

Leendert Weeda

Horace's *Sermones* Book 1

Credentials For Maecenas

Leendert Weeda

HORACE's *SERMONES* **BOOK 1**



CREDENTIALS FOR MAECENAS

Managing Editor: Izabella Penier

Associate Editor: Pablo Markin

Language Editor: Adam Leverton

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-064262-9
e-ISBN 978-3-11-064263-6



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 License.
For details go to <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>.

© 2019 Leendert Weeda

Published by De Gruyter Poland Ltd, Warsaw/Berlin

Part of Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

The book is published with open access at www.degruyter.com.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

www.degruyter.com

Cover illustration: gettyimages

Contents

Preface and Acknowledgements — VII

1 Horace, his Poetry, Maecenas — 1

- 1.1 General Introduction — 1
- 1.2 References — 8
 - 1.2.1 The Literary Frame — 10
 - 1.2.2 The Functional Frame — 11
- 1.3 Horace's Life — 14
 - 1.3.1 Autobiography in Horace's Poetry — 14
 - 1.3.2 Horace's "Biography" — 17
- 1.4 Horace and Maecenas: Patronage or *Amicitia*? — 23

2 The *Sermones* (Satires): Preparing for the Future as a Political Commentator — 32

- 2.1 Introduction to the Chapter — 32
- 2.2 *Sermones*, Book 1: Conversation Pieces — 46
 - 2.2.1 *Sermones* 1.1 and 1.2: The Cynical Ways of the Aristocracy and the Nouveau Riche — 47
 - 2.2.2 *Sermones* 1.3 and 1.4: From Censuring the Elite and the Nouveau Riche to a Serious Conversation with Friends — 73
 - 2.2.3 *Sermones* 1.5 and 1.6: Horace's Credentials for Maecenas Continued: A Journey to Brundisium; Youth and Education in Venusia and Rome — 126
 - 2.2.4 *Sermones* 1.7 and 1.8: Threats from the East: Parthia and Egypt — 166
 - 2.2.5 *Sermones* 1.9 and 1.10: Maecenas' Circle: No Place for Nouveau Riche. Horace's Literary Programme for Several Genres; the Literary Schools Revisited — 190

3 Summary of *Sermones* Book 1: Horace's Credentials Containing Political Commentary; Virgil's *Eclogae* and Horace's *Sermones* Book 1 Compared — 231

- 3.1 Introduction to the Chapter — 231
- 3.2 Summary of *Sermones* Book 1 — 231
- 3.3 The First Book of *Sermones*: Horace's Credentials and His Political Commentary — 254
- 3.4 Virgil's *Eclogae* and Horace's *Sermones* Book 1 Compared — 263

Appendix — 269

Bibliography — 271

Index — 286

Preface and Acknowledgements

In this book I present my interpretation of the first book of *Sermones* as a collection of Horace's credentials for Maecenas and I will trace his efforts in getting accepted as an associate of the latter after his miscalculation joining Brutus. Although *Sermones*.1 contains quite a few of Horace's reflections on his poetic orientation and of his views on the standards of good poetry, I do not regard those as his primary objective in writing the book. I will consider those within the context of his self-presentation. I will also examine his commentary on the main contemporary political themes which he presents in the book, which I see as part of his efforts to prove him to be a trustworthy member of Maecenas' circle and which I also see as his first preparations for his future as a political commentator.

I am grateful to the Department of Classical Languages and Cultures of the Faculty of Arts of Radboud University Nijmegen for their support and in particular to Marc van der Poel, professor of Latin Language and Literature and Mrs. Bé Breij, professor of Latin and ancient rhetoric for their continued interest and encouragement. I also acknowledge my thanks to the management and staff of the Radboud University Library for their help in making the digital library facilities available to me. This enabled me to write the book in my own study at home.

I record with gratitude the professional support of De Gruyter which was very efficient and excelled in the quality of communicating. I am especially indebted to Dr. Izabella Penier, the managing editor for culture, for her attention and commitment and to Dr. Pablo Markin who managed the review process with great care. Further, I am very grateful to my daughter Dr. Claire Weeda for her help with a digital problem.

My very special thanks go to my dear wife Marja who during the research for and writing of the book stimulated me by her thoughtful reactions when I discussed again a new idea. She has the wonderful capacity to keep me on the right track and to show the other side of the picture.

1 Horace, his Poetry, Maecenas

1.1 General Introduction

The focus of this book is on Horace's *Sermones* book 1 (S.1), which he wrote between 38 – 35 B.C., when, after the death of Julius Caesar, the Republic came to an end and the transition to the Principate commenced.¹ S.1 is part of Horace's early work that he started at the age between twenty-two and twenty-seven.² Some three to four years later in 39 or 38 B.C. he joined the circle of Maecenas, and from that time Horace lived and worked in the highly political ambience of the Roman social elite, near the centre of power. It is likely that in those early years of his association with Maecenas Horace was not close to, for example, Octavian, but members of the circle of Maecenas may have stimulated his interest in socio-political matters as a number of the first book's *sermones* testify. Both the discussion about his views on socio-political issues and his self-presentation are not public ones, as he regularly asserts, but take place with his associates of the circle of Maecenas, which also explains his choice of the name *Sermones* (conversations or discussions). For example, when he mentions in S.1.3.52-53 some of the characteristics of friendship he phrases those in words that can be seen as relating to discussions: outspoken (*liber*), frank and courageous (*simplex fortisque*), sharp (*acer*). He also affirms particularly in S.1.3.139-140 (*dulces amici*) his gratitude for being accepted in Maecenas' circle, and in S.1.5.39-44 his appreciation of being with his friends in an intellectual milieu in which he feels comfortable, members of Philodemus' Epicurean group.³ He speaks highly of Maecenas and his circle in S.1.9.48-53, and of course in S.1.10.81-90. We will see in the course of this study that Horace reveals his adhesion to Philodemus' tenets at several places. He follows for example closely Philodemus' writings in his handbook *Περὶ παρρησίας* (On Frank Criticism) in S.1.4.132-133 (*liber amicus*), when he mentions criticism among friends.

My working assumption is that at the time Horace's intention was to become an observer of and commentator on contemporary political issues, in addition to the writing of poetry differing in content and in genre. I postulate that Horace prepares himself in S.1 for his future role as political commentator. The efforts of the political

1 I use the word *Sermones* because this title is an appropriate representation of Horace's intentions, more so than the title of *Satires*. The use of the title of *Sermones* conforms to Horsfall (1981, 108): "none is therefore adequate evidence for the independent titlature of Horace's *Sermones* as 'Satires'." See also section 2.1, where I discuss more fully my arguments for using the title of *Sermones*. For reasons of consistency, I will also use the Latin titles for all works quoted. In the case of Horace the books of *Carmina*, *Epodi*, *Epistulae*, *Ars Poetica* and *Carmen Saeculare*.

2 Although the events described in S.1.7 probably refer to 43 or 42 B.C., it is unlikely that the poem was written at that time. I will argue in my discussion of the poem that it was likely fictitious and written after Horace joined the circle of Maecenas.

3 Conform Gowers (2012, 130): "*simplex* responds to *liber* (both refer to verbal candour)."

commentator *in statu nascendi* in S.1 are primarily on the personal issue of his trustworthiness with Maecenas after his miscalculation joining Brutus. After all, he could just as well have been a Pompeian, as many survivors of Philippi joined Sextus Pompey. S.1 is, as it were, a collection of his credentials for Maecenas. Self-presentation being an element of S.1 is not unique to this author. For example, Gowers (2012, 1) states on the opening page of the introduction to her commentary on S.1, that

it is also a unique cultural document, a blueprint for how to survive in uncertain times and an individual view of one man's formation and emergence on the cusp between republic and empire. [...] Horace's unassuming manner and easy self-presentation are harder these days to take at face value. The casual indirection and changing cast of characters are interpreted as tools for a sophisticated process of generic positioning [by Horace].

