself to the audience as one who listens to the voices of others. The dual role of being both a speaker/satirist and an observer/audience member is constantly at odds throughout his poetry. In S. 1.9 both his verbal speech and his body language do not have the desired effect of extricating himself from the bore; and in S. 2.7 Davus speaks for the satirist in a one-sided dialogue that

⁵⁷ Muecke 1993: 113.

hurls unexpected criticism against the satirist. In both poems, Horace purposely places himself in the subordinated role of an observer and listener. Essentially, Horace becomes an audience member to his own satire, but with a qualification: he hears with defective ears (*demitto auriculas*, *S.* 1.9.20; *rimosa ... aure*, 2.6.46), just like he sees with defective eyes in *S.* 1.5 (*lippus*). In a way, Horace writes in an excuse for the light nature of his poetry – perhaps he misheard (or mis-saw) his source material.

Horace is a satirist who thinks about what it means to be on the other side of his verse, and puts himself in the role of a listener to reflect this concern. By making his persona a listener of the pest's excessive speech, Horace communicates to the reading audience the terrible state of being subject to verbosity, thus aligning his poetics with the audience's listening preferences. And even in *S.* 2.7 where Horace takes on the role of silent listener of Davus, he reasserts the power of the audience (i.e. himself) by threatening to physically punish the brazen Davus for his criticisms: "Where's a rock for me to use? Where are the arrows?" (*unde mihi lapidem ... unde sagittas?* 116). Horace is cognizant of his audience's expectations and reactions, whether the audience is comprised of Octavian, the pest, or a group of unknown readers. In Horatian satire, the listeners and the audience have the power, not the satirist.

The satirist must be an observer of human behavior to find the best source material for his satires from everyday life. Horace impedes his persona's ability to perceive the world through body dysfunction and deficient senses, which thereby has an impact on his ability to produce the satire. His brand of satire may not appeal to everyone, especially the readers of Lucilius. Instead, Horace is beholden to his true audience: Maecenas and Octavian, whose ears he wants to please most of all with his *carmina bona*.

We have thus far seen how the senses of sight, taste, and hearing play into the narrative, poetics, and moral discourse of Horace's *Satires*. The final chapter of this study of the senses in Horatian satire brings together all of these threads by observing one poem, *S.* 1.8, from a synesthetic perspective. *S.* 1.8 is the perfect combination of Horace's satiric poetics, the underlying tension in his relationship with Maecenas, and the physical and grotesque nature of his satire. By perceiving all of the sights, tastes, sounds, smells, and touch made available to us in the garden of Priapus, we shall truly see how Horace's physical books attempt to reach out and impact the audience on a visceral level. Let us follow the pleasing sounds of Horace's *carmina bona* as they are matched against the *carmina mala* of one of his greatest competitors: Canidia.

CHAPTER 4

THE SYNAESTHETIC GARDEN

Introduction

In Chapter 2 we saw that Canidia's poisons (*venena*) could be dangerous and even lethal. Poison would find its way into foods as a symbol of its bad taste or inedibility (*S.* 2.8; *Epod.* 3), and poison could represent the presence of biting, invective speech (*S.* 1.7). In addition to her harmful poisons, Canidia also wields power over the sensory domain of hearing with her enchanting spells (*carmina*). *Carmina*, like *venenum*, is a word that occupies both the poetic and magic discourse: it can mean songs such as those written by a poet, hence "poetry"; or it can mean spells or incantations, such as those uttered by a witch. This dual meaning of *carmina* is at play in *S.* 1.8, where Canidia and her companion, Sagana, trespass into the Esquiline gardens, the territory guarded by the statue, Priapus. Priapus, the garden's defender, says this about the threat that the witches pose:

*cum mihi non tantum furesque feraeque suetae
hunc vexare locum curae sunt atque labori
quantum carminibus quae versant atque venenis
humanos animos.* (Hor. *S.* 1.8.17-20)

It doesn't bother nor concern me that thieves and wild animals are accustomed to bother this place so much as the women who manipulate human minds with spells and poisons.

Their "spells" (*carminibus*, 19) are among the first attribute Priapus ascribes to the witches – perhaps because singing and verbal enchanting is one of the most common stereotypes of witches. The noun *carmen*, *carminis* is cognate with *canere*, "to sing" (and also *canto*),¹ and typically refers to "speech made special through meter, diction, accompanying bodily movement,

¹ Ernout and Meillet 1959 s.v. *carmen*.

or performance in ritual context” – hence poetry.² Magical activities, including enchantment, defamation, and incantation, are considered forms of “song.” In *S.* 1.8, The poetic quality of the witch’s *carmina* is emphasized by the verb *versant* (19), which means “to turn” or “manipulate,” but also shares a root with the word for a line of poetry, *versus*. The stereotype of the singing witch is exemplified by the Homeric witch figure Circe: she lures Odysseus’ men to through their auditory senses (“singing,” ἀειδούσης, Hom. *Od.* 10.221; and “singing beautifully,” καλὸν ἀοιδιάει, 227).³ Practitioners of witchcraft literally “sing” their spells, which is reflected in other Latin words applied to witches, such as *cantatrix*. Unlike poetry and other ritualized contexts for song, magical *carmina* tend to be associated with the female sphere, whereas poetic *carmina* belong in the male sphere.⁴

In the previous chapter we saw Horace draw a distinction between *carmina bona*, his own well-ordered and humorous poetry, and *carmina mala*, the poetry that resembled Lucilian “salt” and prolixity.⁵ This valuation of *carmina mala* is also present in Canidia’s spells and chants which are used to invoke underworld deities, subvert the natural order, and do physical harm. Throughout *S.* 1.8, and in her other literary portrayals, Canidia attempts to dominate the reader’s auditory senses with her spells (*carmina*), and it is up to Horace to stop her with his poetry

² Habinek 2005: 1.

³ Circe is also known for mixing poisons, κακὰ φάρμακα, the Greek equivalent to *venena mala*: “and all around were mountain wolves and lions which she had bewitched when she gave them evil drugs” (ἀμφὶ δέ μιν λύκοι ἦσαν ὀρέστεροι ἢ δὲ λέοντες / τοὺς αὐτὴ κατέθελεξεν, ἐπεὶ κακὰ φάρμακ’ ἔδωκεν, Hom. *Od.* 10.212-3). Like *venenum*, Gk. φάρμακον is neutral and requires an adjective (or context) to determine whether it is pejorative (Watson 2003: 231); e.g., Hor. *S.* 2.1.48: *inimica venenum* (by transferred epithet); *Ep.* 5.61-2: *dira / venena*.

⁴ Habinek 2005: 220-1.

⁵ See Chapter 3: 153-5.

(*carmina*). And thus, we have two poet-singers vying for power in a gender power struggle: Canidia, the female chanter of *carmina mala*, and Horace, the male poet of *carmina bona*.⁶

This chapter marks the culmination in our study of the senses in Horace's *Satires*. The unifying perspective of my analysis is Horace's employment of sensory and corporeal imagery and references to the physical body throughout *S.* 1.8, an anecdotal poem whose narrative persona is a garden statue of Priapus. In this chapter, I draw upon all of the body's senses present in *S.* 1.8: sight, taste, hearing, smell, and touch. First, I observe the historical and olfactory implications of poem's setting as a former cemetery filled with unearthed putrefying human flesh. Then, I turn my attention to the physical bodies of the characters to address the elusive sense of touch: the implied impotence of the Priapus statue simultaneously inverts and reaffirms the Roman ideal of masculinity; and the unpredictability of the female body, symbolized by the witch-hag Canidia, takes on characteristics of opposing forces as both male and female, animal and human, representing *potentia* and *impotentia*. Horace's bodies exhibit blurred boundaries, just like satire itself, which eschews definition by integrating other genres within its generic boundaries. Finally, I call attention to the sounds from within the garden, from the chanting voices of the witches to the explosive fart straight out of Old Comedy and Priapus. My analysis will discuss the place of *S.* 1.8 within *Satires* 1 and observe intertextual dialogue with the *Priapea*, literature of magic, contemporary literature, and its relationship to Horace's

⁶ The word *epodos* (literally: "one who sings over") is used of a male practitioner of magic and carries with it the connotation of singing (Dickie 2001: 14). *Epodoi* is the name of Horace's iambic corpus in which Canidia and her coven figure prominently and another arena where Horace's and Canidia's *carmina* clash.

Epodes. Horace brings together a panoply of senses in his Esquiline garden to create a truly synesthetic reading (or listening) experience for his audience.⁷

Garden of Corpses

Before *S.* 1.8 begins, bodies – namely, dead bodies – supply important imagery for Horace at the end of the previous poem:

*Persius exclamat: “per magnos, Brute, deos te
oro, qui reges consueris tollere, cur non
hunc Regem iugulas? operum hoc, mihi crede, tuorum est.”* (Hor. *S.* 1.7.33-5)

Perseus shouted: “By the mighty gods, Brutus, I beg you, who have made a habit of evicting kings, why don’t you slit Rex’s throat? This task, believe me, belongs to your line!”

The intended victim of assassination, *hunc Regem*, is Rupilius Rex, an historically-based character from the courtroom drama narrated in the poem. He shares his name with the Latin word for “king” or “tyrant,” *rex*, a name repeated throughout the poem.⁸ The word *rex* recalls the expulsion of the last king of Rome, Tarquinius Superbus, by Lucius Iunius Brutus, whose *cognomen* is also scattered throughout the poem.⁹ It also suggests the tyrant Julius Caesar,¹⁰ assassinated in 44 BCE by another Brutus, Marcus Junius Brutus the Younger, embroiling Rome into another decade of civil war. The final image of *S.* 1.7 is the headless corpse of Rex after he

⁷ For analysis of Horace *S.* 1.8 see Fraenkel 1957: 121-4; Rudd 1966: 67-74; Anderson 1982: 74-83; DuQuesnay 1984: 38-39; Habash 1999; Hallett 1981; Henderson 1989; Welch 2001; Sharland 2003 and 2011; Schlegel 2005: 90-107; and the relevant analyses in the commentaries by Brown 1993 and Gowers 2012. On Canidia in general, see Rudd 1966: 148-149; Richlin 1992b; Freudenburg 1995; Oliensis 1998: 68-90; and Paule 2012.

⁸ *S.* 1.7.1, 5, 6, 9, 25, 35.

⁹ *S.* 1.7.18, 23, 24, 33.

¹⁰ Gowers 2012: 251-2; Schlegel 2010: 88-9; Porphyrio *ad* Hor. *S.* 1.7.33-5 calls this a “very witty joke” (*urbanissimus iocus*, Holder 1979: 271).

has been murdered (*cur non / hunc Regem iugulas?*), emphasized by the poem's abrupt ending and elisions in line 35. The allusion to tyrannicide serves as a reminder of Rome's violent past, as murder and war tend to demarcate periods of transition within Roman history.

From the ashes of civil war, the garden ornament Priapus is born into the next poem. He is fashioned out of a *truncus* (S. 1.8.1), whose primary meaning is tree trunk, but is another word for a headless body, forging a connection with the previous poem through allusion to corpses and death. Furthermore, the setting of S. 1.8 is dominated by more bodies, *cadavera*, once buried on the Esquiline which was formerly a *commune sepulchrum*:

huc prius angustis eiecta cadavera cellis
conservus vili portanda locabat in arca
hoc miserae plebi stabat commune sepulchrum 10
 ...
nunc licet Esquiliis habitare salubribus atque
aggere in aprico spatium, quo modo tristes 15
albis informem spectabant ossibus agrum. (Hor. S. 1.8.8-16)

Previously a fellow slave arranged for corpses, cast out of narrow cells, to be carried here in a cheap coffin. This communal grave was intended for the miserable common people [...]. Now it is permitted to reside on the wholesome Esquiline and to stretch one's legs in the sunny embankment, from which recently people were looking sadly at the landscape shapeless with white bones.

During the early years of the first century BCE, the area between the Esquiline and Viminal gates were known dumping grounds for corpses, primarily by slaves and the impoverished (*miserae plebi*, 10) who could not afford the expense of proper burial.¹¹ The illegal dumping of

¹¹ Cf. Var. L. 5.25 on the burial pits: "[they are called] burial pits (*puticuli*) because there corpses have been thrown out and are rotting in the public place beyond the Esquiline" (*puticuli quod putrescebant ibi cadavera proiecta, qui locus publicus ultra Esquilias*). See Bodel 1986: 50 and 2000: 129 who estimates based on comparative data that 1,500 corpses per annum turned up unwanted in the city of Rome out of 30,000 total deaths: "When it came to disposing of the dead in public facilities, the Romans were content to put aside their religious precepts regarding the sanctity of graves and approached the problem exclusively in terms of pragmatic concerns of hygiene and amenity" (148).

bodies in the city became a health concern and public nuisance due to the unsightliness and stench of abandoned cadavers. The bodies in Priapus' garden are *cadavera* (8) rather than *corpora* perhaps to indicate that they are abandoned flesh not intended for ritual burial.¹² The smell of flesh left out in the open would likely have been unbearable and marked the place as one of death.¹³ In the early 30s BCE, Maecenas sponsored the area's reclamation into what became known as *Horti Maecenatis*, located south of the Esquiline gate.¹⁴ This act of generosity, however, is never mentioned explicitly in the poem. Maecenas' preservation of the area was a great public service that made the place usable again and no longer offensive to the eyes and noses of the Romans, as indicated by the phrase *Esquiliis ... salubribus* (14). It seems that city officials may have come to recognize the health risks of a mass grave.¹⁵ Maecenas essentially

¹² Bodel 2000: 129.

¹³ Morley 2015: 114; in addition to the smells of the dead, there would also have been other potentially rank smells floating around Rome as zoning markers, such as fullers, the Cloaca Maxima, undisposed chamber pots (that would sit in private cesspits), butchers, trash, cooking smells, the burning of bodies on funeral pyres. Some of these smells would have been particularly bad in the lower-class households, especially clustered together in *insulae*, and could be blamed on an inadequate sewage system (Morley 2015: 114-16; Koloski-Ostrow 2015). Morley will ultimately come to argue that "the Romans themselves apparently failed to notice this," i.e. all of the urban smells that we would find repugnant, and had likely adapted to them (116-17); *contra* Potter 1999: 169; Koloski-Ostrow 2015: 109, where smells played a role in shaping the urban setting.