Gowers' reference to S.1 as "a blueprint for how to survive in uncertain times" and her (2012, 2) observation that "it can still be fruitful to treat the account [S.1] as oblique 'autobiography', contrived and partial, like so many autobiographies: the self-presentation of a man from nowhere" prompted me to explore in detail whether the focus of S.1 could be self-presentation within the context of Horace's efforts to find a safe environment at this crucial stage of his life. Thus, the seeds of my understanding were already present in the scholarly literature, but I did not find any study that reads, as I do, S.1 consistently as a work in which Horace explains his past and gives a self-presentation for the benefit of his future. He also explores the characteristics of writing commentary poetry, which is not limited only to the genre of satire, and addresses in detail the issue as to how to deliver his future critical messages to different audiences.

In the case of S.1, I will be looking for political content differing from the usual form. In addition to Horace's relatively few obvious political pronouncements in the book – such as his opinions on contemporary issues, political statements, or references to political actors – I search in particular for a more concealed political content, that is the result of his efforts to find his place within his new milieu of the associates of Maecenas. Much of the scholarly literature is a good starting point for the purpose of uncovering the concealed content, but it is often not sufficient. Research of classical texts is often carried out from the perspective of a literary frame, where the scholar investigates the literary objectives of ancient authors: the latter are supposed to create a literary continuity with their paragon by referring to predecessors. But, ancient authors may also have been inspired by objectives other than purely literary ones, namely by functional objectives. I take full account of the results of the many studies within the literary frame, but I deliberately examine the poems within the historical socio-political context for themes that illustrate the poem's political scope and thus add new facets to the debate of the poems' meaning. Therefore, I analysed S.1 within, what I call, a functional frame. This starts from the notion that a poet may have two objectives, and therefore works within two frames of mind, at the same time creating both a literary and a functional poetic output, the latter being more latent

than the first. In the functional frame, which I believe is Horace's primary orientation, his main purpose is to deliver a specific political objective, namely his credentials. He achieves this by raising socio-political issues or describing contemporary events with a political relevance that are recognized by Maecenas, enabling the latter to judge the worth of Horace. In my study of Virgil's political commentary (Weeda, 2015), I introduced the notion of a functional model that opens many new perspectives of the poet's intentions and runs next to the literary model. I will explain the idea of the two models further in section 1.2.

One scholar pointed out to me that applying to Horace's earliest work the same formula as I used in my book on Virgil's political commentary may be "tricky." He argues that the *Aeneis* glorifying the *gens Iulia* and celebrating Roman greatness is manifestly political, and that "the same cannot be said of Horatian satire, which in many ways adheres to the Epicurean maxim 'live unknown'," and that Horatian satire is less political than the *Aeneis*. Some scholars advanced a similar argument comparing Virgil's *Eclogae* and the *Aeneis*: the former was seen to be less political than the latter. At most five of the ten *eclogae* were considered having political content. Yet, I analyzed the *Eclogae* from a functional perspective, which yielded some interesting new insights. Contrary to the above view, I (2015, 83-84) concluded that Virgil gives commentary on contemporary political and social matters in each and every *ecloga*.⁴ For example, I suggest that Mopsus in *Ecl.*8.26, who is generally seen as a shepherd and to whom the girl Nysa was given (*Mopso Nysa datur*), symbolizes a newcomer in the countryside, most likely a veteran soldier to whom a piece of land was given after Philippi, bringing *Ecl.*8 within the category of political poems about the destruction of rural communities.⁵ *Ecl.*10 also contains an important functional reference. By

⁴ For the political themes in Virgil's *Eclogae*, see Weeda (2015, 54-84); Weeda & van der Poel (2016). Seven *Eclogae* concern directly the expropriations: 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10. Virgil refers especially to the expropriations and the expulsions in the Mantua region in *Eclogae* 1, 6, 9 and 10. Four contain a description of the indifference of and the exploitation by the new owners (in 5, 7, 8 and 9). In addition, the threat to the pastoral life (in 2, 3 and 9) and the destruction of rural communities (in 6, 8 and 9) are also described. He introduces in *Ecl.*4 his view of the preferred constitutional arrangements when the war is over, that is a hereditary form of non-elected political authority and one-man rule. For Virgil writing on politics, see Dominik (2009). For references to the scholarly literature on the political content of the *Eclogae*, see Weeda (2015, 55 note 68).

⁵ This interpretation is presented in more detail in Weeda (2015, 63-64; 70-71). Virgil's inspiration by Theocritus can be seen in his choice of the shepherds' names in the *Eclogae*. Many of these (12 of 19) come from Theocritus' *Idylls*, such as Amyntas, Corydon, Daphnis, Menalcas, Tityrus, and others. But not Mopsus. Mopsus was a mythological hunter and warrior mentioned by Apollonius Rhodius. He was a member of the crew of the *Argo* and also a seer who counselled Iason. Ovid (*Met.*8.350) mentions Mopsus who joined Meleager as a hunter. See also: Perutelli (1995, 42-44); Clausen (2003,155). It is of course possible that Theocritus used the name of Mopsus in work that has been lost to us, but was still extant in Virgil's time and not part of Artemidorus' anthology. However, when Mopsus features in other work than Virgil's he is not a shepherd but a fighter or at least a member of a group of fighters.

referring to the river Reno (*Rhenus* in Northern Italy) and Gallus, Virgil locates the narrative in his native area, and thus evokes the social and economic destruction in his own home territory. The *Aeneis* is indeed a “political” poem besides celebrating Roman greatness, but, when I studied the poem in a functional frame, more insights emerged with respect to Virgil’s commentary on contemporary political issues than were identified before. For example, examining whether Virgil had a model for Dido in mind, for which many women were suggested in the scholarly literature, I (2015, 133-137) suggest that Cleopatra was his “functional model for Dido for the purpose of giving his views on major contemporary political issues. The functional model implies that many passages in which the poet writes about the person of Dido can be seen as references to Cleopatra.”⁶

Returning to Horace, when I started the study of S.1, I expected that the book could yield more political content than is often recognized, just like Virgil’s *Eclogae*. I find that this is indeed the case with respect to S.1. But, although there is in general no opposition between satire and political content – and between on the one hand the literary and on the other the moral or political values – the political content of S.1 and Horace’s condemnation of political or social evil do not make S.1 into a book of satire. I do not read Horace in S.1 as being a satirist. We will see in section 2.1 that in S.1.4, S.1.6, and S.1.10 Horace himself says that he does not intend to be a writer of satire. Further, although he censures wrong-doers often in S.1, he never addresses them directly. However, if one reads the book as the budding poet’s preparation for his future as a political commentator by making himself acceptable to the leading political milieu in Rome, S.1 is a book that shows already much of his views on contemporary political and social issues. I also note that at that stage Horace was not committed to writing exclusively satiric poetry. He wrote the *Epodi* simultaneously and after 30 B.C. he changed to writing the *Carmina* and both contain a great deal of political commentary.

Studying Horace’s texts from a literary point of view one risks missing essential clues to political points. However, studying his texts primarily from a functional point of view one may run the opposite risk, that is that issues arising from the poet’s philosophical or poetic orientation are neglected, such as for example the Epicurean basis of his ethical views or his relationship to Lucilius’ poetry. Notwithstanding all that, I decided that it is right to focus in this book on the functional aspects of S.1, as long as I carefully consider other scholars’ studies of the significance of Horace’s philosophical perceptions for his socio-political views and his poetic posture. One must understand the poetic level fully before one can discover the functional position. I will give some examples from Horace’s S.1 below. My method of reading

⁶ For the reference to the river Reno in *Ecl.*10, see Weeda & van der Poel (2016). For the choice of models for Dido, see Weeda (2015, 120-137). For the scholarly literature on models for Dido, see Weeda (2015, 121 note 141).