¹⁴ Bodel 2000: 131; Welch 2001: 184. Porphyrio *ad* Hor. *S.* 1.8.7: "[in] the new gardens: he said this because Maecenas established the gardens after he first experienced the wholesomeness of the air at a prior time when the Esquiline region was free from graves and tombs" ('*novis hortis*': *ideo dixit, quod, cum Esquilina regio prius sepulchris et bustis vacaret, primus Maecenas salubritatem aeris ibi expertus hortos constituit*, Holder 1979: 272). Bodel 1986: 50-4 discusses the archaeological search for the location of the *commune sepulchrum* in *S.* 1.8 based on the literary accounts.

¹⁵ Koloski-Ostrow 2014: 107-8.

turned the *commune sepulchrum* into an Epicurean pleasure garden for a new type of public service: communal enjoyment. The new garden, then, becomes a nexus of sensory experience, where one can look upon the verdant foliage, smell the fresh flowers and plants, feel the wind blowing and the warmth of the sun, and enjoy the silence.

These pleasure gardens, or *horti* (in the plural), began to appear in the Late Republic, and differed from the Roman *hortus* (in the singular). The *hortus* was a small, personal garden that provided a food source to its owner and cultivator, lauded as functional and fecund.¹⁶ The *horti*, on the other hand, were rumored to have been founded by Epicurus¹⁷ and intended strictly for pleasure – a place to walk, gaze upon, and enjoy *otium*. As a natural refuge from the city, they would have been a silent place ripe for contemplation and relaxation. But, lacking the fecundity of a generative vegetable garden, the *horti* came to be associated with a sterility and lack of functional utility; the lushness was only superficial and ultimately the *horti* were deemed “morally suspect.”¹⁸

S. 1.8 conveys the garden’s conflicted past and present existence, referencing in particular the difference in aesthetic qualities. “Then” (*prius*, 8) in the past, the garden as cemetery was associated with negative imagery: the pathetic plebeians (*miserae plebi*, 10), a shapeless and

¹⁶ Plin. *Nat.* 19.19.

¹⁷ Plin. *Nat.* 19.19.51-3: “Epicurus, the master of leisure, first instituted this [i.e. urban garden] in Athens. Until him it had not been customary for rural estates to exist in towns” (*primus hoc instituit Athenis Epicurus otii magister; usque ad eum moris non fuerat in oppidis habitari rura*).

¹⁸ Pagan 2006: 9: “In time, this disparity between the humble beginnings of the *hortus* and the luxurious capabilities of the *horti* during the late Republic left Roman moral sensibilities in a deep predicament. [...] The difference between the *hortus* and the *horti* can also be measured in terms of fertility and sterility; the less useable produce a garden yields, the more morally suspect it becomes.”

ugly expanse (*informem*, 16) in which human bones are disseminated and left out in the open (*albis ... ossibus*, 16) – a sight that anyone would look upon with sadness (*tristes*, 15). And “now” (*nunc*, 14) the gardens are under the care of Maecenas, described in terms that conjure positive imagery.¹⁹ The bodies that once occupied the space had been reduced to mere bones; now living bodies walk around (*spatiari*, 15) in the bright and sunny space (*aggere in aprico*, 15). Essentially, the garden has become a space that encourages healthy bodies (*salubribus*, 14) instead of storing dead ones, and replaced dark with light imagery.

Although Maecenas turned the space into an Epicurean pleasure garden, his renovations merely covered the garden’s dirty past and superficially hid the bodies. According to *S.* 1.8, the *cadavera* are still present under a superficial makeover of lush grass and vegetation. The bodies are the main attraction for Canidia and her coven as a source for necromancy (“to draw out the souls from the underworld to give responses,” *ut inde / manibus elicerent animas responsa daturas*, *S.* 1.8.28-9). Coupled with the regicidal ending of *S.* 1.7 and its hint at civil war, the haphazard cemetery of *S.* 1.8 could stand in for a mass war grave of the thousands who died in the triumviral civil wars in which Horace himself took part. The presence of the *cadavera*, persistent remnants of past wars, reaffirms the negative and sterile associations of the garden and foreshadows the dark deeds of the witches.²⁰

Similarly Canidia herself is a reflection of the garden’s conflict between sterility and fecundity. As a woman she is socially expected to procreate and rear children, a role justified by the perceived biological purpose her body as a receptacle for life. Rather than acquiesce to this social expectation based on her biology, Canidia acts contrary to her expected role. In *S.* 1.8 she

¹⁹ Anderson 1982: 78; DuQuesnay 1984: 38.

²⁰ *Contra* DuQuesnay 1984: 39 calls the poem “a compliment to Maecenas on the building of the *horti*.”

loiters in the cemetery at night and casts spells; in the *Epodes* she pursues an amorous, extra-marital relationship,²¹ fakes childbirth,²² and, in a more extreme example of rejection of her body's biological function, she commits infanticide.²³ Furthermore Canidia's name, possibly a derivation of *canities*, "old age,"²⁴ aligns her with the stereotype of a sterile old woman who can no longer produce children – the inversion of the Roman feminine sexual ideal.²⁵ As a representation of persistent old age Canidia, as white as the corpses that occupy the garden,²⁶ symbolizes Rome's "dead and destructive past."²⁷

It is generally agreed that the composition of *Satires* 1 spans 38 BCE to its publication in 36-35, which aligns with the phase of the second triumvirate during the Sicilian Wars that pitted Octavian and Marc Antony against Sextus Pompey.²⁸ Romans were undoubtedly still

²¹ She concocts a "love potion" (*amoris ... poculum*, *Epod.* 3.38) to win back her lover, Varus: "not by means of ordinary potions, Varus ... will you return to me" (*non usitatis, Vare, potionibus ... ad me recurres*, 73-5).

²² "The midwife dyes the sheets red with your blood and you jump up, strong, although supposedly you have just given birth" (*tuo / cruore rubros obstetrix pannos lavit, / utcumque fortis exsilis puerpera*, *Epod.* 17.50-2).

²³ *Epod.* 5, although the narrative breaks off before the *puer* is killed, the abrupt ending is highly suggestive of his death.

²⁴ Oliensis 1998: 68.

²⁵ See *Epod.* 8 and 12 as examples of Horatian invective against old women. Richlin 1992b: 109-16 observes that "The invective against *vetulae* [old women] constitutes a sort of apotropaic satire that attempts to belittle and control the power of old women, pitting the phallus against the threat of sterility, death, and the chthonic forces" (113); see also Dickie 2001: 78.

²⁶ "Their paleness made both women terrifying to look at" (*pallor utrasque / fecerat horrendas aspectu*, *S.* 1.8.25-6).

²⁷ Anderson 1982: 81.

²⁸ DuQuesnay 1984: 20-3. Nisbet 1984: 9 has argued that Canidia's name may derive from a historical figure, Canidius Crassus (political opponent to Octavian who fought with Antony in the Parthian campaigns and commanded the ground troops at Actium) as a literary expression of political tension.

experiencing tensions from the first triumvirate, assassination of Julius Caesar in 44 BCE, and the ensuing civil wars. In particular the Battle of Philippi in 42 BCE was a great personal loss for Horace who fought on the losing side with Caesar's assassins. After his subsequent pardon by Octavian, his post as *scriba quaestorius*, and adoption into Maecenas' literary network, Horace uses his poetry to communicate a fresh start both from his own past deeds and as a revisionist of Lucilian satire.²⁹ In much the same way, the Priapus of *S.* 1.8 is given a fresh start in a new landscape. Just as Horace contends with the ghosts of the past, Priapus must fend off the witches who try to resurrect the dead and threaten the future of the new gardens. In the last section of this chapter, we will explore the similarities between Horace, the poet, and Priapus, the persona.

Change is in progress, but Augustus and the Golden Age are not yet a reality. Although many readers notice that Horace's poems seem to reject direct discourse on contemporary politics, *Satires* 1 is nevertheless a byproduct of the intersection between Rome's violent past, its fraught present, and uncertain future for the state.³⁰ In *S.* 1.8 Horace subtly manipulates the sensuous garden setting and all the bodies therein to echo his outlook on the instability of contemporary Rome, including a subversion of traditional gender roles manifested in both Priapus and Canidia.

The Satiric Priapic Body

This section is dedicated to analyzing the physical body of the satiric persona. *S.* 1.8 is narrated from the perspective of a statue of ithyphallic Priapus, through whose eyes the audience

²⁹ Especially *S.* 1.4 and 1.10; Gowers 2012: 3-4.

³⁰ Especially *S.* 1.5 and 7, along with the *Epodes* whose composition dates (40-30 BCE) overlap with *Satires* 1 and 2 (Gowers 2012: 5; Mankin 1995: 10-12).

witnesses the deeds in the garden (“I myself saw,” *vidi egomet*, 23). The audience follows Priapus from his birth as a statue built from a tree trunk (*truncus ... ficulnus*, 1) into a likeness of the god Priapus, until he takes on the role of watchman over the garden. Just as the *faber* is shown to deliberate with uncertainty “whether to make [the tree trunk] into a footstool or Priapus” (*incertus scamnum faceretne Priapum*, 2), so too does Horace the poet make decisions about the manifestation of his narrative ego. By drawing inspiration from the *Priapea*, Horace constructs his Priapus with a mess of protruding limbs meant to shock the viewers’ senses, yet applies his own satiric measures by making Priapus impotent. The statue might be frightening to look at, but Horace’s Priapus is primarily a voyeur himself, unable to combat actively the witches who transgress into his space.

By donning the mask of a Priapic literary persona, Horace aligns *S.* 1.8 with the *Priapea*, a collection of Greek and Latin poems of varying length and meter “written about the phallic god Priapus, or addressed to him, or spoken by him, or invoking him.”³¹ Priapus has been called “a talking phallus,” distinguished by a prominent erect penis and aggressive sexual behavior; he was often memorialized in statues placed at boundary markers, on roads, and in gardens as a protector of these liminal places.³² He was considered a good luck charm (*fascinum*) to ward off evil and a symbol of fertility, heralded for his generative powers especially as it relates to the

³¹ Parker 1988: 1. My study focuses on the eighty poems (sometimes 86 – see Callebat and Soubiran 2012: xviii-xix, 35-40) in the Latin collection of the *Priapea*, whose date and authorship are uncertain, even single versus multiple authorship (Parker 1988: 34; Richlin 1992b: 141-3; Callebat and Soubiran 2012: xxvii). Even if this particular collection of poems was not in circulation in the first century BCE, *topoi* from the *Priapea* in the *Greek Anthology* were established long before (from the third century BCE) and influenced later poets from Republican and Augustan Rome (Parker 1988: 2; Callebat and Soubiran 2012: xvi).

³² Richlin 1992b: 116.

garden setting.³³ In Roman culture Priapus was not seriously worshipped, but featured in the context of folklore, epigram, and satire as an expression of obscenity and exaggerated masculinity. *S.* 1.8 features common motifs found in the *Priapea*, such as a rustic setting over which Priapus is the watchman,³⁴ especially against thieves;³⁵ he wields another rustic “weapon” in addition to an erect, apotropaic phallus, like a sickle (*falx*) and club (*fustis*),³⁶ to suggest an additional *membrum*.³⁷ However, Priapus prefers to use his erect penis as his primary weapon to threaten sexual penetration – *irrumatio*, *fututio*, and primarily *pedicatio*.³⁸ Priapus is the embodiment of the eponymous “Priapic prime directive,” which is a defining characteristic of the Roman ideal of masculinity. The directive states that “a *real man* must always and only play the insertive role” in sex acts with no regard to the gender of the party playing the penetrative role.³⁹

³³ Barton 1993: 91-8.

³⁴ Cf. from Callebat’s and Soubiran’s edition of the *Priapea*: “the ruddy watchman of gardens” (*ruber hortorum custos*, 1.5); “the little field commissioned to me” (*commissio mihi...agello*, 15.1-2); “Watch over my orchard carefully, Priapus, and threaten thieves with your red penis” (*diligens Priape facito tutelam pomarii / <et> rubricato minare furibus mutunio*, 72.1-2).

³⁵ Threats against thieves appear in nearly half of the *Priapea* (Richlin 1992b: 120, 245 n. 19).

³⁶ *Ne prendere cave! Prenso nec fuste nocebo,
saeva nec incurva vulnera falce dabo:
traiectus conto sic extendere pedali
ut culum rugam non habuisse putes. (Priap. 11)*

Careful I don’t catch you. I will not harm you with my seized club, nor will I give you grave wounds with my crooked sickle: when I extend and pierce you with my foot-long pole, you might think your anus doesn’t have a wrinkle.

³⁷ Adams 1990: 16. Cf. “sickle” *falx* (*Priap.* 6.2); “staff” (*sceptrum*, 25.1); “threatening with a sickle” (*falce minax*, 30.1); “thieves stole my sickle” (*falcem ... fures subripuere*, 55.1-2).

³⁸ *Pedicatio* is the most common threat in *Priap.* 6, 11, 15, 17, 25, 28, 31, 35, 41, 51, 52, 64, 69, 76, 77.

Occasionally *irrumatio* is threatened: *Priap.* 28, 30, 35, 44, 56, 70 (Richlin 1992b: 121).

³⁹ Williams 2010: 163; Richlin 1997: 538.

Priapus is a god defined by the shape of his body and violations he has committed upon other bodies. This section is dedicated to analyzing the Priapic body and character under the larger sensory umbrella of touch. Touch is the most elusive of the senses. Even Aristotle could not completely define the mechanics of touch, arguing that the skin is the primary tactile organ, but that haptic sensation occurred somewhere else in the body.⁴⁰ Often the hands are considered the primary physical medium for touch; we have seen this in *S.* 1.9 where the pest and Horace both initiate a sort of reciprocal touching the other as a sign of familiarity. Touch provides a range of sensations, such as experiencing hot and cold, pleasure and pain, softness and roughness, life and death – and thus the subject of touch is also difficult to define.⁴¹ For our purposes, touch will be discussed primarily as a medium for sexual pleasure – appropriate for hypersexual Priapus.⁴² Priapus’ “touch” traditionally means sexual violation where his penis makes direct contact with another body; but generally speaking touch can symbolically represent the collapsing of boundaries between the one touching and touched, or subject and object. In the *Satires*, however, Priapus is denied the ability to reach out to anyone via touching or any other sensory medium for the majority of the poem. He is only able to watch the women who violate his

⁴⁰ Arist. *de An.* 422b19-23; Purves 2014: 29 reads several passages from Herodotus’ *Histories* where touch is preferred to the other senses, especially sight, as an indication that Herodotus’ autopsy contains an element of the tactile, “sensuous geography” (29).

⁴¹ Purves 2014 also includes various forms of internal “touching” in her purview, like the vestibular system, proprioception, and kinesthesia (23-4).

⁴² Adams 1982, where *tango* and its compounds and derivatives furnish a large class of euphemisms” for sex, in particular to describe the role of the male (185-6). See Chapter 1: 43-6 where touch is used to imply sex in Pl. *Bac.* 913-15 and *Per.* 11; also Hor. *S.* 1.2.28: “there are those who refuse to **touch** except those women whose border on the stitched garment **covers** her ankles” (*sunt qui nolint tetigisse nisi illas / quarum subsuta talos tegat instita veste*); *Priap.* 28.5: “I will **touch** a higher place” (*altiora tangam*), i.e. the mouth for *irrumatio*.

space, and literally laying their hands (*scalpere terram*, *S.* 1.8.26) onto his physical space to claim it as their own.

Horace's ithyphallic Priapic persona suggests threats of insertive penetration through the visual impact of his many protruding *membra*:

*nam fures dextra coercet
obscenoque ruber porrectus ab inguine palus* 5
*ast importunas volucres in vertice harundo
terret fixa vetatque novis considerare in hortis.* (Hor. *S.* 1.8.4-7)

For my right hand repels the thieves along with a red stake erected from my lewd groin; but a reed-pole fixed to my head frightens the annoying flying creatures and prevents them from settling in the new gardens.

The word *palus* (5) is typically employed in an agricultural context as a stake or fence used to support grape vines.⁴³ But the color (*ruber*, 5),⁴⁴ shape (*porrectus*, 5), and location of *palus* protruding from his groin (*ab inguine*, 5) combine to create a “unique”⁴⁵ euphemism for an erect penis, and perhaps a word play on the Greek φαλλός.⁴⁶ Although *palus* does not appear in *Priapea*, it signals adherence to Priapic generic convention by supplying an additional *membrum* and using a word that suits an agricultural context. Additionally, the “reed-pole” (*harundo*, 6) affixed to Priapus' head visually adds a third erect limb to his silhouette along with his “right

⁴³ Adams 1990: 24; *OLD*, s.v. *palus* 1 “a length of unsplit wood, post, stake ... used for marking boundaries,” as, e.g., Cato *Agr.* 37.3: “cut the vine poles and dried out **stakes** to fit” (*ridicas et palos ... siccos dolato*), Var. *R.* 1.8.4: “a firm support, which is customarily the best for a vineyard and made of oak or juniper, is called a *ridica* (vine pole). The next best is a **stake** made of a thick branch so it will last longer” (*unum robustum, quod optimum solet afferri in vineam e quercu ac iunipiro et vocatur ridica; alterum palus e pertica meliore dura, quo diuturnior*).

⁴⁴ Richlin 1992: 67.

⁴⁵ Adams 1990: 16.

⁴⁶ Gowers 2012: 269.

hand” (*dextra* [*manus*], 4) and “red stake” (*ruber ... palus*, 5). It has also been suggested that *harundo* has a practical function as a bird trap in addition to its apotropaic function.⁴⁷

Despite the preponderance of phallic protrusions and imagery, Horace’s Priapus differs from the traditional Priapus in that he is impotent. He cannot fulfill his conventional apotropaic role, thus calling into question his masculinity. Priapus admits as much when he says that he is “unable to destroy and prevent the witches in any way ... from collecting bones and harmful herbs” from his garden (*has nullo perdere possum / nec prohibere modo ... quin ossa legant herbasque nocentis*, *S.* 1.8.20-2). Tara Welch calls Priapus a “verbal eunuch,” arguing that his sexual impotence also applies to his stunted speech.⁴⁸ Instead, Priapus is relegated to the role of voyeur. He cannot participate, but only relate to the audience what he sees, conveyed in the emphatic “I myself **saw**” (*vidi egomet*, 23). He provides a lengthy account, full of visual descriptors, of what the garden looked like before and after Maecenas (8-16), and he bears “witness” to the witches’ deeds, *testis*, as he is called several times in the poem (36, 44). The word *testis* not only confines Priapus to the role of an observer, but it also puns on the word for testicle, *testis*. For the Romans, the genitals were associated with the “aggressive and prophylactic eye,” as both were considered a source of simultaneous “vulnerability and power.”⁴⁹ The pun on *testis/testis* is appropriate for the ithyphallic god, recognizing both his sexual and

⁴⁷ Parker 1988: 15 calls *harundo* a “wreath worn by a deity and a trap for birds made of limed twigs.” Cf. Horace’s other uses of *harundo*: “to ride on a long **stick** like a horseman” (*equitare in harudine longa*, *S.* 2.3.248); “[a Laurentian boar] fed on sedge and reeds” (*ulvis et harundine pinguis*, 2.4.42).

⁴⁸ Welch 2001: 184.

⁴⁹ Barton 1993: 95-7. Barton 2002 elaborates, writing that the eyes and genitals “were part of the body that most profoundly exemplified the paradox of socialization; if they were respected one could endure being in the sight of others, if not, being visible was unendurable” (219).

powers of sight; but it also underscores the irony of his sexual deficiencies. All of Priapus' judgments are described in visual terms, citing in particular the witches' physical appearance. He calls Canidia "hideous to **look at**" (*horrendas aspectu*, 26), and he beseeches the audience that we "**would see** with a big laugh and a smile" the witches when they are chased out of the garden in the end (*magno risuque iocoque videres*, 50), where the word *video* is the final word in the poem. Priapus' role as a watchful watchman (*testis*) places him in the sensory domain of sight and outside the domain of touch. We shall see later that Priapus is challenged by the witches' role as singing enchantresses from the domain of hearing.

Even from the opening lines of *S.* 1.8, Priapus' physical body suggests his ineffectiveness:

*Olim truncus eram ficulnus, inutile lignum,
cum faber, incertus scamnum faceretne Priapum,
maluit esse deum. deus inde ego, furum aviumque
maxima formido* (Hor. *S.* 1.8.1-4).

Once I was a little fig trunk, a useless piece of wood, when a craftsman, unsure whether he should make a footstool or a Priapus, decided I should be the god. Because of this I am the god, the greatest object of fear to thieves and birds.

On the surface, the description of Priapus' origin seems like an expression of a common theme from *Priapea*: the presence of a creator, and his construction out of the raw material, *lignum*.⁵⁰ But as we take a closer look, the passage from *S.* 1.8 foreshadows the weakness and impotence of Horace's Priapus. As another's creation, Priapus is put in a position of subordination to a higher power. Horace reinforces this idea in *S.* 1.8 by portraying Priapus' creation as arbitrary (*maluit esse deum*), as though his being a god was a result of chance, thus undermining whatever

⁵⁰ *Non me Praxiteles Scopasve fecit,
non sum Phidiaca manu politus,
sed lignum rude villicus dolavit
et dixit mihi "Tu, Priapus esto!"* (Priap. 10.2-5)

Neither Praxiteles nor Scopas made me, I was not polished by Phidias' hand. But the farmer fashioned a rough **piece of wood** and said to me, "May you be Priapus!"

power he has as Priapus. Additionally, Priapus is constructed from an *inutile lignum* (1), a “useless piece of wood,” as compared to the *lignum rude* of *Priap.* 10.4). The word *lignum* used elsewhere in the *Priapea* to suggest perceived inability to perform a sexual assault, which Priapus quickly redresses by stating that the material of his *membrum* does not prevent him from penetrating his victims.⁵¹ It seems formulaic, then, for Priapus comically to address awareness that he is only a statue; but it is also conventional for him to provide an adversative statement that he is still able to commit rape. And thus, early in *S.* 1.8 Priapus’ impotence is established contrary to what one might expect from the conventions of the *Priapea*.⁵²

Horace’s Priapus is made from a *truncus*, a tree trunk that has been hewn and stripped of its branches, an appropriate raw material for a statue. As we saw above *truncus* can also mean corpse or headless body, continuing the regicidal motif from *S.* 1.7.35 and making Priapus an appropriate companion for the *cadavera* within the garden-cemetery. Additionally, *truncus* carries the connotation of being imperfect, deprived, or lacking some essential feature.⁵³ This

⁵¹ *Quod sum ligneus, ut vides, Priapus
et falx lignea ligneusque penis,
prendam te tamen et tenebo prensam. (Priap. 6.1-3)*

Although I am a **wooden** Priapus, as you can see, and both my sickle is **wooden** and penis is **wooden**, nevertheless I will catch and hold you firm.

⁵² *Priap.* 43.1: “Although I am made of **wood**” (*quamvis sim ligneus*); 73.2-4: “My penis does not stand erect in my groin, but although it is now lifeless and a **useless piece of wood**, it will be useful if you provide a sanctuary” (*non stat in inguinibus mentula tenta meis. / Quae tamen exanimis nunc est et inutile lignum, / utilis haec, aram si dederitis, erit!*). *Contra Priap.* 56.3, in which Priapus admits his impotence because his *mentula* is “only made of wood” (*quid ista lignum est*).

⁵³ Cf. Liv. 31.29.11, as an adjective: “But Capua ... survives, a **destroyed** city, deprived of a senate, plebeians, and magistrates – a monstrosity” (*Capua quidem ... superest, urbs trunca, sine senatu, sine plebe, sine magistratibus, prodigium*); Ov. *Am.* 3.7.15: “I lay there like a motionless **trunk**, a sight and **useless** weight” (*truncus iners iacui*,

word, then, may also suggest Priapus' lack of male potency, an essential feature for the god, his statues, and for Roman men in general. Furthermore, Priapus is carved from the trunk of a fig tree (*ficulus*), which also undercuts his manhood. Fig (*figus*) can refer to an anal hemorrhoid and carries the degrading association of being anally penetrated.⁵⁴ In Greek Comedy and in the iambs of Hipponax the fig (ἰσχάς, σῆκον) is a euphemism for female genitalia, which may figure into the fruit's association with unmanly sexuality.⁵⁵ Figs appear occasionally in *Priapea* as objects that are stolen, a crime for which Priapus ironically threatens anal rape.⁵⁶ In *Priap.* 41, Priapus encounters a poet who will not dedicate verses to him and uses the superlative of *ficus* as a threat of anal penetration: "let him walk, **riddled with anal ulcers**, among the learned poets" (*inter eruditos / **ficosissimus** ambulet poetas!* 3-4).⁵⁷ Later in *S.* 1.8, *figus* appears in the description of Priapus' explosive fart: "I, a **fig tree**, broke wind, splitting my ass crack" (*pepedi / diffissa nate **figus***, 46-7). In a reversal of expectations, Horace's audience might have

species et inutile pondus), where *truncus* refers to the impotence of Ovid's persona's despite attempts at sexual arousal. It also contains the word *inutile* and a first person verb in a similar construction to *S.* 1.8.1.

⁵⁴ Hallett 1981: 343; Adams 1982: 113.

⁵⁵ Henderson 1991: 134 writes "the elongated shape and wrinkled appearance of the dried fig naturally suggest the female organs."

⁵⁶ *Priap.* 51.5 "This **fig** is not preferable to my neighbor" (*non **figus** hic est praeferenda vicinae*); 69.1: "When longing for a **fig** overtakes you" (*cum **fici** tibi suavitas subibit*). Hallett 1981: 343-4; Schlegel 2005: 93.

⁵⁷ The superlative of *ficus* in *Priap.* 50.2 is a spurious reading: "a girl most beautiful / badly afflicted with anal ulcers plays with my heart" (*fucosissima <ficosissima> me puella ludit*). Parker 1981: 50 and Hallett 1981: 344 take the reading of *ficosissima*; Callebaut and Soubiran 2012: 218-19 argues for *fucosissima* explaining a stronger manuscript tradition.

understood the implication that Priapus' anus was "deformed through penile penetration."⁵⁸ We shall return to this important passage at the end of the chapter.

We have seen how the confines of gardens act as a convergence point for the past, present and future, and how Horace plays with the conventions of the *Priapea* to create a satiric Priapus whose manhood is undermined by his inability to touch, and instead can only watch – ironically conveyed by *testis*. At the end of the poem, we will see Priapus break out of his shell – literally – to commit his own sort of flatulent revenge against the witches. He will no longer be relegated to the post of watchman and narrator, but becomes an actor in the narrative. First, however, the next section of this paper follows the theme of breaking boundaries through the figure of Canidia. We will analyze her physical transgression into the space of the gardens and how Horace simultaneously plays with transgressing the semantic boundaries of her physical female body. As a singer of *carmina mala*, Canidia's enchanting voice fills the silent gardens as a threat to Priapic masculinity and Horatian poetry.

Canidia: A Body Without Boundaries

After the audience is introduced to the unconventional setting of the garden and Priapus' unconventional body, we finally meet the witch-hag,⁵⁹ Canidia, and her companion, Sagana. As

⁵⁸ Hallett 1981: 345.

⁵⁹ Freudenburg's term encompasses both her association with magic and old age (1995: 208). Paule 2012: 17-8 argues that the modern term "witch" is limited in its meaning, whereas a plurality of Latin words are employed for female practitioners of magic to create a more accurate distinction: *cantatrix*, *sacerdos*, *vates*, *docta*, *divina*, *saga*, *maga*, *venefica*, *lamia*, and *strix*. Ancient literary "witches" are variable and cannot be typified with a single set of defining characteristics (see 17-27 for a nuanced explanation of each term). For the sake of simplification, I will

mistresses of both incantations (*carminibus*, *S.* 1.8.19) and deadly poison (*venenis*, *S.* 1.8.19), the women become Priapus' primary antagonists. In Chapter 2, we witnessed the deadly but comical force of Canidia's poisoned food: in *Epod.* 3 excess garlic had all the features of her poison and repelled Maecenas' lover, and in *S.* 2.8 her bad snake-poison breath made the food inedible and caused Nasidienus' dinner guests to turn tail. Canidia's appearance in *S.* 1.8, however, finds her more prominently in the role of *cantatrix* as a singer of *carmina mala*. Canidia and Sagana enter Priapus' gardens to perform a revenge love spell for which they require bones (*ossa*, 22) and special herbs (*herbas ... nocentes*, 22) gathered from the former cemetery. Impotent Priapus is only able to watch and describes the machinations of the witches to the audience.