S.1 is similar to what Freudenburg (2001,1-6) recommends, who moved from a literary reading of Horace's *Sermones* in his earlier (1993) book toward a functional reading in his later (2001) book searching after the interrelations of the poet's poetic choices and his implicit political motivations. Although the topical contemporary political issues pointed out by Horace in S.1 have recently attracted more attention than in the past, I intend to demonstrate that Horace's concern is not primarily with individual political issues, but that he wrote S.1 with a view to convincing Maecenas that he would be a trustworthy member of his group. The title of my book – Horace's *Sermones* book 1: Credentials for Maecenas – reflects this overarching theme of S.1. The themes of individual poems, although each differs from the other, are consistent with this main objective for the whole of S.1. Yet, Horace deals with many contemporary political issues. These are in brief the following. Besides considering the poetic form of presenting his message, Horace shows in S.1.1-1.4 his concern about the growth of, among other reprehensible actions, unlimited ambition and pursuit of extravagance of several groups in Roman society. The last lines of S.1.3 are essential because he expresses in those lines that he feels accepted by Maecenas and his associates, but that he also understands that he has much to explain about his past with Brutus. Horace broadens this course in the first sixty-two lines of S.1.4, that is often seen as a programmatic poem in which he gives his views on the nature of true poetry. His poetic analysis shows indeed not only his grasp of the Epicurean views on true poetry, but also his ability to apply those in the poem. But there is also a clear political aspect in S.1.4.1-62, namely that he pits these views on poetry against those of the Stoics, followers of Sextus Pompey and anti-Caesarians. Further, I hope to demonstrate in this book that he gives his views on many other contemporary political issues in most poems of S.1. For example, he makes a stand against the Republicans and Pompeians (S.1.1, S.1.3, S.1.6) and he takes the side of Octavian in the conflicts against Sextus Pompey and Marc Antony (S.1.2, S.1.7, S.1.8). He shows his concern about the activities of Marc Antony and Cleopatra, and he denounces the penetrating Greek and Eastern cultural customs and practices (S.1.8, S.1.10) which spread over many layers of Roman society, and which he sees as a danger for the continuance of the Roman values. We will also see that he gives in the first book his critical commentary on some moral socio-political issues, such as the unashamed self-interest, avarice, vulgar conduct and materialistic attitude of the nouveau riche, either the wealthy free-born upstarts or the new rich freedmen (*libertini*) and their sons, and the threat of the lack of restraint of the ambitions for high political office by new men. He criticizes the never-ending civil war leading to fragile arrangements with respect to the administration of the state. In this way, he substantiates firstly that he shares the concern of Octavian and Maecenas, thus acquainting the latter that their political views concur and that therefore those cannot be an impediment for being a member of his circle. Secondly, that he shows to his colleague poets that he is a competent poet. Further, in the last third of S.1.4 he demonstrates that he is of good political

stock upholding the traditional Roman values and that he shook off the last traces of Republican sympathies. One also finds this theme in S.1.5 and S.1.6, when Horace informs Maecenas that he grew up in the right milieu, and that he is no longer a provincial and received a good education. As far as I can ascertain, this coherence between the individual poems and the consistency with which those are part of the overall theme have not been described before.

Discussing the individual poems in chapter 2, I take full account of the important philosophical and intertextual issues that are raised in earlier studies, such as those by DuQuesnay (1984), Freudenburg (1993), and Oliensis (1998). That is not to say that I reach the same conclusions as they do. For example, Freudenburg (2001, 21) suggests that “the act of naming Maecenas [in the first half-line of S.1.1] lets us see the social climber in Horace himself.” He refers to Oliensis (1998, 17-18) who in my view leaves the question whether Horace was a social climber open. I do not think that he was a social climber and that he presented himself as such; I will examine this in more detail in section 2.1 (Introduction to the chapter entitled: The *Sermones* (Satires): Preparing for the future as a political commentator). I also consider more passages as fiction than for example Gowers (2003; 2012). I interpret the journey to Brundisium (S.1.5) not as autobiography, and the role of Horace’s “father” only in part as autobiography. Further, I differ from Freudenburg’s (2010, 281-282) interpretation of the words *libertino patre natum* (a freedman’s son) which Horace uses three times, in S.1.6.6, S.1.6.45, and S.1.6.46. Freudenburg argues that the poet offers himself to Maecenas as a “truth telling philosopher” like Bion of Borysthenes (see also the discussion of *libertino patre natum* in S.1.6 and note 219). I will argue that Horace offered himself as a potential political commentator; thus, I interpret the words as part of his endeavours to be acceptable to Maecenas within the context of the contemporary opinion concerning social mobility. Horace was not a philosopher as such, but his occasional references to philosophical dogmas were generally ancillary to his ethical socio-political views.

Yet, although Horace’s prime objective writing S.1 was presenting his credentials to Maecenas and was not writing political commentary in itself, we will see when I discuss the individual poems in detail that he gives in the first book his critical commentary on several socio-political issues. I mentioned those briefly above. One also finds Horace’s commentary on significant political issues of a different nature in many poems of *Sermones.2* (S.2), written between 35 and 30 B.C., and of the book of *Epodi* (*Epod*), which was written simultaneously with S.1 and S.2 between approximately 38 and 30 B.C. Five out of eight poems of S.2, and eleven out of seventeen *Epodi* have a political content, ranging in subjects from freedom of speech, the civil war, Actium and Octavian as a military leader, the threat of sorcery, the social consequences of the land confiscations, denouncing avarice and self enrichment, to

the baseness of parvenus.⁷ Some of these subjects are the content of Virgil's *Eclogae*, written between 42 and 35 B.C. The latter are all somehow concerned with the civil war and the land expropriations and were written in the same period as a number of Horace's *Sermones* and *Epodi*.⁸ I will compare in the final pages of this book (section 3.4) the political views expressed in Virgil's *Eclogae* and Horace's S.1. In my book (Weeda, 2015), entitled *Virgil's Political Commentary*, I examine the political issues on which Virgil presented his own independent commentary. For long periods he was consistent in his opinions about several political themes. Virgil wrote poetry which was supportive of Augustus, but at the same time he dared to be critical of him or of his policies. Virgil was a commentator with an independent mind and not a member of Augustus' putative propaganda machine: he was perhaps a model for Horace.

I will refer regularly to my book on Virgil's political commentary (Weeda, 2015). In chapter 1 of this earlier book I deal with the method of study of the political content of Virgil's poems. I present an explanation of the notion of literary and functional references. At the end of chapter 1, I give a short exposition of some general aspects of propaganda and of propaganda in antiquity. In the second chapter of my previous book, I present the context within which the poets wrote. I discuss briefly some aspects of Augustan poetry, and of the visual media, such as statues, reliefs, portraits and paintings in Rome and Italy in the Late Republic and Early Empire. I also examine in this chapter the levels of literacy, the process of distribution and multiplication of poems, the likely audiences in the public and private sphere, and the position of poets in general and their dependency on patronage.

In this book I will use the general frame as set out in the first two chapters of my preceding book on Virgil. For the sake of good order, I will briefly summarize the concepts of literary and functional references presented in Weeda (2015) in the next section (1.2) because these notions will be applied regularly in the analysis of Horace's poems. In the third section of this chapter, I deal with the phenomenon of autobiography in Horace's poetry (section 1.3.1), and the meaning of his use of the first-person *persona*. In addition, I present a brief summary of Horace's life (section 1.3.2). In section 1.4, I discuss Horace's relationship to Maecenas, and in particular whether this was one of patronage or of *amicitia*. I will present the discussion of the individual poems of S.1 in chapter 2. In the last chapter 3, I intend to evaluate the nature of his self-presentation and his poetic choice, and also to determine the main issues of his political commentary that he intertwines through his representation. At first, as the

⁷ For the dates of writing of S.1, S.2 and *Epod*, see also Watson (2003, 9): "roughly 42-31 BC." For a more detailed overview of Horace's socio-political views, see section 3.3. For the discussion of the political content of *Sermones*.2, see Weeda (2010, 139-150); for that of the individual *Epodi*, see Watson (2003); Weeda (2010, 150-171); see also note 174.