The composition dates of the *Satires* and *Epodes* overlap with a period of antagonism against magic and witchcraft and its official banishment from Rome in 33 BCE.⁶⁰ Horace's portrayal of Canidia, then, may have been inspired by contemporary anxieties about magic as being harmful to Roman state ideologies.⁶¹ Furthermore, Kimberly Stratton situates the portrayal of powerful female practitioners of witchcraft within a larger discourse of the Romans' fear of powerful women, which she calls the "wicked woman motif," prevalent in Latin literature.⁶² As early as

continue to refer to Canidia as a witch and her retinue as a coven, trusting my reader to understand that there is more nuance here than the English terminology suggests.

⁶⁰ Lejay 1911: 220; Rudd 1966: 72, citing Tac. *Ann.* 2.32. Many Romans still retained private superstitions, but Rudd remarks that "none of them would have had anything but contempt for a creature like Canidia."

⁶¹ DuQuesnay 1984: 39 argues another historical association between Canidia and Nigidius Figulus, a supporter of Pompey the Great, who was tried and exiled as a practitioner of magic, calling *S.* 1.8 "an expression of relief at the removal of various undesirables from the city and the end of Sex. Pompeius."

⁶² Stratton 2007: 72: "I argue that long-standing societal concerns about female sexual license combined with Augustan political ideology to shape the deployment of magic discourse in both literary representations as well as political indictments during the imperial period." Literary depictions of Cleopatra VII might be informed by

the third century BCE, elite Roman women had growing access to increasing wealth, independence, and political influence; this increasing power was perceived as a threat to Roman males, who retaliated by creating a body of literature that suppresses independent women by portraying them as “licentious, power grasping, and overly masculine.”⁶³ I will show how Horace’s portrayal of Canidia fits into this larger body of literature that seeks to demonize powerful women through magic rhetoric and stereotyping, particularly through separating her from traditional feminine characteristics.

According to Ellen Oliensis, Canidia is a “fixture in [Horace’s] poetic world,”⁶⁴ appearing numerous times throughout the *Satires* and *Epodes* where she collects magic ingredients, casts

Stratton’s interpretation of magic discourse as applied to portrayal of women, e.g., Plut. *Ant.* 37.4, where Cleopatra seduces Marc Antony with “drugs” (φαρμάκων, Greek for *venena*) and “magic rites” (γοητείας). On the vilification of women in ancient literature, see generally Pomeroy 1975: 177-81, Richlin 1984 and 1992b, who writes that, regarding the invective of literary females, “fear produces mockery which disguises the fear as contempt” (1984: 76).

⁶³ Stratton 2007: 72. On the “wicked woman motif,” see 73-9, where Stratton cites as examples Cato’s speech that opposes the *Lex Oppia* through attacking the characters of women (Liv. 34.2-7); Clodia’s portrayal by Cicero as a *meretrix* who has a “feminine libido” (*muliebrem libidinem*, *Cael.* 1) without restraint; and Sallust’s treatment of the women who assisted Catiline in his conspiracy, aligning them with prostitution, immodesty, and old age (*Cat.* 24.1-4).

⁶⁴ Oliensis 2009: 162. Porphyrio the scholiast suggests the name Canidia may be a pseudonym for a certain Gratidia, called *venefica*, who specialized in oils and was a known enemy of Horace. But most modern scholarship reads her as a fictional character who comes to symbolize many different things, perhaps more than simply a composite of Horace’s knowledge of witchcraft. She may be stock figure in the typology of the aging prostitute (Dickie 2001: 178-81, *contra* Stratton and Kalleres 2014: 4 who criticize Dickie for reading female witches too literally); Canidia could also be a stand-in for Archilochus’ Neobule and reliance on the Greek iambic tradition (Rudd 1966: 148).

love spells, commits infanticide, and is the embodiment of *venenum* – poison or invective.⁶⁵ Canidia is granted the dubious honor of uttering the last minatory words of the *Epodes*⁶⁶ and *Satires* 2.⁶⁷ In this way, she is Horace’s “anti-dedicatee” and foil to Maecenas who is lauded in Horace’s poems (*S.* 1.1, *Epod.* 1, *Carm.* 1.1, *Ep.* 1.1).⁶⁸ Throughout his poetry, and especially evident in *S.* 1.8, Canidia tries to replace Horace’s *carmina* with her own and to overcome male *potentia* represented by Priapus. Canidia is one of the few women to appear in Horace’s *Satires* – and certainly the most prominent female figure.⁶⁹ However, Canidia is fashioned from Horace’s own masculine perspective, making her into a sort of Other.⁷⁰ Horace introduces Canidia as a boogey-woman – a completely unrealistic creature intended to frighten – as a means to neutralize the threat of her femininity. Horace constructs Canidia’s body – the female body – into a locus of duality, at once human and animal, masculine and feminine, sterile and fertile. By taking a closer look at how Horace constructs Canidia’s physical form and plays with the sensory

⁶⁵ *S.* 1.8, 2.1.48, 2.8.9; *Epod.* 3.7, 5, 17; See Chapter 2: 109-18 for Canidia’s role as poisoner.

⁶⁶ *Epod.* 17.81, addressed to the Horace persona: “do you lament that the end of your art has done nothing against me?” (*plorem artis in te nil agentis exitus?*).

⁶⁷ *S.* 2.8.94-5: “As if Canidia had breathed onto the food, worse than African serpents” (*velut illis / Canidia adflasset peior serpentibus Afris*).

⁶⁸ Welch 2001: 185.

⁶⁹ The *mendacem ... puellam*, so important to the plot but who never appears (*S.* 1.5.82); The old woman (*anus*) whose prophecy for Horace’s death is related in Horace’s own voice (*S.* 1.9.30-4); Penelope’s imagined reduction to a greedy and unchaste woman (*S.* 2.5.70-88). Generally, see Richlin 1984.

⁷⁰ “The hugely exaggerated and emphasized features in the stereotype [of women in satire] tells us nothing (directly) about Roman women, but plenty about the fears and preoccupations of Roman society with regard to women, as enunciated by male satirists” (Richlin 1984: 67).

aesthetics of her body from the *Satires* and *Epodes*,⁷¹ I will show how Horace disassociates Canidia from her femininity, and ultimately her humanity. In the process of conveying his own perception of the female, Horace reasserts himself as the dominant masculine power.

Canidia as Anti-Roman Matron

The bodies of Canidia and Sagana are a paradox when it comes to their behavior. They are female, but they do not act like traditional Roman women – or like women at all. Rather, “Canidia epitomizes the perversion of traditional Roman hierarchies.”⁷² She is old and ugly (*horrendas aspectu*, *S.* 1.8.26; *obscenas anus*, *Epod.* 5.92; *anus*, 17.47), yet still insists on pursuing romantic affairs with her love spells.⁷³ She is, in fact, an inversion of the ideal Roman woman.

Canidia’s witchcraft represents a threat to normative Roman religious practices. Canidia and her coven invoke chthonic deities, like Nox and Diana (*Epod.* 5.51), Hecate and Tisiphone (*S.* 1.8.33-4), rather than the traditional gods. They transgress into sacred space (*sepulcrum*, 10); they show little regard for the dead (*iubet sepulcris caprificos erutas*, *Epod.* 5.13) and even reverse nature by raising the dead for their dark purposes (“they rouse the incinerated dead,”

⁷¹ This is not to say that the satiric Canidia is the same as the iambic Canidia; in fact, the tone of *S.* 1.8 differs significantly from the serious, more threatening tone of *Epod.* 5. I believe Horace is doing different things with Canidia as she appears in different genres. So, while the focus of my study is *S.* 1.8, I also draw upon Canidia’s appearances throughout the *Epodes* where a correlation can be identified. She is a much more nuanced character, however, and cannot necessarily be read as the same character in a single narrative across genres.

⁷² Oliensis 1998: 68.

⁷³ In this way, Canidia fits within the typology of women in satiric invective identified in Richlin 1984: 68 as “old women (repulsive).”

crematos excitare mortuos, *Epod.* 17.79; “in order to draw the souls of the dead to give responses,” *ut inde / manibus elicerent animas responsa daturas*, *S.* 1.8.29). In *Epod.* 5, the gods are described as opposed to the women murdering an innocent child: “I beg ... by Jove who would disapprove of this” (*precor, / per improbatum haec Iovis*, 7-8). Additional references to divine right and wrong are scattered throughout the poem further establishing incongruity between the coven’s illicit activities and a higher sense of justice: “whatever god rules in heaven” (*o deorum quidquid in caelo regit*, 1) and “your poisons can overturn right or wrong, but not human retribution” (*venena magnum fas nefasque, non valent / convertere humanam vicem*, 87-8). By ignoring *fas* in the name of magic, Canidia turns away from the directives of the Roman pantheon and, especially in first century BCE Rome, represents a “perversion of proper religious practice” and subversion of the natural order.⁷⁴

Canidia also represents female vice with “her loose tongue and unbridled sexuality” characteristic of the vitriolic genres in which she appears.⁷⁵ Horace plays with contrasting light and dark imagery throughout to give nuance to the witches’ immodest characters. The scene is set at nighttime, “when the Moon puts forth her beautiful face” (*Luna decorum / protulit os*, *S.* 1.8.21-2); elite Roman women were often accompanied out in public, and it would be unseemly for them to be out alone at night. The nighttime scene casts the entire garden into darkness, which is matched by the witches’ dark deeds and “**black** clothing” (*nigra ... palla*, 23). Perhaps the brightest feature of the witches is their salient, highly visible, sickly-white faces: “their **pale**ness made both women horrifying to look at” (*pallor utrasque / fecerat horrendas aspectu*, 25-6). A blanched face, especially on a woman, had negative associations for the Romans as

⁷⁴ Dickie 2001: 140-1.

⁷⁵ Oliensis 1998: 68.

possible indication of sickness or, even worse, immodesty.⁷⁶ If there should be any discernible color on a woman's face, one would expect a red blush (*rubor*), a sign of feminine modesty, made famous by Lavinia's wordless blush in the *Aeneid*.⁷⁷ In *S.* 1.8, the moon is personified to possess these outward signs of modesty: she has a *decorum* ... *os* (21-2), blushes at the unsightly acts of the witches (*Lunamque rubentem*, 35) and hides (*latere*, 36). The witches' *pallor*, on the other hand, could be "an unhealthy indication of innocence destroyed," according to Mark Bradley, whose study on color conception in antiquity argues that colors held associations outside absolute chromatic identification into the realm of symbolism and metaphor.⁷⁸ Bradley also draws a distinction between other words for white complexion, *candidus*, which has connotations of "bright" and "shining" and therefore associated with desirable beauty.⁷⁹ Clearly, Canidia's *pallor* does not make her *candida*, the absent and more positive synonym that playfully suggests her name.

And so, Canidia's immodesty is visible by the *pallor* of her face, in addition to the state of her hair and feet: the women are barefoot (*pedibus nudis*, 24) and their hair is unkempt (*passoque capillo*, 24), which is not in keeping with expectations for female comportment. In a time when upper-class women were expected to be demure and not allowed to carry on affairs

⁷⁶ Bradley 2009: 150-9, 2014: 134.

⁷⁷ Verg. *A.* 12.64-6: "Lavinia's burning cheeks were covered in tears and the **deepest blush** cast a fire over her burning face" (*lacrimis Lavinia ... / ... flagrantis perfusa genas, cui plurimus ignem / subiecit rubor et calefacta per ora cucurrit*). This outward sign of Lavinia's *pudor* has an erotic effect on Turnus and drives him to war: "passion throws him into confusion and he fixes his gaze onto the maiden" (*illum turbat amor figitque in virgine vultus*, 70).

⁷⁸ Bradley 2009: 155 and 2014; cf. Plin. *Pan.* 48.4 on *femineus pallor*.

⁷⁹ Bradley 2009: 146, citing, among others, Ov. *Am.* 3.3.5-6.

outside of marriage, the witches exhibit aggressive sexual power.⁸⁰ To this end, in *S.* 1.8 they perform spells with effigies by placing them in positions of dominance and submission with sexual undertones:

lanea et effigies erat, altera cerea: maior 30
lanea, quae poenis compesceret inferiorem;
cerea suppliciter stabat, servilibus ut quae
iam peritura modis. (Hor. S. 1.8.30-3)

There was one effigy of wool, another of wax. The dominant was wool, who was submitting the submissive to punishments. The wax was standing like a suppliant, as though it were about to die in the manner of a servant.

In a common formula found on binding curses the dolls are placed in poses that are “clearly erotic.”⁸¹ The dolls act as surrogates for humans, implying sexual submission of the wax doll (representing Canidia’s lover) to the wool doll (representing Canidia herself).⁸² The witches burn the smaller, subservient wax doll (*imagine cerea / largior arserit ignis*, 43-4) as an act symbolizing the melting of the uncooperative lover’s heart.⁸³

In *Epod.* 5 the women act in a similarly indecorous manner through the medium of magic. They prepare a love potion for the *senex* Varus, Canidia’s errant lover (55-9). An archetype of the lusty *senex* from comedy, Varus frequents the Subura at night, an area known for prostitution,⁸⁴ wearing aromatic oils (*nardo perunctum*, 59) to increase his sex appeal and being chased by barking dogs (*latrant Suburanae canes*, 58). His appearance is supposed to make the audience laugh (*quod omnes rideant*, 57), which stands out as the only reference to laughter in

⁸⁰ Pomeroy 1975: 160.

⁸¹ Faraone 1989: 298.

⁸² Theoc. *Id.* 2 and Verg. *Ecl.* 8 are Horace’s literary models for incorporating witches and wax dolls.

⁸³ Faraone 1989: 294-5.

⁸⁴ Mankin 1995: 128.

the poem. In fact, it is the only instance of laughter (*rideo, risus*) in the entirety of Horace's *Epodes*.⁸⁵ In the decidedly dark and grim genre of iambic poetry, smiling and laughter is not a frequent occurrence. The line sounds like it belongs in the *Satires* where Horace aims to elicit laughter from the audience.⁸⁶ As we will see, laughter is much better suited to the portrayal of the witches in satire when we are beckoned to laugh at them as they flee the garden, defeated by an impotent statue (*magno risuque iocoque videres, S. 1.8.50*).