⁸ For a discussion of Virgil's political commentary in the *Eclogae*, see Weeda (2015, 54-84). For the dates of writing the *Eclogae*, see Weeda (2015, 60; 70).

book has presumably also readers who are only interested in the overall picture I will present in section 3.2 a summary of the results of my analyses of the individual *sermones*. Subsequently, I will consider in section 3.3 my interpretation of the first book of *Sermones* as a collection of his credentials for Maecenas. S.1 contains quite a few of Horace's reflections on his poetic orientation. I will consider those within the context of his self-presentation. Next, I will examine in section 3.3 the main political themes which he presents in S.1. Further in this section, I will give a broad outline of his political commentaries in his other work of the same period of 38 – 30 B.C., and I will compare those with that in S.1. Thus, I will consider the commentary he presents in *Sermones* book 2, the *Epodi* and some of the *Carmina* of the same period. I will make use of some of the results of my thesis (Weeda, 2010), in which I analysed the complete oeuvre of Virgil, Horace and Propertius. Finally in section 3.4, I will compare Virgil's *Eclogae* and Horace's *Sermones* book 1 with respect to the nature of political commentary in either book. The outline of Horace's political commentary of the 30s B.C. and the comparison with the *Eclogae* will be brief. Although I recognize the point made by a colleague that "this could be fuller and contain more references to other accounts such as Griffin (1993)," I nevertheless decided to abandon a full discussion for two reasons. First, it would lead the research away from the subject of this book, that is Horace's objective in writing S.1, and second it would more than double the size of the present book. In the meantime, I started a book on the political content with the working title Horace's political commentary in the thirties B.C.: *Sermones* book 2 and *Epodi*.

I give at the end of the book an extensive bibliography and an index.

1.2 References

This section is an abbreviated version of Weeda (2015, 8-13). My starting point is the work of Thomas (1986), who presents a very valuable model of classification of references.⁹ After discussing Thomas' model I will extend this by differentiating between on the one hand the literary (section 1.2.1) and on the other the functional frame (section 1.2.2).

In Latin literature imitation is a frequently occurring feature. However, *imitatio* is not copying. The frequent occurrence and importance of ancient authors' references to their literary predecessors has led presumably in the recent past to an over-emphasis on the intertextuality of references, which has resulted in an abundance of secondary

⁹ I will not enter into a discussion about the merits of using the word "allusion" or "reference." Hinds (1998, 17-25) has many interesting things to say about the subject. I will use the word "reference" for two specific reasons. First, it is the term used by Thomas. Second, the word "reference" is more appropriate for my argument, when I develop my model of the functional frame.

literature searching for possible literary sources of references. Conte (1986, 23) coined the term “comparisonitis.” That is not to say that comparison is not a very worthwhile tool in literary research, such as in Harrison’s (2007b) admirable study of “generic enrichment” in Virgil’s and Horace’s poetry. For instance, his (2007b, 48-59) analysis of the match of, on the one hand, the different parts of Silenus’ song in Virgil’s *Ecl.*6 and, on the other, the *Metamorphoses* of Parthenius in particular, but also of Ovid and the works of Hellenistic poets, illustrates the contrast between a study in the literary frame and the functional frame. Harrison’s interpretation of Silenus in the poem is wholly within the literary frame, when he (2007b, 48) states: “The character of Silenus, I would argue, could be presented in this poem as performing Parthenius’ actual role in literary history, forming a crucial conduit between the Roman poets of the mid-first century BC and the great Hellenistic poetry of Alexandria.” Needless to say those different perspectives will often lead to different interpretations, which are supplementary and not contradictory. In my earlier study of the political content of Virgil’s poetry, I worked chiefly within the functional frame, and I will do the same in the present study of Horace’s poetry. Consequently, I interpreted Silenus’ song very differently from Harrison.¹⁰ Hinds (1998, 18-19) concurs with Thomas’ view (1986, 173) “deploring the promiscuous citing of literary ‘parallels’ in old-fashioned commentaries, ‘whose importance goes uninterpreted and whose provenance seems to matter little’.” Paraphrasing Thomas’ (1982, 163) summary Hinds (1998, 18) states: “in his [Catullus’] self-presentation the alluding author was seen (variously) to reject, correct, or pay homage to his antecedents [Euripides, Apollonius, Callimachus, Ennius and Accius], acknowledging their importance but ultimately claiming his own version as superior.” The dynamics of appropriating appear in the variety of referring actions (rejection, correction, paying homage) and the variety of intertextuality, from Euripides to Accius.¹¹

Thomas’ model of “the art of reference,” which he expounds in his 1986 paper, is particularly useful for this study. In his exposé, Thomas (1986, 173) says: “What I propose to do is to take Virgil, specifically the *Georgics*, and to use the poem as a basis for establishing a typology of reference.” He (1986, 175) suggests:

a typology with several categories, and although certain of these overlap and others have their own subcategories, the issue is most conveniently approached with recourse to the following types: **casual reference**, **single reference**, **self-reference**, **correction**, **apparent reference**, and **multiple reference** or **conflation** (this last being the most sophisticated form of the art and often including within it a number of other categories).

¹⁰ See Weeda (2015, 66-67).

¹¹ Hinds (1998, 17-34). See also Conte (1986) and Thomas (1982; 1986). The term “dynamics of appropriating” is used by Hinds. Martindale (2000b, 2), when discussing literary canon making through the ages, suggests that “authors elect their own precursors, by allusion, quotation, imitation, translation, homage, at once creating a canon and making a claim for their own inclusion in it.”

Except for the single reference (and to some extent the casual reference and the self-reference), Thomas allocates literary qualities to the remainder of the categories, such as enriching the narrative, instilling veracity, or making the story more lively, thus assigning these references to what I call the literary frame. For reasons of economy the remainder of Thomas' categories are mentioned only briefly in the footnote.¹² Here, I intend to discuss only his notion of the single reference (Thomas, 1986, 177-182) in some detail in the section about the functional frame (1.2.2), as his conception of single reference fits well into my notion of appropriations within the functional frame; however, my contribution has some important extensions to Thomas' concept.

1.2.1 The Literary Frame

In these cases the author, inspired by a literary objective, wants to create a literary continuity with his paragon by referring to a predecessor or an admired fellow-author. The referring author's aim can be to establish his literary credibility, demonstrate his erudition, or achieve his inclusion in the literary canon. Conte (1986, 27), discussing the "decidedly unfruitful" predominance of the position of the author over the text, remarks that "if one concentrates on the text rather than on the author, on the relation between texts (intertextuality) rather than on imitation, then one will be less likely to fall into the common philological trap of seeing all textual resemblances as produced by the intentionality of a literary subject whose only desire is to emulate." The referring author engages into conversation with the system of his literary colleague(s) or predecessor(s). In the words of Conte (1986, 28): "One text may resemble another not because it derives directly from it nor because the poet deliberately seeks to emulate but because both poets [the original and the 'referring' author] have recourse to a common literary codification." In the next section (1.2.2), I will argue that an author can also step outside the literary frame by referring to models which are taken from real life people or events, or from expressions of the visual arts.

In general, the literary objective is achieved in practice by referring to texts from the literary tradition, and, as stated in the previous section, Thomas' typologies are a valuable instrument studying the characteristics of the literary frame. The appropriating author describing for instance a person or event has a person or situation in mind whose "parallel" from previous texts he uses and, in many cases,

¹² The casual reference (Thomas, 1986, 175) "recalls a specific antecedent, but only in a general sense," with minimal importance to the new context and is often meant to "instill generic veracity." For self-reference see note 16. Correction (Thomas, 1986, 185) is a form of reference when "the poet provides unmistakable indications of his source, then proceeds to offer detail which contradicts or alters that source." The term apparent reference (Thomas, 1986, 190) is used by Thomas "of a context which seems clearly to recall a specific model but which on closer investigation frustrates that expectation."

adapts. From the abundance of studies, I refer to the work of Nelis (2001), who in his search for a model for Dido in the *Aeneis* demonstrated that there is much literary continuity between Virgil and Apollonius, and argues that Medea as portrayed by Apollonius in the *Argonautica* was the (literary) model for Dido.¹³

References can also be discriminated on the basis of how transparent and recognisable they are. I will use “refer to” or “reference to” when a word or words apply directly to a person or a thing. There is no doubt in the reader’s mind who or what is meant. An “indirect reference” means that the word or words apply obliquely or covertly, i.e. by suggestion or by a hidden or obscure meaning. A third type is an allusive reference, which “is a covert, implied or indirect reference” and is often symbolical or is achieved by using a metaphor, parable or allegory. The main difference between an indirect and an allusive reference lies in the use of symbols or myths by the latter. An allusive reference requires a greater power of association by the reader than a (indirect) reference.¹⁴ Allusive references were quite common in Augustan Rome and were used in all kinds of visual media, particularly in sculpture, architecture and painting. These were understood by the Romans and were seen as a form of commentary on the events of the day. “Augustan culture, and especially the arts, architecture and poetry, were a sophisticated and cosmopolitan blend of many traditions.” (Galinsky, 1996, 148; Lowrie, 2009a, 21-22; Zanker, 2010, 3). This is very visible for example in the *Ara Pacis Augustae*, in Augustus’ *Prima Porta* statue, in wall paintings and in the Forum of Augustus. Similarly, allusive references were very common in Latin poetry and a reading of these poems with alertness for these references can reveal hidden themes.