In furthering her typology as the antithesis to the Roman feminine ideal, Canidia prefers pursuing amorous relationships to abiding by her duty as a Roman woman by marrying and having children. In *Epod. 17*, the Horace narrative persona accuses her of being barren and therefore faking pregnancy: "the midwife washed the birthing sheets red with your blood, and you jump up, strong, although you have supposedly just given birth" (*tuo / cruore rubros obstetrix pannos lavit, / utcumque fortis exsilis puerpera, 50-2*). And in *Epod. 5* Canidia exhibits the ultimate reversal of her biologically determined role as mother: she murders a young boy. In eschewing her natural role as a woman, Horace emphasizes the more dangerous and threatening side of women through Canidia's characterization. She is empowered sexually, she dominates men around her, whether it is Priapus in *S. 1.8*, Maecenas in *Epod. 3*, the *puer* in *Epod. 5*, and Horace in *Epod. 17*. Furthermore, she is unable or unwilling to abide by her socially acceptable

⁸⁵ Compare this with his other genres: *rideo* in any verbal form appears sixteen times in the *Satires*; eighteen times in the *Epistles*; six times in the *Ars Poetica*; and ten times in the *Odes*; and *risus* appears nine times in the *Satires*; five times in the *Epistles*; four times in the *Ars Poetica*; and three times in the *Odes*. There is one occurrence of *iocosus*, "joking," "playful," in the *Epodes* as an epithet for Maecenas (*Epod. 3.20*).

⁸⁶ Anderson 1982: 82: "Invective accomplishes less than laughter." Laughter is a prominent theme in other *Satires*, famously the similarly abrupt ending of *S. 1.5.97-8*: "Gnatia gave us both **smiles and laughs**" (*Gnatia ... / dedit risusque iocosque*).

function by pursuing amorous relationships. In essence she exerts power more in the character of a man than a woman.

Tara Welch writes that “Canidia is a textual prism that refracts Horace’s own impotence in all its domains,”⁸⁷ namely the domain of Roman masculinity and poetic dominance. Priapus is threatened because the witches are intruders into his physical space and metaphorical space of masculine aggressive sexuality. And Horace the poet is threatened by the witches as singers themselves in a forum – namely, in Maecenas’ gardens and home – where he is trying to establish himself as a poet and viable member of his literary retinue.⁸⁸ In the next section, we will see how Horace plays with the women’s dominant voices, mutating them and the witches themselves into animals and hybrid creatures to vilify them.

Canidia as Hybrid

In this section, Horace takes his invective against the witches even further. Previously he aligned the women with immoral behaviors that distance them from the Roman ideal of female *pudor*. Horace’s narrative from *S.* 1.8 focuses on the witches’ physical appearance, aligning them with animals and hybrid creatures in a further attempt to desexualize (and even dehumanize) them.⁸⁹ Association with animals and bestial qualities is not unique to Horace’s witches. Witches have long been aligned with animals, going back as far as Homer’s Circe. We

⁸⁷ Welch 2001: 185.

⁸⁸ Henderson 1989: 60-63.

⁸⁹ Richlin 1984 shows that animal invective is rare (*pace* Nisbet 1987: 195), but when it is employed it is used most commonly against women (70; also 1992: 113). E.g., in the Horatian corpus *Epod.* 8 and 12; cf. also Hes. *Th.* 592-99, Semon. fr. 7, Juv. 6.

previously saw Circe in her role as a poisoner and enchantress.⁹⁰ She also exerts her power over Odysseus' crew by turning them into animals with her poisons: "and all around were mountain wolves and lions that she had bewitched when she gave them evil drugs" (ἀμφὶ δέ μιν λύκοι ἦσαν ὀρέστεροι ἢ δὲ λέοντες / τοὺς αὐτὴ κατέθελξεν, ἐπεὶ κακὰ φάρμακ' ἔδωκεν, Hom. *Od.* 10.212-13). Odysseus is only able to reverse her magic with the help of a trick from the gods (the moly) and drawing his sword against her – perhaps a symbol for his phallus and sexual domination over her. And both the Furies and Gorgons are female figures that have snaky hair, both of which cause trouble for heroes throughout ancient literature.⁹¹ In what appears to be a literary topos, animals accompany literary witches as their symbolic connected to primitive behaviors and nature that threaten male *potentia*, compelling them to overcome it.

Horace uses a range of sensory language and descriptors to paint a grotesque image of the witches as bestial.⁹² The Priapic narrator describes the women with physical, grotesque language: they appear positively wild with their bare feet (*pedibus nudis*, 24) and hair unkempt (*passoque capillo*, 24). The women fill the garden with howling (*ululantem*, 25), which is the natural utterances of wolves and dogs. And in a further bestial typology, the women claw at the ground with their long nails (*scalpere terram / unguibus*, 26-7) and tear apart living creatures

⁹⁰ See this chapter's "Introduction" (158).

⁹¹ For the Furies' snaky hair see Verg. *A.* 6.280-1.

⁹² Bakhtin 1984b: "The grotesque character of the transformation of the human element in to an animal one; the combination of human and animal traits is, as we know, one of the most ancient grotesque forms" (316); and Richlin 1984: "The reduction of women ... to stereotypes viewed part by part enables the satirist to view women as intrinsically vile, both morally and physically" (76).

with their teeth (*mordicus*, 27).⁹³ Horace's depictions of the women align them female dogs, situating their portrayal in a longer tradition of women likened to animals in antiquity. The association between Canidia and dogs is quite fitting since Canidia's name could derive from the Latin word *canis*, "dog."⁹⁴ Canidia and Sagana sound like bitches, when they howl, and look like bitches, as they dig up the ground. In *S.* 1.8 Priapus witnesses "infernal bitches wandering around" (*infernas errare canes*, 35), and the witches invoke Hecate and Tisiphone, deities affiliated with canines.⁹⁵ Associating women with dogs is in keeping with the misogynistic depiction of "female powers and desires," such as a high sex drive.⁹⁶ By pursuing Varus in *Epod.* 5 Canidia herself becomes a bitch in heat, nagging her man to return to her. Dogs are also

⁹³ Similarly in *Epod.* 5, Canidia and her cohort are portrayed in bestial terms, shading the boundaries between human and animal: like Medusa Canidia's hair is bound with vipers (*brevibus illigata viperis*, 15); Sagana is likened to a bristly sea urchin (*horret capillis ut marinus asperis / echinus*, 27-8) and a wild boar (*aut currens aper*, 28), both described in terms that convey their tactile texture. Another witch, Veia, fervently digs in the ground like a dog (29-31), and Canidia gnaws at her fingers (*rodens pollicem*, 48).

⁹⁴ Oliensis 1998: 68. This association is strengthened by mention of the Dog Star, Canicula. Canidia's name also suggests derivation from *canere*, "to sing," or *canities*, "old age," implying she is too old to pursue amorous liaisons, which is in keeping with her depictions throughout the *Satires* and *Epodes*. Meyer 2014 treats the canine imagery in Horace's *Epodes* and, following Oliensis 1998, includes references to Canidia as canine imagery (113-18).

⁹⁵ In *Epod.* 5 Canidia snatches bones out of the mouth of starving dogs (*ossa ob ore rapta ieiunae canis*, 23), and dogs bark at Canidia's cheating lover, Varus (*adulterum / latrant Suburanae canes*, 57-8). MS variant *latrant* has been suggested by Housman; *pace* Shackleton Bailey 1982: "Canidia is stating the outrageous fact; a wish or imprecation is out of place, even if there were any obvious reason why she should want the dogs to bark" (79-80; Bain 1986; Oliensis 1998). Watson 2003: 228-9 argues for the jussive subjunctive *latrent* because it is in response to a prayer uttered in the previous lines.

⁹⁶ Oliensis 1998: 69.

common animal companions for old, undesirable women.⁹⁷ Old hags are traditionally represented in literature as female dogs, such as Hecuba, perhaps because they stereotypically abuse and nag others.⁹⁸ Canidia and Sagana are no longer human, but base, wild animals, deconstructed to mere body parts, not unlike the feral ingredients in their own concoctions: *serpentes* (*S.* 1.8.34), *lupi barbam* (42), *variae cum dente colubrae* (42).

Through their bestial portrayals, the witches are reduced to their primitive urges and behaviors that come to life through sensory language: their visible unkempt appearance (*pedibus nudis passoque capillo*, 24); the audible howling (*ululantem*, 25) which is itself onomatopoeic; the tactile digging in the ground with long fingernails (*scalpere terram / unguibus*, 26-7); and the action of rending the lamb with the mouth (*divellere mordicus agnam*, 27) followed by the outpouring of gore (*cruor in fossam confusus*, 28) leaves a figurative bad taste in the audience's mouth. The women who are the subjects of a plethora of sensory experiences in *S.* 1.8 are themselves sensual beings, driven by lust and bodily desires. The women occupy Priapus' garden and but bring within its boundaries a diversity of senses conveyed to the audience through Priapus' descriptions.⁹⁹

⁹⁷ Oliensis 1998: 73-4.

⁹⁸ There is also an association with witches, animals, and a fierce gaze. Of Hecuba: "you will become a dog with a fiery gaze" (κύων γενήσῃ πυρρὸν ἔχουσα δέργματα, Eur. *Hec.* 1265); also of Medea's gaze in this simile: "the gaze of a lioness with newborn cubs" (τοκάδος δέργμα λεαίνης, Eur. *Med.* 187, where δέργμα / δέρκομαι is etymologically related to the Greek word for serpent, δράκων, pulling together more animal imagery as it relates to witches); and *Epod.* 5.9-10: "Why do you stare at me like a stepmother or a beast hunted with a spear?" (*quid ut noverca me intueris aut uti / petita ferro belua?*). Cf. Horace's blunted vision in *S.* 1.5.30, 49.

⁹⁹ Cf. *Epod.* 12.3, where Horace's sexual experience with an old woman is also described as a threat to his senses, especially his "sensitive nose" (*naris obesae*).

These feral and sensational descriptions across the *Satires* and *Epodes* blur the identities of Horace's witches and, as I argue, divide them between the realm of animal and human. On the one hand they are women who act as a threat to males; but on the other they are wild animals driven by their passions. Both of these methods of invective deemphasize the witches' femininity by making them sexually repulsive. Additionally, I read that Horace's witches, in being likened to animals, take on the characteristics of hybrid creatures from the imagination of the ancients. Common hybrids include Centaurs, Sirens and Harpies, notorious for their unpredictability and marginalization: "their horrifying appearance ... places them on the fringe of humanity, neither wholly separated from nor wholly included in society."¹⁰⁰

Harpies, half-woman half-bird beasts, are especially appropriate hybrid association for Canidia due to their olfactory likeness. The harpies are referred to in Homer as ἄρπυιαι, personification of wind spirits: "the winds / Harpies snatched" (ἄρπυιαι ἀνείρειψαντο, *Od.* 1.241, 14.371, 20.77-8). This hints at their connection to Canidia through their control of the wind – or, rather, bad breath. Canidia figuratively releases her rank breath onto the food as an expression of the failed feast of Nasidienus in *S.* 2.8:¹⁰¹

... quem nos sic fugimus ulti
ut nihil omnino gustaremus, velut illis
Canidia afflasset peior serpentibus Afris. (*Hor. S.* 2.8.93-5)

We fled him [Nasidienus], getting revenge by tasting nothing at all as though Canidia, worse than African serpents, had breathed upon the food.

¹⁰⁰ Paule 2012: 82.

¹⁰¹ Oliensis 1998: 69; *contra* Lowe 2010: 244-6 who argues that Nasidienus' dinner guests occupy the role of harpies for their rapacious behavior by reading it together with Verg. *Aen.* 3. Gowers 1993b argues that Canidia has garlic breath as an expression of her iambic force (280-310).

Canidia's bad breath symbolizes the food's inedibility, and acts as a reminder of Canidia's omnipresent *venenum*, suggested by *serpentibus Afris*, 95. Her breath is so smelly – and the food so unappetizing – that the guests abruptly flee. Similarly, in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius, the harpies are depicted as ruining the meals of Phineus, the blind prophet. They were sent to punish Phineus for prophesying too clearly by stealing his food and leaving a stench over the rest: “additionally, they left a putrid stench upon it; no one could even tolerate to stand at a distance, let alone eat it. This is how terribly the remnants of the meal stank” (καὶ δ' ἐπὶ μυδαλέην ὀδμὴν χέον· οὐδέ τις ἔτλη / μὴ καὶ λευκανίηνδε φορεύμενος, ἀλλ' ἀποτηλοῦ / ἑστηώς· τοῖόν οἱ ἀπέπνεε λείψανα δαιτός, A.R. 2.191-3).¹⁰² Again, the harpies are associated with a foul smell, and cause the dinner guest to turn tail,¹⁰³ which reflects aspects of Canidia's hybrid characterization.

The multi-shaped bodies of hybrids seem to defy definition, and thus they are relegated to the Underworld, as in Vergil's *Aeneid*.¹⁰⁴ As guardians of the gates, hybrids are not fully in the Underworld, nor are they out of it. This conception of hybrids has solidified their traditionally marginalized status, residing on the boundaries of definition. In a similar vein, according to Lucretius hybrids exist only in the imagination:

¹⁰² Cf. Verg. *A.* 3.234: “They defile the feast with their mouth” (*polluit ore dapes*), where there is a connection with the foul smell originating from the mouth, like in the case of harpy-Canidia.

¹⁰³ Cf. the blind Phineus with Horace's “bleary-eyed” (*lippus*, *S.* 1.5.30; *lippi*, 49) persona as both objects of the wrath of harpies.

¹⁰⁴ *multaque praeterea variarum monstra ferarum,
Centauri in foribus stabulant Scyllaeque biformes
et centumgeminus Briareus ac belua Lernae,
horrendum stridens, flammisque armata Chimaera
Gorgones Hapyaque et forma tricorporis umbrae.* (Verg. *A.* 6.285-9)

Furthermore many monsters of various beasts were standing in the entryway: Centaurs, dualformed Scyllas, the hundred-handed Briareus, the Lernean hydra shrieking horribly, Chimaera fitted with flames, Gorgons, Harpies, and the shadow of a three-bodied shade [Geryon].

*ne forte ex homine et veterino semine equorum
confieri credas Centauros posse neque esse
aut rabidis canibus succinctas semimarinis
corporibus Scyllas et cetera de genere horum
inter se quorum discordia membra videmus.* (Lucr. 5.890-4)

You would not believe that Centaurs could come to be or exist, by chance comprised of a man and the seed of a horse of burden, or that a Scylla could exist as half fish with a girdle of rabid dogs, along with the other types of creatures in which we see incompatible limbs.