1.2.2 The Functional Frame

The references within the literary frame discussed above are appropriations of a written text: poetry, historiography, rhetoric, or any other literary text. Appropriating authors can refer for several reasons, ranging from the wish of exhibiting their work to the wish of making a statement. However, in Latin literature – as in any literature – references to individuals, pictures, events or places that are not written down are also much in evidence.

Above, I indicated that Thomas’ conception of the single reference should be considered in some detail as it may have a bearing on my notion of the functional

¹³ Nelis (2001, 184): “The sheer weight of the evidence set out in the two preceding chapters suggests that the Medea of Apollonius is the central model for the creation of Virgil’s Dido.” For Medea as a model for Dido, see also Weeda (2015, 123; 133-135).

¹⁴ Contrary to Claes (1988, 103-112) I see the significance of allusion as a mental stimulus of associative interpretation and less as a rendering of intertextuality.

reference. But first, what is a single reference?¹⁵ In Thomas' words (1986, 177): "Virgil's chief purpose in referring to a single *locus* is simply stated: he intends that the reader recall the context of the model and apply that context to the new situation; *such reference thereby becomes a means of imparting great significance, of making connections or conveying ideas on a level of intense subtlety.*"¹⁶ And as Thomas (1986, 178) further remarks "reference to a single author or passage is often such that the full force of the reference and significance for the new setting can only be recovered through consultation of a larger context of the model than has in fact been recalled." Thomas presents his notion of single reference only within the context of referring to fellow authors (see note 15). Whereas his concept is very close to my notion of a functional reference, there is however one crucial difference. A functional reference is not restricted to only referring to a written text by another author, but can also refer to stories about or pictures of mythical or contemporary individuals, places or events that have not been recorded in a written form.

In my notion of a functional reference the appropriating author does not primarily have a literary objective, but a functional one. The author works within a different frame of mind than the literary one. His main purpose is to deliver a *specific statement* creating a functional description of individuals or events. The appropriating author intends to portray with a functional description the characteristics of a person, such as the political motivation or views of a person. In addition, the author may search for the nature of a (political) issue, or the manner in which his *persona* acts. In this study I am looking for political statements in the narrative, references to political actors and events. In the case of both individuals and events the author may select a model generally renowned for the characteristics he wants to illustrate. I call such a model a functional model. The choice of model for individuals is often either a contemporary (often not recorded in a written form) or a well-known historical or mythical person who generates associations in the readers' minds. As a consequence, when the model in the author's mind is an illustrious contemporary individual, the author by implication refers to this contemporary person. It is likely that in such a

15 Thomas (1986, 177-182) considers 12 instances of single references. Without wishing to discuss the merits of these references I only note these: G.1.50-53 re. to CATUL.64.12; G.1.32 re. to CATUL.66.64 and to Callim.*Aet.*4, fr. 110 Pf; G.104-110 re. to Hom.*Il.*21.257-262; G.3.485 re. to LUCR.6.1191; G.3.556 re. to LUCR.6.1144; G.3.480-481 re. to LUCR.6.1140; G.1.247-248 re. to ENN.*Ann.*33, 160 Skutsch; G.4.447 re to Hom.*Od.*4.463; Euphrates in G.1.509, in G.4.561, and in A.8.726 re. to Callim.*Ap.*108; G.1.252-256 re. to ENN.*Ann.*384-385, to Eur.*Med.*1-5, and to ENN.*scen.*246-251 V².

16 *My emphasis.* Acc. to Thomas (1986, 176) some casual references can have similar characteristics as single references. He gives an example of G.3.453-454 which "in reality [...] belongs in the paragraph to follow [about single references], and is anything but 'casual'." Self-reference (Thomas, 1986, 182-183) "belongs to the same realm as single reference, but the fact that the recalled *locus* is the poet's own work creates the potential for highly allusive statement." See also Conte (1986, 25-26), and Campbell (1970, 56-81), writing in 1924 about Horace's view on poetry's function in the community.

case a reader will associate the narrative with contemporary events and individuals. Similarly, the referring author's choice of model for describing an event may be a contemporary event. The dynamics of appropriation in using a functional model is similar to my interpretation of Thomas' (1986, 177) idea of the single reference: "recall the context of the model and apply that context to the new situation," and "making connections or conveying ideas on a level of intense subtlety." The key words are "context," "making connections," and "conveying ideas," meaning that a single reference invites the reader to contemplate a wider vista, that of the conceptual and ideational themes which motivate the author.

Conte (1986, 38), discussing allusion within the conception of the "poetic langue," states:

When a past text is summoned up allusively [by a referring poet] and its latent vitality spreads through a new poem, allusion works as an extension of the other weapons in the poet's armory. Allusion, in fact, exploits a device well known to classical rhetoric, 'figurae elocutionis' (tropes). If a poem uses 'golden scythe' to denote 'moon', rhetoric teaches me that this is a figure – more precisely, a metaphor. The verbum proprium 'moon' and the figurative expression 'golden scythe' denote exactly the same object, but the difference in function is crucial.

Conte (1986, 38) argues that the "poet sets up a tension. A gap is created between the letter (the literal meaning of the sign) and the sense (the meaning)." I argue that in the case of Conte's example the different frames (the literary or the functional) are crucial for the "sense" that the author wants to convey. The use of "golden scythe" as described by Conte can be seen as an instance of both the referring and original poet "having recourse to a common literary codification" (Conte, 1986, 28) and belongs – according to my definition – to the literary frame. The poet may want to describe the beauty of the bright moon on the increase. However, if the referring poet were in a functional frame of mind he would refer to the real celestial body on the increase and not to a past text, thus suggesting a very different "sense." For instance, the new context would show that the poet wishes to refer to the promise of the future greatness of a bright young man.

In addition to the above case of a functional model of the "scythe," a further example may illustrate my point, when the appropriating author (Horace) refers to a text by a preceding author (Pindar). Horace quotes in his panegyric *Carm.*1.12, almost to the letter the opening lines of Pindar's second *Olympian Ode* using the second *Olympian* not as a literary model but as a functional one. He lauds Augustus by referring to Theron of Acragas and thus implying that the former is of the same stature as the Sicilian king.

1.3 Horace's Life

It would seem that relatively much of Horace's life is known as he regularly gives autobiographical references in his work. However, before it is taken for granted that these references serve as reliable sources of information about the course of Horace's life, I will briefly discuss recent scholarly opinions on the credibility of the poet's "autobiographical" information.