Hybrid creatures have no corporeal existence (*confieri, esse*, 891) owing to the impossibility of construing their incompatible body parts (*discordia membra*, 894) in ways that make sense.

Similarly, Canidia is a mixture of seemingly incompatible parts: she is a woman who exhibits licentious behavior; she shares physical and sensual characteristics of dogs and other beasts; and she is representative of features of invective speech (*venenum*) that must be expelled from Horace's garden. In this way, Canidia truly is a hybrid creature, as all of these disparate ideas have come together into one body; her hybrid features have marked her as a threat that must be expelled from Horace's garden, literally marginalizing her to live up to the reputation of hybrids as figures that reside on boundaries, not within them. Canidia becomes a blank canvas onto which Horace can impose any agenda he would like.

Modern scholarship tends to read Canidia's presence in *S.* 1.8 as an intrusion from without, in particular, from the iambic genre, where she most notably appears.¹⁰⁵ Canidia transgresses Horace's genres from the iambic to the satiric. Satire thrives on establishing boundaries (*iam satis est*), only to transgress them; it is by definition a "hodge-podge." So Canidia trespassing into satire is not extraordinary, but rather an indication that *iambos* is still a force present in Horace's oeuvre. However I argue that Canidia's presence extends beyond a suggestion of the iambic genre. Just as her body suggests a connection with unpredictable, marginal hybrid creatures, her presence embodies an indication of satire-as-hybrid. Throughout the *Satires* and

¹⁰⁵ Sharland 2003: 107.

Epodes the witches are portrayed with language and imagery from epic, tragedy, comedy, bucolics, and philosophy. Although we will see that the witches are chased from Maecenas' gardens in *S.* 1.8, they are not expelled from Horace's poetry. They reappear in *Satires* 2, in addition to the *Epodes*, at pivotal moments; Canidia's *carmina mala* compete with Horace's own *carmina* in *S.* 2.1, and her hasty presence and rank breath mark the end of Horace's *Satires* in *S.* 2.8. Their reappearance indicates that the women, symbolic of genre play and relics of the historical and literary past, have undergone integration.¹⁰⁶ Canidia is a reminder that the past cannot be entirely eradicated – Horace cannot completely leave behind the *carmina mala* / *venenum* of Lucilius, nor can he forget his role in the civil wars, which would not have been resolved by the publication of *Satires* 1 in 36-35 BCE, and Actium would have just been won by Octavian at the publication of *Satires* 2 and *Epodes* in 30 BCE.¹⁰⁷ Horace's poetry expresses this attempt to do something new with the satiric genre, and also conveys uncertainty about Rome's future.

As a final thought to this section, we return to the introduction where we saw Horace's equation for a well-ordered poem expressed in a hybrid body, the symbol appropriate for Canidia, but also for Horace's view on poetics:

*Humano capiti cervicem pictor equinam
iungere si velit et varias inducere plumas
undique collatis membris, ut turpiter atrum
desinat in piscem mulier formosa superne,
spectatum admissi risum teneatis, amici?* (Hor. *Ars* 1-5)

If a painter should choose to join a horse's neck to a human head and put multi-colored feathers on limbs that have been gathered from everywhere, so that a woman, beautiful on top, should disgracefully turn into a black fish below; admitted to this spectacle, friends, could you hold back a laugh?

¹⁰⁶ Paule 2012: 84: "The only option for dealing with invasive foreign elements in satire is integration."

¹⁰⁷ Gowers 2012: 3, who follows DuQuesnay 1984: 20-1.

Here, Horace justifies the artist's creation of seemingly incongruous body parts, joining a horse and human, or feathers to limbs, or a fish to a woman. Certainly the audience might laugh (*risum*, 5), but perhaps this is the artist's intention after all. The notion of sensible arrangement of subject matter falls within the judgment of the artist, just as the arrangement of verses or decisions about narrative, characterization, and theme rest with the poet – or, at least, the skilled poet.

Aspects of Horatian poetry may feel haphazardly composed, just as we saw in this section with Canidia's characterization that draws from many different sources of inspiration. Just like the genre of satire itself, sometimes we question the exact nature of its form. Horace, however, does not haphazardly combine a miscellany of ideas and symbols within his poetry. He composes his poetry by design, always conscious of the audience's desired reaction, which in satire is laughter. The final section of this paper follows Horace's narrative to its punch line in the form of Priapus' explosive fart as an unexpected but satiric response to Canidia's *carmina mala*.

An Explosive Ending

One of the primary senses this chapter has traced is the sound of the witches' singing *carmina mala* in *S.* 1.8: *carminibus quae versant atque venenis / humanos animos* (19-20). In fact, all varieties of speech uttered by the witches fill Priapus' and the audience's ears throughout the poem, beyond their *carmina*. Sagana is heard "howling" like an animal at the moon (*ululantem*, 25), and each of witches "call upon" (*vocat*, 33) an underworld deity, Hecate and then Tisiphone. They summon the spirits of the Underworld in a necromantic rite to receive their "**responses**" (*elicerent ... responsa daturas*, 28-9); and later the witches are heard "**chattering**" with the

shades (*alterna loquentes*, 40), their voices “**echo**, sad and shrill” (*resonarint triste et acutum*, 41). At last, Priapus asks, “How could I as a witness shudder at the **voices** and deeds of these two Furies without avenging myself?” (*ut non testis inultus / horruerim voces Furiarum et facta duarum?*, 44-5). Priapus first isolates the witches’ audible *voces* as their most terrifying feature; and, as we will see, Priapus will get his own auditory revenge against their horrible voices.

In contrast to the witches who dominate the sensory field of sound, Priapus is primarily a voyeur. All of his descriptions of the women are provided in terms of his sight. Priapus fastidiously describes the physical landscape of the garden both before and after its transformation into a pleasure garden; and his narration of the witches focuses in part on their physical, feral description. Priapus also calls attention to the visual emphasis of his narration: “**I myself saw**” (*vidi egomet*, 23), “horrible to **look at**” (*horrendas aspectu*, 26), and “**you would see**” (*videres*, 34, 50). He also refers to himself twice as a “witness” (*testis*, 36, 44), which also playful puns on “testicle,” *testis*, appropriate for the ithyphallic god. Priapus has firmly situated himself outside the sensory realm of sound by not uttering a peep – that is, until the very end of the poem:

*nam displosa sonat quantum vesica pepedi
diffissa nate ficus; at illae currere in urbem.* (Hor. S. 1.8.46-7).

For just as a burst bladder resounds I, a fig tree, farted, splitting my ass crack - and those women run into the city.

Attributed to a fear response,¹⁰⁸ the little garden statue emits an explosive fart that is so strong that it splits his wooden body. The fart also marks the first time that Priapus makes a sound in

¹⁰⁸ Henderson 1991: 195-6 shows that crepitation can designate fear, like at Ar. *Nu.* 1113: “I tremble and shiver and fart out of fear” (δέδουκα καὶ πέφρικα καὶ βδελύττομαι); Habash 1999: 288; Oliensis 1998: 73: “a terrifying fart”; Anderson 1982: 79: “his fear did wreak vengeance, for it caused the terrifying *peditum*.” Hallett 1981: 342 argues

the entire poem. The passage is packed with words related to loud sounds in quick succession, *displosa sonat ... pepedi* (46). The witches are chased out of the garden, frightened by the loud noise, and in a perverse way, Priapus is able to get his revenge (*ut non testis inultus*, 44).

Priapus triumphs in the end over the witches by chasing them away, yet any power he exhibits is undermined by the method. The fart is accompanied by other imagery (and smells!) associated with the lower body stratum: namely, the anus and excrement. The insertive sexual violence that usually defines Priapus is turned on its head: Horace's Priapus scares his foes with his *other* side. Emily Gowers notes that *pepedi* humorously plays on *pedico* (for *pedicavi*), the aggressive sexual act that the reader would expect of Priapus.¹⁰⁹ Horace manipulates imagery associated with the fart to suggest anal penetration – the ultimate reversal in Roman perceptions of masculinity. In this passage Priapus attests to the reality of what he witnessed (as a *testis*) in the gardens:

*mentior at si quid, merdis caput inquiner albis
coruorum atque in me veniat mictum atque cacatum
Iulius et fragilis Pediatia furque Voranus.* (Hor. S. 1.8.37-9).

But If I'm lying about anything, may my head be defiled with crows' white shit, and may Julius, soft Pediatia, and Voranus the thief come to piss and shit on me.

Although the act of defecation here is conditional, Priapus paints a vivid image of his own head covered in white bird poop, which was probably not an uncommon fate for a lawn ornament.

While urination is rare, defecation is an integral part of obscene humor in Old Comedy.¹¹⁰

Bodily excretion was traditionally perceived as socially inappropriate and, as such, comic poets

that Priapus farts intentionally, citing *ut non testis inultus* (S. 1.8.44). Rudd 1966: 72 believes the fart is accidental and “not due to any majestic assertion of a *numen* but simply to muscular weakness.”

¹⁰⁹ Welch 2012: 263.

¹¹⁰ Henderson 1991: 187-203.

took pleasure in publicizing something that was usually private. The publicized degradation, coupled with the smells and sounds of defecation, were intended to elicit a laugh from the audience.¹¹¹

Regarding the smell of foul body parts, as Mark Bradley notes, “the body’s odours bore witness to the irresponsible and improper control of the orifices, both what went in them and what came out of them, and the idea of the permeability of boundaries governs notions of the foul body.”¹¹² Defecation brings attention to the rear and anus, foreshadowing not only Priapus’ fart, but also hints at the additional use for the anus as the object of penetration. The men who befoul Priapus represent types of “unmanly sexuality” to the Romans: according to Emily Gowers, Pediatia’s manliness is undercut by his name’s feminine ending, its suggestion of the action *pedico*, and his epithet *fragilis*, “soft”; and Voranus’ name, derived from *voracius*, “voracious,” suggests sexual insatiability of the anus.¹¹³ The fact that unmanly stereotypes befoul Priapus makes him their subordinate and undercuts his masculinity in the eyes of the Romans.

The birds defecating on Priapus’ head and the proximity of *merdis caput* (37) emphasizes the dichotomy of the upper and lower body spheres representing the classical and the grotesque bodies. Mikhail Bakhtin’s theory of the grotesque argues that genitalia and open holes (like the anus and vagina) are integral in degrading and smelly bodily functions (copulation, defecation,

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹¹² Bradley 2015: 135-6.

¹¹³ Gowers 2012: 277.

urination) thus occupy the world of the lower stratum.¹¹⁴ The head and the face, on the other hand, are associated with the senses of sight and hearing, and above all intellectual thought; the head exhibits lofty functions, and thus occupies the sublime stratum of the classical body.¹¹⁵ The head also houses the nose, which in smelling the feces, urination, and flatulence, represents and undesirable intersection of the upper and lower body strata. These opposing body parts and functions underscore the disrupted worldview Horace proposes: the inversion of expectations for Priapus, and ultimately for satire itself.¹¹⁶

Finally, the condition of Priapus after the fart (*diffissa nate*) uses language to associate Priapus with the receptive role in anal penetration:¹¹⁷ his rear end is literally split open. The end of the poem mirrors the introduction with a reminder of his lowly origins from a fig tree (*ficus*) to imply that he is now *ficosus*. With the combined imagery of a split bottom and anal ulcers, Priapus falls short of the Roman ideal of masculinity. Priapus has become the victim of the same threats he once levied on others.

¹¹⁴ On the open body as grotesque body, Bakhtin writes: “the stress is laid on those parts of the body that are open to the outside world ... the open mouth, the genital organs, the breasts, the phallus, the potbelly, the nose ... this is an unfinished and open body without clearly defined boundaries” (1984b: 26-7).

¹¹⁵ Bakhtin 1984b: 26-7, 315-18; Farrell 2007: 177 conducts a lexical study of words used of the body in the works of Horace and concludes that “those words that are unique to the *Sermones* tend to involve organs associated with digestion, elimination of waste, copulation.” The *Odes* focuses on the “expressive parts of the body,” namely the face and head, which are “constantly being adorned with garlands, perfumes, crowns, and other badges of honor” (178). See also Farrell’s interpretation of the Bakhtinian “grotesque” and “classical” bodies (175 n. 4).

¹¹⁶ The proximity of the head and defecation could also imply scatophagy, a metaphor for anal penetration (Henderson 1991: 193-4).

¹¹⁷ Hallett 1981: 341-2. Cf. Rudd 1966: 70-2.

Although the fart is Priapus' only utterance heard by the witches in the poem, it speaks volumes as a meta-poetic expression. Priapic statues, such the one featured in *S.* 1.8, with their conspicuous multiplicity of protruding limbs, were used as boundary markers and signaled ownership of a new space. Horace's Priapus, with his hyperbolic erect *membrum*, was probably also a comic sight and an overzealous attempt by Horace to demarcate the boundaries of his patron's gardens. Similarly, the Priapus statue also signals where Horace establishes metaphorical boundaries within his poetry: boundaries of time and history; boundaries of the body as a way to restrain bodily function; boundaries established by cultural *mores*; and boundaries to define the satiric genre. Yet all of these established boundaries are in some way transgressed, blurred, or torn down throughout *S.* 1.8.

The boundaries of the Priapic body were transgressed by playing out the metaphor for the penetrative act. But his body underwent an actual physical transgression when a force from within, the fart, escaped and burst the confines of his body in the process. Just as the boundaries of the Priapic body could be crossed and even destroyed, Horace shows how his satire is subject to external influence from other genres like epic, tragedy, comedy, bucolic, and didactic poetry. For example Priapus' fart bears resemblance to a natural explanation in Lucretius, and thus we are brought back to Horace's didactic epic predecessor:

*tum perterritorepo sonitu dat scissa fragorem.
nec mirum, cum plena animae vesicula parva
saepe haud dat parvum sonitum displosa repente.* (Lucretius 6.129-31)

Then with a clanging sound [the cloud] splits and emits a crash. This is not remarkable since a small bladder, full of air, often makes a great sound when it bursts suddenly.

The word for bladder (*vesica, vesicula*) along with similar vocabulary (*displosa* and *sonitu* / *sonitum* for *sonat*) signals Horace's imitation of Lucretius. The force emitted by Priapus' fart is on par with the clash of thunder, which is arguably the most powerful and loudest natural force.

Horace aligns the power of Priapus' fart to that of Zeus, the king of the gods, whose domain included thunder and lightning. The practice of aligning bodily functions – particularly farting – with natural phenomena is also a feature of comedy, famously in Aristophanes' *Clouds*.¹¹⁸ By combining the language of lofty didactic poetry and the low-brow fart jokes from comedy within a reimagined character drawn from obscene poetry, Horace reveals the goal of his satire: to recast generic convention within the boundaries of new satire.

The dichotomy within the penetrative/insertive model that is so central to the Roman construction of masculine identity is still applicable here. Simply because other genres insert themselves into satire does not mean they are actively in charge, nor that satire is a passive recipient. Horace's Priapus is the ultimate example of this: he overcame his foes (*illae currere in urbem*, 47) by a force from *within* him. Satire accepts other genres into its boundaries, but in doing so these genres are subject to integration, deconstruction, inversion, or anything else to elicit a laugh from the audience. Ultimately Horace establishes boundaries – generic or corporeal – in order to be transgressed

Behind the Satiric Mask ...

Priapus may get the final word in the poem, but the audience gets the last laugh. After the explosive fart, the witches flee the garden (*illae currere in urbem*, 47) and their disguises fall away – teeth and hair (*Canidiae dentes, altum Saganae caliendrum / excidere*, 48-9).¹¹⁹ Before

¹¹⁸ Ar. *Nu.* 390-1: “ST: It is soft at first, *pappax, pappax*, and then urges on: *papapappax*! And when I shit, it *really* thunders: *PAPAPAPPAX!!!* Just like those clouds” (ΣΤ: ἀτρέμας πρῶτον, παπὰξ παπὰξ, κάπειτ' ἐπάγει παπαπαπὰξ· / ὅταν χέζω, κομιδῇ βροντᾷ, παπαπαπαπὰξ, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖναι).

¹¹⁹ Hahn 1938: 231 n. 3 believes these are not disguises but that the witches are so old that their bodies are falling apart; *pace* Richlin 1984: 72.

Priapus had made a big deal about the witches' horrifying appearance (*horrendas aspectu*, 26). What was once "unkempt hair" (*passoque capillo*, 24) and the teeth that viciously ripped apart the lamb (*divellere mordicus*, 23) – body parts once so frightening – are now falling off the women's faces as though they were fake all along. The women's masks are literally falling off.

Everyone wears a mask in *S.* 1.8. The traditional Priapus, a figure usually accustomed to pursue young girls and boys, now wears the mask of an impotent (*inutile*, 1) lawn ornament. A perverse sort of Priapic revenge is achieved by the end of the poem (*ut non testis inultus*, 44). The play on words between the adjective "impotent" (*inutile*) and verb "revenge" (*inultus*), along with the proximity of *testis inultus*, succinctly conveys Priapus' triumph *despite* his impotence. Canidia and Sagana don the physical masks of witches, which are merely disguises that fall away. And the satirical narrator, Horace, wears a literary mask for his audience – one that is part Priapus, but also part Canidia. The satirist plays perfectly the role of a sexually frustrated literary persona, not unlike his human counterpart in *S.* 1.5 who is jilted by the *puella mendax*. But he is also part Canidia, the *venefica* and composer of *carmina*, if only to vilify her persona and the *venenum* that she wields.

Even though *S.* 1.8 can be interpreted in various ways, there is one undeniable fact: the final image of the poem is laughter. In revealing themselves as phonies, the witches (or just women?) become figures to be mocked rather than feared: "you would see with a hearty laugh and smile" (*cum magno iocoque risuque videres*, 50). For a poem that has been shown to be a battleground of poetic utterances between Canidia and Priapus, it is very striking that the last word in the poem is a in the domain of sight: "you would see" (*videres*, 50). Although elsewhere we have seen Horace devalue his own seeing abilities through his *lippus* persona in *S.* 1.5, the message here is clear. As a second person verb, *videres* is a very pointed address to the reading audience,

the true voyeurs of this poem, that there is a direct connection between seeing with the eyes and laughing with the mouth (or belly). Horace beckons us to remain in the role of voyeurs. And if we keep our eyes open, we are bound to see something that will elicit a laugh.

CONCLUSION

SENSING THE *SATIRES*

The second floor in the Musée de Cluny in Paris contains a showroom with six large, Flemish tapestries that date to the 15th century CE. The tapestries bear the coat of arms of Jean Le Viste, President of the French Court of Assistance, and have only relatively recently been rediscovered, acquired, preserved, and put on display.¹ They are richly decorated with textured foliage, exotic animals, and flowers woven onto a bright red background. The central image on each tapestry is the same, and lends its name to the collection: *The Lady and the Unicorn* (“La Dame à la licorne”). Each tapestry depicts the lady and the unicorn acting out a different sensory experience. For example, in the tapestry called “La Vue,” the lady kneels and holds a mirror up to the unicorn whose front hooves rest on her lap as it gazes at its reflection. In “Le Goût,” the lady places her hand in a bowl of sweets, next to which sits a monkey indulging in a treat, while the unicorn is raised onto its hind legs. And in “Le Toucher,” the lady stands while delicately grasping the unicorn’s horn.²

These sensory tapestries raise an issue not unlike one that has been looming in the background of this study on the senses in Horace’s *Satires*, but hitherto has not been fully addressed: the depiction of the body’s senses in an artistic medium, no matter how vividly done, is fake. Someone viewing *The Lady and the Unicorn* tapestries does not *feel* the horn of the

¹ In 1882 (Lyll 2000: 41).

² There is also a tapestry for smell (“L’Odorat”) and hearing (“L’Ouïe”), in addition to a representation of what is perhaps “sixth sense,” titled “A Mon Seul Désir” (“To My Only Desire”). In this mysterious tapestry the lady is putting a necklace back into a jewelry box, considered a renunciation of bodily passion that has been heralded by the five sense tapestries (Lyll 2000: 45).

unicorn, or *taste* the sweet treat that the monkey bites into. In visual art, the senses need to be depicted in such a way so they can be deciphered through observational cues: the placement of a hand, a bright color, the presence or absence of an object. This poses a challenge for the artist to take a physical experience, like smell or hearing, and capture its essence on a flat viewing surface.

A similar observation can be made about Horace's treatment of the sensory landscape in his *Satires*. The current study has shown how Horatian satire features a plethora of sensory imagery, sensory body parts, and sensing bodies. We need to recognize, however, the challenge of effectively conveying the senses in the written word. The *Satires* undergo various literary manipulations in order to duplicate a sensory experience for the audience. For example, in *S.* 1.5 Horace conveys blunted vision by limiting his persona's line of sight to personal concerns (friends, food, and drink) to the exclusion of the political context. In *S.* 2.2 and 2.8, Horace vividly describes feasting scenes, paying close attention to language, style, and diction, so that the audience can indulge their eyes, noses, mouths and bellies on mere words. And by fashioning a silent and listening persona in *S.* 1.9 and 2.7, Horace engages the audience's ears to listen along with him. In sum, Horace manipulates narrative, language, and characters to convey his own satiric sensorium.

Horace's *Satires* are full of both bodily senses and sensing bodies. Horace's sensory satire, however, still does not duplicate sensation. But is the purpose of writing the senses supposed to duplicate a direct sensory experience? Likely not. An experience of direct sensation from written text is as illusory as Canidia's teeth and Sagana's wig that fall off at the end of *S.* 1.8, or as Horace's aspirations for sex on the road to Brundisium. The usual satiric response to such illusion is laughter: "we laughed at fabricated things" (*ridetur fictis rerum*, *S.* 2.8.83).

The purpose of writing the senses, therefore, is to engage the audience's literary aesthetics through our intellectual understanding of sensory aesthetics. Horace fashions vivid and nuanced satire that is imbued with sensory imagery to impact our minds, not our bodies. Through this sort of sensual-mental seduction, we become an audience that cannot passively read (or see, taste, listen, smell, or feel) his poems. We become actively engaged – entangled, even – in Horace's satiric world and complicit in his poetic agenda.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, J. N. 1990. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Baltimore, MD.
- Anderson, W. S. 1982. *Essays on Roman Satire*. Princeton, NJ.
- Armstrong, D. 1982. "Horatius Eques et Scriba: Satires 1.6 and 2.7." *TAPhA* 116: 255-88.
- Auerbach, E. 1953. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (trans. W. R. Trask). Princeton, NJ.
- Bain, D. 1986. "Waiting for Varus? Horace, Epodes, 5, 49-72." *Latomus* 45.1: 125-31.
- Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin, TX.
- . 1984a. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Minneapolis, MN.
- . 1984b. *Rabelais and His World* (trans. H. Iswolsky). Bloomington, IN.
- Barchiesi, A. and Cucchiarelli, A. 2005. "Satire and the Poet: The Body as Self-referential Symbol." In Freudenburg 2005: 207-23.
- Barton, C. A. 1993. *Sorrows of the Ancient Romans: The Gladiator and the Monster*. Princeton, NJ.
- . 2002. "Being in the Eyes: Shame and Sight in Ancient Rome." In Fredrick 2002: 216-35.
- Bartsch, S. 2006. *The Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-Knowledge, and the Gaze in the Early Roman Empire*. Chicago.
- . 2015. *Persius: A Study in Food, Philosophy, and the Figural*. Chicago.
- Behr, F. D. 2009. "Open Bodies and Closed Minds? Persius' *Saturae* in Light of Bakhtin and Voloshinov." In Plaza 2009: 222-54.
- Berg, D. 1996. "The Mystery Gourmet of Horace's *Satires* 2." *CJ* 91: 141-51.
- Bodel, J. 1986. *Graveyards and Groves: A Study of the Lex Lucerina*. Cambridge, MA.

- . 2000. “Dealing with the dead: undertakers, executioners and potters’ fields in ancient Rome.” In Hope and Marshall 2000: 128-151.
- Bradley, M. 2009. *Colour and Meaning in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge, MA.
- . ed. 2015. *Smell and the Ancient Senses*. New York.
- Bramble, J. C. 1974. *Persius and the Programmatic Satire: A Study in Form and Imagery*. Cambridge, MA.
- Branham, R. B., ed. 2002. *Bakhtin and the Classics*. Evanston, IL.
- . ed. 2005. *The Bakhtin Circle and Ancient Narrative*. Groningen, Netherlands.
- Braudy, L. and Cohen, M., eds. 1999. *Film Theory and Criticism*. New York.
- Braund, S. M., ed. 1989. *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*. Exeter.
- . 1996. *The Roman Satirists and Their Masks*. London.
- Braund, S. M. and Gold, B. K., eds. 1998. “Vile Bodies: Roman Satire and Corporeal Discourse.” *Arethusa* 31.3: 247-386.
- Braund, S. M. and Osgood, J., eds. 2012. *A Companion to Persius and Juvenal*. Malden, MA.
- Brink, C. O. 1971. *Horace on Poetry, Vol. II: The Ars Poetica*. Cambridge, MA.
- Brown, P. M., ed. 1993. *Horace: Satires I*. Warminster, England.
- Butler, S. and Purves, A. C., eds. 2014. *Synaesthesia and the Ancient Senses*. London and New York.
- Callebat, L. and Soubiran, J., eds. 2012. *Priapées*. Paris.
- Castle, G. 2007. *Blackwell Guide to Literary Theory*. Malden, MA.
- Charpin, F., ed. 1978. *Lucilius: Satires*. 3 vols. Paris.
- Clay, D. 2003. “Lucretius’ Honeyed Muse: History and Meaning of a Simile.” In Monet 2003: 183-96.

- Classen, Carl J. 1996. "Grundlagen und Absicht der Kritik des Lucilius." In Klodt and Krenkel 1996: 11-28.
- Classen, Constance. 1993. *Worlds of Sense: Exploring the Senses in History Across Cultures*. London.
- . 2012. *The Deepest Sense: A Cultural History on Touch*. Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield, IL.
- Classen, C., Howes, D. and Synott, A. 1994. *Aroma: The Cultural History of Smell*. London.
- Classen, C. and Howes, D. 2013. *Ways of Sensing: Understanding the Senses in Society*. New York.
- Cody, J. V. 1976. *Horace and Callimachean Aesthetics*. Brussels.
- Connors, C. 2005. "Epic Allusion in Roman Satire." In Freudenburg 2005: 123-45.
- Corbeill, A. 1996. *Controlling Laughter: Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic*. Princeton, NJ.
- . 2004. *Nature Embodied: Gesture in Ancient Rome*. Princeton, NJ.
- Courtney, E., ed. 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford.
- Cucchiarelli, A. 2001. *Satira e il Poeta: Orazio tra Epodi e Sermones*. Pisa.
- . 2002. "'Iter satiricum': Le voyage à Brindes et la satire d'Horace." *Latomus* 61: 842-51.
- Dalby, A. 2000. *Empire of Pleasures: Luxury and Indulgence in the Roman World*. London.
- D'Arms, J. 1990. "The Roman *Convivium* and the Idea of Equality." In Murray 1999: 308-20.
- Davie, J., trans. 2011. *Horace: Satires and Epistles*. Oxford.
- Davis, G., ed. 2010. *A Companion to Horace*. Malden, MA.
- Dickie, M. W. 2001. *Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World*. London.

- duBois, P. 2003. *Slaves and Other Objects*. Chicago and London.
- Dufallo, B. 2000. "Satis/satura: Reconsidering the 'programmatic intent' of Horace's *Satires* 1.1." *CW* 93: 579-90.
- DuQuesnay, I. M. LeM. 1984. "Horace and Maecenas: The Propaganda Value of *Sermones* I." In Woodman and West 1984: 19-58.
- Edie, J. M., ed. 1964. *The Primacy of Perception*. Evanston, IL.
- Ernout, A. and Meillet, A. 1959. *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Latine*. Paris.
- Evans, H. B. 1978. "Horace, *Satires* 2.7: Saturnalia and Satire." *CJ* 73: 307-12.
- Fairclough, H. R., trans. 1969-74. *Virgil*. Cambridge, MA.
- Faraone, C. A. 1989. "Clay Hardens and Wax Melts: Magical Role-Reversal in Vergil's Eighth *Eclogue*." *CPh* 84.1: 294-300.
- Farrell, J. 2007. "Horace's Body, Horace's Books." In Heyworth, Fowler, and Harrison 2007: 174-93.
- Fiske, G. C. 1920. *Lucilius and Horace*. Madison, WI.
- Fortson, B. W. 2008. "Bleary Eyes and Ladles of Clay: Two Liquid Sabellicisms in Latin." *Glotta* 84: 52-71.
- Fredrick, D., ed. 2002. *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*. Baltimore, MD.
- Freudenburg, K. 1993. *The Walking Muse. Horace on the Theory of Satire*. Princeton, NJ.
- . 1995. "Canidia at the Feast of Nasidienus (Hor. S. 2.8.95)." *TAPhA* 125: 207-19.
- . 2001. *Satires of Rome. Threatening poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge, MA.
- . ed. 2005. *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*. Cambridge, MA.
- . ed. 2009. *Oxford Readings in Horace: Satires and Epistles*. Oxford.
- Galinsky, K. 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton, NJ.