1.3.1 Autobiography in Horace's Poetry

The question whether his poetry gives us real autobiographical information is much discussed. Already some forty years ago, Zetzel (1980, 62) argues "that we should also look skeptically at what Horace says about his own background and about his reasons for writing satire." Zetzel substantiated his view with examples of the inconsistencies regarding the representation of Horace or his opinions in the first book of *Sermones*. More recently Bond (2009, 140) discusses the "problem of the veridical value of Horace's 'autobiographical' comment in the *Satires* and, in the light of recent scholarship, the status of the first-person satiric *persona* as a representative of the 'real' Horace." He holds the view that a "middle course" needs to be steered between on the one hand the autobiographical approach and on the other the demolition of the latter by the excessive emphasis on the satiric *persona*.¹⁷ Freudenburg (1993, 1-16; 2010) discusses Horace speaking through the first-person *persona*, and makes the point (1993, 4) that "neither Catullus nor Horace can be credited with inventing the practice of speaking through a mask, for as the term *persona* (the actor's 'mask') suggests, the practice was well known to them from drama. Even more influential was the use of the first-person mask in rhetoric." Freudenburg argues that Horace does not primarily use the first-person *persona* to give us details of real events in his life, but to symbolize poetic fiction and convey (satiric) irony. The poet uses the *persona* (mask) as an artifice. Although I agree with Freudenburg that Horace does not primarily use his first-person *persona* to present real events, I differ from him that he applies the form in S.1 to convey irony. In my opinion, he presents in the book a *persona* of himself to transmit to Maecenas the most positive picture possible of his own personality and background in order to convince Maecenas that he will be a worthwhile addition to his circle of associates. For example, Horace describes in several passages of S.1.4, S.1.5, and S.1.6 his youth and his education to show that he has the right background for the group, that he adheres to Epicureanism, and

¹⁷ For the reliability of *Sermones* as autobiography, see note 21. For a discussion of Horace's *persona*, see also Anderson (1982, 5-6); Davis (1991, 1-10); Freudenburg (2005b, 27-30); Oliensis (1998, 1-16); Schlegel (2005, 11-16).

that he adheres to the right political camp. I will return to those examples when I discuss the *sermones* that are concerned with this particular topic. One can find many more examples of his use of the first-person *persona* as a functional reference in his later work, such as the *Carmina*. In my opinion, the famous falling tree in *Carm.*2.13 and *Carm.*3.8 is particularly illustrative.¹⁸ In the first twelve lines of *Carm.*2.13, he describes his narrow escape from death when a falling tree at his estate just misses him. Next, we hear about the dangers of life. In lines 17-20 he refers to the Parthian war, and in line 28 he resumes the theme of the hardship of war: *dura fugae mala, dura belli* (the hard evils of exile, the evils of war).¹⁹ The *carmen* ends peacefully in lines 36-40. According to Nisbet and Hubbard (2004, 205) “it does not seem mere romantic subjectivism to sense an unspoken thought (cf. Heinze): if he escapes the meaningless accidents of fortune (cf. Milton, *Lycidas* 73ff.), perhaps he himself may have the same capacity to enthral, to console, and to survive.” In *Carm.*3.8, Horace returns to the crashing tree. Celebrating his lucky escape, he encourages Maecenas to relax and enjoy a good meal with fine wine, and to forget for a moment his worries about the affairs of state (line 17: *mitte civilis super urbe curas*), again a reference to a political issue. Paraphrasing Freudenburg’s (2010, 283-284) interpretation of Horace’s story of the falling tree, the image can indeed be understood to symbolize that the tree under which a lyric poet usually writes his *Carmina* comes crashing down and that the poet is prevented from writing lyric verse. But, extending the allusion, I suggest that Horace may also indicate with the image of the crashing tree that some of his *Carmina* will differ considerably from the usual lyric songs. The functional reference of the falling tree may symbolize that the idyll and myth of a *carmen* is destroyed and that the poem conveys a very different story. For example, contrary to Nisbet and Hubbard (2004, 205), I interpret the finale of *Carm.*2.13 as follows: if Horace “escapes the meaningless accidents of fortune, perhaps he himself may have the same capacity to” continue writing *carmina* with a critical contemporary political content. Other examples can be found in the *Epodi*, particularly the poems about the witch Canidia. I will discuss in section 2.2.4 (S.1.8) the first-person *persona* in *Epod.*17 by which Horace does not relate real-life experiences with the evil witch, but uses the form of the first-person *persona* as a functional reference to the generally known activities of witches and the destructive consequences of their art to Roman society.

Although I present section 1.3.2 as Horace’s “biography,” I share the doubts about the historicity of much “autobiographical” information in his work. For example, as I

¹⁸ For *Carm.*2.13, see Nisbet & Hubbard (2004, 201-222). For *Carm.*3.8, see Nisbet & Rudd (2007, 122-132).

¹⁹ The passages of Latin or Greek texts in this book are taken from the Oxford Classical Text (OCT) editions, where available. If the OCT text is very old or not available, the Teubner or another standard edition has been used. The renderings into English are mine. All deviations from this general rule will be clearly indicated.

will argue below, his journey to Brundisium (S.1.5) is most likely fictitious.²⁰ Further, Williams' (1995, 302) observations that the location of "his father's property was in a part of the territory of Venusia that originally have belonged either to the Apuli or to the Lucani," and that (1995, 303) "the poet regards himself as belonging to one of the pre-Roman Sabellian tribes," can imply that Horace was not born in Venusia itself, but somewhere in the region. I will discuss in more detail Williams' (1995, 301-304) proposition about Horace's origins in section 2.2.5, when I analyse S.1.9.29-34. And it is doubtful whether this Sabellian boy was bullied by the sons of the Venusian veterans. I suggest that these "autobiographical" references are either not historical at all, or, if these have some real historical grounds, have been adapted in order to meet the qualities required for a functional reference. But, I also suggest that when Horace through a poetic *persona* repeatedly presents a description of a certain event or a presentation of a certain opinion over a period, it is likely that these events took place and these views were genuinely held by him. Assertions by the poet such as that he went to Athens, fought at Philippi at the side of Brutus, and later belonged to the circle of Maecenas, are most likely real autobiographical facts.

Gowers (2003) offers a broad interpretation of Horatian "autobiography," that is very helpful to understand the tension between autobiography and fiction. She does this within the context of Horace as a satirical poet, which is a different scope than mine. Yet, I consider her approach also to be very useful for my focus on Horace, the man who wants to close for Maecenas the gap between his present and his past. Gowers (2003, 58) argues that Horace's personality is artistically constructed "taking a more flexible view of what counts as autobiography, and suggest[s] that there is more of it in the book [of S.1] than at first meets the eye." Her (2003, 57-58) statement is very relevant when she writes that

when I [Gowers] use the word "autobiography" here, then, it is really shorthand for "partial, generically, ideologically, and rhetorically determined justification of one's life," but I will persist in using it for two reasons. First, while it is impossible to return to the age of innocent faith in the details of Horace's life-story, and while the current emphasis on "persona" is a very necessary corrective to more literal interpretations, there is some danger in all this of losing sight of the historical figure Horace and his connections with a particular period, the uncertain time of the second Triumvirate. In other words, there was a life-story to be told, an image to be fashioned, a position to be defended, even if these were tailored to generic and rhetorical demands. Secondly, words like "persona" and "self-representation," with their emphasis on the immediate performance, do not do enough to convey the element of reminiscence in the *Satires*, the gap Horace makes between his present and his past, which is largely what will concern me here.

I differ from Gowers that "words like 'persona' and 'self-representation,' [...], do not do enough to convey the element of reminiscence." In my view, S.1 is primarily about

²⁰ Conform Musurillo (1955, 162).

self-representation, as the focus is on the personal issue of Horace's trustworthiness with Maecenas. The poems of S.1 were not written for public readings, as he regularly asserts, but for discussion with Maecenas and his associates, which also explains his choice of the name *Sermones* (conversations or discussions). I see many reminiscences in the book through which Horace closes the gap of his past and gives his views which are relevant for his present and future. He often does this by using the form of the first-person *persona* presenting himself as engaged in fictitious events. This enables him to give his commentary, while Maecenas can recognize this as fiction but can still consider the factual points that Horace makes. This way Horace can arrange an informal setting for the interchange of views. I will still continue the use of both the concepts of poetic fiction and autobiography, but I do this knowing that those two are interwoven and serve to depict Horace's life-story. I will return to Gowers' views when I discuss S.1.5.

I concur with Gowers (2003, 58) who also argues that

if all the jumbled fragments are put together, a life-story for Horace can be extracted which presents a coherent sequence of facts: his upbringing in Southern Italy, followed by an education in Rome; a disastrous experience as military tribune under Brutus, proscription, and defeat at Philippi; miraculous rebirth under Octavian; the crucial introduction to the mogul Maecenas, thanks to the talent-spotters Virgil and Varius; acceptance into an exclusive literary group; and finally a deceptively ordinary life as a celebrity.

1.3.2 Horace's "Biography"

Although Horace's poetry – not only in his *Sermones* – contains many fictitious references to putative autobiographical events, I will present in this section the traditional scholarly views on Horace's career.²¹ Suetonius wrote about Horace in the

²¹ For different "biographies" of Horace, see for example: Armstrong (1986; 2010, esp. 15-20); Bradshaw (2006, 1-16); Fraenkel (2002, 1-23); Gowers (2012, 2-6); Lyne (1995, 1-8); Nisbet (2007). For the reliability of the autobiographical references in Horace's work: conform Bather & Stocks (2016b, 2) "This potted 'autobiography' [at Bather & Stocks, 2016b, 1-2] derives from Horace's own poetry and Suetonius' biography on Horace. Such obtrusive autobiographical references must be read with caution, since Horace's corpus makes poetic capital out of blurring the boundaries between fiction and reality; at the same time it is most likely that Suetonius' biography [...] relies heavily on the autobiographical 'evidence' within Horace's poetry." See also Gowers (2012, 2): "Many of H.[orace]'s 'biographical' details now look like genre-specific tropes, props for a rhetoric of authenticity (the freedman father, the receptive child) or personal parallels for a history of Roman satire (from clumsy to refined) that has the Horatian version as its endpoint;" Anderson (1982, 50-73); Gowers (2003; 2005, 54-55); Oliensis (1998, 17-41); Schlegel (2005, 11-16).

De Poetis of his *De Viris illustribus*.²² According to Suetonius, Quintus Horatius Flaccus was born on 8th of December of the year 65 B.C. in the town of Venusia (modern Venosa) in Apulia. Many scholars state that his father had been a slave, who had been set free and who later became a *praeco* (auctioneer) and *coactor* (collector of money)²³. Not only Horace's own words *libertino patre natum* (child of a freedman) in S.1.6.6, and S.1.6.45-46, but also the opening line of Suetonius' *Vita Horati: Q. Horatius Flaccus, Venusinus, patre ut ipse tradit libertino et exactionum coactore* (Quintus Horatius Flaccus of Venusia had a father who was a freedman and a collector of money at auctions, as he himself writes) refer to this. However, Gordon Williams (1995, 299) argues, that it is much more likely that the poet's father was a member of the social class "immediately below the level of the upper class in Italian towns."²⁴ According to Williams (1995, 300) "it is hard to see Horace's father as a former imported oriental slave, [...]. But it is equally hard to see the poet as the son of such a man, for he [the poet] constantly gives expression to feelings of pride and joy in belonging to a particular region of Italy, and those feelings also appeal to a sense of long-established tradition." Williams' view that Horace's father belonged to a social class just below the top in Venusia may be substantiated by Horace's reference to experiences from his early youth in Venusia in S.1.6.71-75.

*causa fuit pater his, qui macro pauper agello
noluit in Flavi ludum me mittere, magni
quo pueri magnis e centurionibus orti,
laevo suspensi loculos tabulamque lacerto,
ibant octonos referentes Idibus aeris:*

(I am indebted to my father for this, who, although not rich with his poor little farm, would not send me to Flavius' school, to which the spoiled sons of important centurions went, with their casket and writing tablet hanging from their left shoulder, bringing their eightpence school-fee on the Ides [of each month])

The passage refers to the punishment of Venusia after Sulla's victory, and to the settlement of veterans in the town. Venusia had not remained loyal to Rome in the Social War, while the majority of Latin towns maintained their support to Rome. The *centuriones* in the poem stand for these veterans who were not very popular among the citizens terrorising the original population, together with their young sons. At the time that Venusia came again under Roman control during the Social War in 89

²² Rostagni (1944).

²³ Mayer (1995, 279-280); Nisbet (2007, 7); Ross Taylor (1925, 161-170). Nisbet refers to S.1.6.86-87: [...] *ut fuit ipse, coactor* [...] (or like himself, coactor). According to Fiske (1966/1920, 316), cited by Freudenburg (1993, 205-206; 2010, 280-282) the words *libertino patre natum* may be an allusion to Bion of Borysthenes when he first met Antigonus Gonatas. See also note 219.

²⁴ See also my discussion of S.1.6.

B.C., Horace's father may have been enslaved temporarily with many other men from Venusia. It is probable that he was re-enrolled a Roman citizen later, which made him a freedman. In that case, Horace was technically the son of a freedman. As a freedman's son, he may well have been the victim of bullying by the sons of Sulla's veterans.²⁵ Horace's father combined the profession of *coactor* with the running of a farm, which made him a man of reasonable financial means and Horace himself was later admitted to the equestrian ranks.²⁶ The words *libertino patre natum* are repeated in *Ep.1.20.19-22*, but in this passage Horace may have used the phrase to try to give his words more impact. The poet does not use the phrase anywhere other than in the quoted lines of *S.1.6* and *Ep.1.20*.

S.1.4.105-129 and *S.1.6.76-78* contain a moving account of his father's efforts to give the young Horace a good education. In the former passage Horace describes his father's moral teaching and in the latter passage the poet testifies that his father decided that there was only one place possible for his son's education and that he took him to Rome. I will consider Horace Sr.'s involvement in more detail when I discuss the particular *sermones*, but at this stage I note that it is very likely that the father's involvement has much poetic fiction: the involvement may be symbolic for Horace's respect for the old Roman values handed down to him for many years.²⁷ Here I will take the relevant texts at their face value as if those were autobiographical. *S.1.6.76-78* reads:

*sed puerum est ausus Romam portare, docendum
artis quas doceat quivis eques atque senator
semet prognatos.[...]*

(but he dared to take his boy off to Rome, to be taught those studies which any knight or senator would have his own children taught)

He was educated in Rome by Orbilius, fond of flogging, a grammarian who originally came from Beneventum, where according to *S.1.5.77-78* Apulia begins to display her familiar hills (*incipit ex illo montis Apulia notos/ ostentare mihi*). Orbilius was an *eques*

²⁵ Gowers (2012, 222); Gowers (2012, 237): "These may be the lumbering sons of Sullan veterans who lorded it over the dispossessed local population of a colonized Venusia (conform 62? = 71: *qui macro pauper agello* [who, although not rich with his poor little farm]); Williams 1995: 305. Fraenkel [2002] 3 detects an army school here and memories of schoolboy bullying." Muecke (1993, 107); Williams (1995, 300-309); Williams (1995, 305) puts forward an interesting speculation, that is that Horace was of the old Sabellian tribe "of diminutive physique" (see also *Ep.1.20.24*). Consequently, he suffered a lot from the bullying of the stout sons of soldiers in Venusia.

²⁶ For more details about Horace's father and Horace's education, see the discussions of *S.1.4* and *S.1.6*. See also Freudenburg (1993, 5 note 8); Harrison (1965, 111-114); White (1993, 5-14); Weeda (2015, 44). For Horace's equestrian career, see Armstrong (1986, 255-263); Ross Taylor (1925).