- Giesecke, A. L. 2000. *Atoms, Ataraxy and Allusion: Cross-generic Imitation of the De Rerum Natura in Early Augustan Poetry*. Hildesheim, Germany.
- Goh, I. 2015. "The Campanian Case of Gaius Lucilius: Downtrodden Satire from Suessa Aurunca." *Illinois Classical Studies* 40.1: 91-120.
- Golden, M. and Toohey, P., eds. 1997. *Inventing Ancient Culture: Historicism, Periodization, and the Ancient World*. London and New York.
- Gordon, P. 2002. "Some Unseen Monster: Reading Lucretius on Sex." In Fredrick 2002: 86-109.
- Gowers, E. 1993a. "Horace, *Satire* I.5: An Inconsequential Journey." *PCPhS* 39: 48-66.
- . 1993b. *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*. Oxford.
- . 2002. "Blind Eyes and Cut Throats: Amnesia and Silence in Horace, *Satires* I.7." *CPh* 97.2: 145-61.
- . 2003. "Fragments of Autobiography in Horace, *Satires* 1." *CLAnt* 22: 55-92.
- . 2005. "The Restless Companion: Horace, *Satires* 1 and 2." In Freudenburg 2005: 48-61.
- . 2009. "The Ends of the Beginning: Horace, *Satires* I." In Houghton and Wyck 2009: 39-60.
- . ed. 2012. *Horace: Satires Book I*. Cambridge, MA.
- Gummere, R. M., trans. 1970. *Seneca: Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales II*. Cambridge, MA.
- Gunther, H. C., ed. 2013. *Brill's Companion to Horace*. Leiden and Boston.
- Habash, M. 1999. "Priapus: Horace in Disguise?" *CJ* 94.3: 285-97.
- Habinek, T. 2005. *The World of Roman Song: From Ritualized Speech to Social Order*. Baltimore, MD.
- Hahn, E. A. 1939. "*Epodes* 5 and 17, *Carmina* 1.16 and 1.17." *TAPhA* 70: 213-30.

- Hallett, J. P. 1981. "Pepedi / diffissa nate ficus: Priapic Revenge in Horace's *Satires* 1.8." *RhM* 124: 341-47.
- Hallett, J. P. and Skinner, M. B., eds. 1997. *Roman Sexualities*. Princeton, NJ.
- Harrison, S. J., ed. 1995. *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*. Oxford.
- . ed. 2007a. *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*. Cambridge.
- . 2007b. *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. Oxford.
- Henderson, Jeffrey. 1975. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*. New York.
- . trans. 2007. *Aristophanes: Fragments*. Cambridge, MA.
- Henderson, John. 1989. "Satire Writes 'Woman': Gendersong." *PCPS* 35: 50-80 = Henderson 1999: 173-201.
- . 1993. "Be Alert Your Country Needs Lerts: Horace, *Satires* 1.9." *PCPhS* 39: 67-93 = Henderson 1999: 202-27.
- . 1994. "On Getting Rid of Kings: Horace, *Satires* I.7." *CQ* 44.1: 146-70.
- . 1999. *Writing Down Rome: Satire, Comedy and Other Offences in Latin Poetry*. Oxford.
- Heyworth, S. J., Fowler, P. G., and Harrison, S. J., eds. 2007. *Classical Constructions: Papers in Memory of Dan Fowler, Classicist and Epicurean*. Oxford.
- Holder, A., ed. 1979. *Pomponi Porfyronis Commentum In Horatium Flaccum*. New York.
- Hope, V. M. and Marshall, E., eds. 2000. *Death and Disease in the Ancient City*. London and New York.
- Houghton, L. B. T. and Wycke, M., eds. 2009. *Perceptions of Horace: A Roman Poet and his Readers*. Cambridge, MA.
- Hudson, N. A. 1989. "Food in Roman Satire." In Braund 1989: 69-87.

- Jackson, R. 1988. *Doctors And Diseases in The Roman Empire*. Norman, OK.
- . 1996. “Eye Medicine in the Roman Empire.” *ANRW* 2.37.3: 2228-51.
- Jay, M. 1993. *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth Century French Thought*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Katz, J. T. and Volk, K. 2000. ““Mere Bellies”?: A New Look at Theogony 26-8.” *JHS* 120: 122-31.
- Keane, C. 2006. *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire*. New York.
- . 2012. “A Life in the Text: The Corpus of Persius’ *Saturae*.” In Braund and Osgood 2012: 79-96.
- Kent, R. G., trans. 1951. *Varro: On the Latin Language*. Cambridge, MA and London.
- Klodt, C. and Krenkel, W. A., eds. 1996. *Satura Lanx. Festschrift für W. A. Krenkel zum 70. Geburtstag*. New York.
- Lateiner, D. 1995. *Sardonic Smile: Nonverbal Behavior in Homeric Epic*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- LiDonnici, L. R. 1995. *The Epidaurian Miracle Inscriptions*. Atlanta, GA.
- Lilja, S. 1972. “The Treatment of Odours in the Poetry of Antiquity.” *Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 49: 1-275.
- Llewellyn-Jones, L. 2003. *Aphrodite’s Tortoise: The Veiled Woman of Ancient Greece*. Swansea.
- Lloyd, G. E. R. 2003. *In the Grip of Disease: Studies in the Greek Imagination*. Oxford.
- Lovatt, H. 2013. *The Epic Gaze: Vision, Gender, and Narrative in Ancient Epic*. Cambridge, MA.
- Lowe, D. M. 2010. “Burt offerings and harpies at Nasidienus’ dinner-party (Horace, *Satires*, 2.8).” *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 15: 240-57.
- Lowrie, M., ed. 2009. *Horace: Odes and Epodes*. Oxford and New York.

- Lyall, S. 2000. *The Lady and the Unicorn*. London.
- Mankin, D. 1995. *Horace: Epodes*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge, MA.
- Marx, F., ed. 1904-5. *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae*. Leipzig.
- McNeill, R. L. B. 2001. *Horace: Image, Identity, and Audience*. Baltimore, MD.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. 1964. "Eye and Mind." In Edie 1964: 159-90.
- . 1968. *The Visible and the Invisible* (trans. A. Lingis). Evanston, IL.
- Mette, J. 1961. "Genus tenue und mensa tenuis bei Horaz." *MH* 18: 136-9.
- Meyer, J. C. 2014. "The Canines of Horace's *Epodes*." *Akroterion* 59: 105-22.
- Miéville, C. 2010. *The City & The City*. New York.
- Miller, P. A. 1998. "The Bodily Grotesque in Roman Satire: Images of Sterility." *Arethusa* 31.3: 257-83 = Plaza 2009: 327-48.
- Morales, H. 2004. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*. Cambridge, MA.
- Morley, N. 2015. "Urban Smells and Roman Noses." In Bradley 2015: 110-19.
- Most, G. 1992. "Disiecti Membra Poetae: The Rhetoric of Dismemberment in Neronian Poetry." In Selden and Hexter 1992: 391-419.
- Muecke, F. 1993. *Horace: Satires II*. Warminster.
- Mulvey, L. 1999. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." In Braudy and Cohen 1999: 833-44.
- Murray, O., ed. 1990. *Symptotica: A Symposium on the Symposium*. Oxford.
- Musurillo, H. A. 1954. "Horace's Journey to Brundisium – Fact or Fiction?" *CW* 48: 159-62.
- Nabokov, V. 1966. *Speak, Memory: An Autobiography Revisited*. New York.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. 1984. "Horace's *Epodes* and History." In Woodman and West 1984: 1-18.
- . ed. 1987. *Cicero: In L. Calpurnium Pisonem oratio*. Oxford.

- O'Connor, J. F. 1990. "Horace's '*Cena Nasidieni*' and Poetry's Feast." *CJ* 86.1: 23-43.
- Oliensis, E. 1998. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge, MA.
- . 2009. "Canidia, Canicula, and the Decorum of Horace's *Epodes*." In Lowrie 2009: 160-87.
- Pagan, V. E. 2006. *Rome and the Literature of Gardens*. London.
- Parker, H. N. 2000. "Flaccus." *CQ* 50.2: 455-62.
- Parker, W. H. ed. 1988. *Priapea: Poems for a Phallic God*. London.
- Paule, M. T. 2012. *Canidia: A Literary Analysis of Horace's Witch*. Ph.D. Dissertation: The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Perry, B. E., ed. 2007. *Aesopica: A Series of Texts Relating to Aesop or Ascribed to Him*. 2nd edn. Urbana, IL.
- Plaza, M. 2006. *The Function of Humour in Roman Verse Satire: Laughing and Lying*. Oxford.
- . ed. 2009. *Persius and Juvenal*. Oxford.
- Pomeroy, S. B. 1975. *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*. New York.
- Porter, J. I., ed. 1999. *Constructions of the Classical Body*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Potter, D. 1999. "Odor and Power in the Roman Empire." In Porter 1999: 169-89.
- . 2014. "The Social Life of the Senses: Feasts and Funerals." In Toner 2014: 23-44.
- . 2015. "The Scent of Roman Dining." In Bradley 2015: 120-32.
- Reckford, K. J. 1999. "Only A Wet Dream? Hope and Skepticism in Horace, *Satire* 1.5." *AJPh* 120: 525-54.
- Rich, A. N. and Mattingley. 2002. "Anomalous Perception in Synaesthesia: A Cognitive Neuroscience perspective." *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 3: 43-52.

- Richlin, A., ed. 1992a. *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. New York.
- . 1992b. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. Rev. edn. Oxford.
- . 1997. "Toward a History of Body History." In Golden and Toohey 1997: 16-35.
- . 2009. "Juvenal and Priapus." In Plaza 2009: 305-26.
- Rostagni, A., ed. 1979. *Suetonio: De Poetis e Biografi Minori*. New York.
- Rudd, N. 1966. *The Satires of Horace*. Cambridge, MA.
- Salzman-Mitchell, P. B. 2005. *A Web of Fantasies: Gaze, Image, and Gender in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Columbus, OH.
- Schlegel, C. 2005. *Satire and the Threat of Speech: Horace's Satires Book I*. Madison, WI.
- . 2010. "Horace and the Satirist's Mask: Shadowboxing with Lucilius." In Davis 2010: 253-70.
- Schmitz, T. A. 2007. *Modern Literary Theory and Ancient Texts: An Introduction*. Malden, MA.
- Selden, R. and Hexter, D., eds. 1992. *Innovations in Antiquity*. New York.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. 1982. *Profile of Horace*. Cambridge, MA.
- . ed. 2008. *Horatius: Opera*. 4th edn. Berlin.
- Sharland, S. 2003. "Priapus' Magic Marker: Literary Aspects of Horace, *Satire* I.8." *AClass* 46: 97-109.
- . 2009. *Horace in Dialogue: Bakhtinian Readings in the Satires*. Oxford.
- . 2011. "Ghostly Guests and Venomous Snakes: Traces of Civil War in Horace, *Satires* 2.8." *AClass* 54: 79-100.
- Skutsch, O., ed. 1985. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*. Oxford.
- Smith, R. A. 2005. *The Primacy of Vision in Virgil's Aeneid*. Austin, TX.

- Sommerstein, A. 2011. “*Hinc Omnis Pendet?* Old Comedy and Roman Satire.” *CW* 105.1: 25-38.
- Spencer, W. G., trans. 1935-38. *Celsus: De Medicina*. Cambridge, MA.
- Standford, W. B. 1936. *Greek Metaphor*. Oxford.
- Stevens, B. E. 2008. “The Scent of Language and Social Synaesthesia at Rome.” *CW* 101.2: 159-71.
- . 2013. *Silence in Catullus*. Madison, WI.
- Stratton, K. B. 2007. *Naming the Witch: Magic, Ideology, and Stereotype in the Ancient World*. 2007.
- Stratton, K. B. and Kalleres, D. S., eds. 2014. *Daughters of Hecate: Women and Magic in the Ancient World*. Oxford.
- Tammet, D. 2011. “Different Ways of Knowing.” *TED Talk Live*.
http://www.ted.com/talks/daniel_tammet_different_ways_of_knowing/transcript?language=en#t-305000 (accessed June 15, 2015).
- Toner, J. P. 2014., ed. *A Cultural History of the Ancient Senses*. London and New York.
- van Campen, C. 2008. *The Hidden Sense: Synesthesia in Art and Science*. Cambridge, MA and London.
- Warmington, E. H., trans. 1938. *Remains of Old Latin. Vol. III: Lucilius, Twelve Tables*. Cambridge, MA.
- Watson, L. 2003. *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*. Oxford.
- Watson, P. A. 1982. “Martial’s Fascination with ‘Lusci.’” *G&R* 29.1: 71-6.
- Welch, T. S. 2001. “*Est Locus Uni Cuique Suus*: City and Status in Horace’s *Satires* I.8 and I.9.” *ClAnt* 20.1: 165-92.

- West, D. 1974. "Of Mice and Men: Horace, *Satires* 2.6.77-117." In Woodman and West 1974: 67-80.
- White, P. 1993. *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge, MA.
- Williams, C. A. 2010. *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*. 2nd edn. Oxford.
- Woodman, T. and West, D., eds. 1974. *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*. Cambridge, MA.
- . 1984. *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge, MA.
- Zanker, P. 1990. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (tr. A. Shapiro). Ann Arbor, MI.
- Zetzel, J. E. G. 1980. "Horace's *liber sermonum*: The Structure of Ambiguity." *Arethusa* 13: 59-77.