²⁷ For the role of Horace's father, see Freudenburg (1993, 33-39); Leach (1971); Schlegel (2000; 2005, 38-58); Yona (2015).

and taught most likely as a private tutor in Beneventum until 63 B.C., when he moved to Rome, again as a private tutor. Supposing that Horace was around fifteen years of age when he went to Rome, Orbilius was in his sixties. As Beneventum is relatively near to Venusia, Horace's father may have known Orbilius, or known of him. The common background in Apulia may have been an important consideration for the choice of the latter as a teacher.²⁸ I see these seeming details about Orbilius as important clues concerning the historicity of Horace's education in Rome. Thus, I regard Horace's narrative about his Roman period with the grammarian as truly autobiographical. Orbilius dictated to him as a boy the *Odissia* by Livius Andronicus, as he writes in *Ep.*2.1.69-71: *carmina Livi/ [...], memini quae plagosum mihi parvo/ Orbilium dictare* (the poems of Livius Andronicus [...], which I remember that Orbilius, who was fond of flogging, dictated to me as a boy). Further, he relates in *Ep.*2.2.41-43 that the *Iliad* was also part of his education in Rome and that more knowledge of Greek poetry was added to this later in Athens. *Ep.*2.2.41-43 reads:

*Romae nutriri mihi contigit, atque doceri
iratus Graeis quantum nocuisset Achilles.
adiocere bonae paulo plus artis Athenae*

(I happened to be brought up in Rome, and be taught how much the anger of Achilles had harmed the Greeks. Kind Athens added some more knowledge)

This combination of Latin and Greek poetry was regarded as the best form of education for a Roman youth. After completing his education in Rome he moved to Athens to be taught at "university" subjects such as moral philosophy and theory of knowledge. According to Fraenkel (2002, 9), Horace became in Greece acquainted with Greek lyric poetry, which he often quoted in his later work, for example Archilochus and Hipponax. He referred to Anacreon in his early work, as *Epod.*14.9-10 shows. Later work shows that he also knew Alcaeus and Pindar.

Horace probably met Brutus in Athens in 44 B.C. and he joined him in Asia. Brutus appointed him *tribunus militum*, a high rank for a son of the provincial upper middle class. Horace mentions this in *S.*1.6.48, *quod mihi pareret legio Romana tribuno* (because as a tribune a Roman legion obeyed me). It is held that Brutus elevated Horace to the rank of *eques*.²⁹ In 42 B.C. he fought with Brutus and Cassius at Philippi, where Brutus' army was utterly defeated and Brutus committed suicide. His involvement in the war at the side of Brutus is mentioned in *Carm.* 2.7.1-2, *O SAEPE mecum tempus in ultimum/ deducte Bruto militiae duce* (Dear friend [Pompeius], often gone with me to the last extremity/with Brutus as commander of the army). In addition to the passage in *Carm.*2.7 quoted below, Horace also mentions his participation in

²⁸ A contemporary source on Orbilius is *SUET.Gram.*9. For Orbilius, see also Folkerts (1972).

²⁹ For Horace's social status, see Armstrong (1986, 267-277; 2010, 17-18). For his career as *scriba*, see Armstrong (1986, 263-267).

the battle of Philippi in his letter to Florus (*Ep.*2.2.47-49), *in arma/ Caesaris Augusti non responsura lacertis./ unde simul primum me dimisere Philippi* (with weapons, no match for the military force of Caesar Augustus. As soon as Philippi discharged me). Horace managed to escape, which he describes with a reference to the Greek lyric poets, in *Carm.*2.7.9-12:

*tecum Philippos et celerem fugam
sensi relictā non bene parmula,
cum fracta virtus, et minaces
turpe solum tetigere mento.*

(with you I underwent Philippi and the hasty rout, leaving my shield behind without honour, when courage was broken and menacing men shamefully fell flat on their face)

Whether this description of Horace's ignominious action at the end of the battle is autobiographical, is again a moot point. He fought undoubtedly at Philippi on the losing side, but his report that he left his shield behind is most likely a functional reference to the Greek lyric poets. One can think of Alcaeus' fragment 428a (Campbell, 2002, 145; Bowra, 1961, 138), Anacreon's fragment 381b (Campbell, 2002, 145) and particularly Archilochus' fragment 5 (West, 1971, 3; Bowra, 1961, 138). The latter fragment reads as follows: "Some Saian exults in my shield – a perfect armour which I left behind unwillingly beside a shrub. And saved myself. What does a shield matter to me? Away with it. I will find one again that is no worse."³⁰ In *Carm.*2.7, Horace depicts the total defeat of Brutus' army, and he expresses, at the time of writing the poem one or two decades after the events, his embarrassment at having been involved with the wrong side in the war after Julius Caesar's death. His functional reference to the text of the fighting man Archilochus signifies his rejection of war and the enjoyment of the peace and quiet of his estate.

After Philippi disaster struck, as Horace is said to have lost both his home and the farm in Venusia during the expropriations. He was forced to earn a living, and he became a "professional" poet. However, it was not possible for him to earn a sufficient income from this occupation, and he was fortunate to find work in the Roman civil service. Suetonius in his *Vita Horati* writes: *victisque partibus venia impetrata scriptum quaestorium comparavit* (when his [Brutus'] party was defeated, he obtained a pardon and secured the position of a quaestor's clerk). It is generally understood that he,

30 Davis (2010b, 112-114); Nisbet & Hubbard (2004, 106-109; 112-114). Nisbet & Hubbard (2004, 113-114) say about the presumed autobiographical nature of the poem: "for the purpose of the poem he is no more autobiographical than in the following stanza [lines 13-14], where he claims to have been rescued by Mercury." For a discussion of the importance which was attached to the loss of one's shield in archaic Greece, see Fränkel (1962, 152-153). For Horace's position of *scriba*, see also Armstrong (1986, 257; 263-267)

and perhaps his father, had sufficient means to buy the position of a *scriba* at the equivalent of the Public Record Office, where the resolutions of the Senate were kept.

In 39/38 B.C., Horace was introduced to Virgil and both became involved with the group of poets who were members of the circle of Maecenas. He does not give us clear evidence of the origins of his friendship with either Virgil, or with Varius and others. According to Nisbet and Hubbard (2001, 40-41), in their commentary of *Carm.*1.3., Horace

speaks in the warmest terms of his brother-poet [Virgil]; cf.1.3.8, *serm.*1.1.41f. Of course one cannot test the strength of the intimacy; the differences of background and temperament [of Horace and Virgil] were considerable. It is perhaps worth observing, though the point need have no special significance, that the *Aeneid* was entrusted not to the eminently efficient Horace, but to two old Epicurean friends, Varius and Tucca.

Horace was about twenty-seven years of age and Virgil was five years older when they got acquainted in 38 B.C. At that time Virgil had not yet released his *Eclogae* and Horace was still engaged in writing his first book of *Sermones* and the *Epodi*. Thus, it is reasonable to suppose that their friendship was not the result of an established authorship of either or both. It is likely that they met somewhere and that each recognised the other's potential as a poet.

Horace testifies to his friendship with Virgil and occasionally other poets in several poems: in *S.*1.5.39-44, when he imagines the joy of welcoming Plotius, Varius and Virgil to the party travelling to Brundisium, in *S.*1.5.48-49, when Virgil and he retire early tired by the journey, in *S.*1.6.54-55, when he mentions that Virgil and Varius vouched for him at Maecenas, in *S.*1.10.44-45 praising Virgil's *Eclogae*, and in *S.*1.10.81, where he mentions that, among many others, Virgil and Varius enjoy his verses. He also testifies in *Carm.*1.3.1-8, a *propempticon* for Virgil, who sails for Greece while Horace prays for a safe journey, in *Carm.*1.24, a *consolatio* to Virgil at the death of his friend Quintilius, and in *Ep.*2.1.245-250 (letter to Augustus) written in 12 B.C., where he champions the cause of Virgil and Varius with Augustus.³¹

Horace gained the trust and friendship of both Augustus and Maecenas. This was documented by Horace himself in *S.*1.6.45-64. I will only quote two lines (61-62) from this long passage: *et revocas nono post mense iubesque/esse in amicorum numero* (then, after nine months, you called me back and bade me to join your friends). Much has

³¹ See also my discussion of *S.*1.5 and *S.*1.6. Horace mentions Virgil, Maecenas, Plotius and Varius in *S.*1.10. See Feeney (2009a, 364-365); Nisbet & Hubbard (2001, 40). For *Carm.*1.3.1-8, see Nisbet & Hubbard (2001, 40). For *Carm.*1.24, see Nisbet & Hubbard (2001, 40, 279-289). For *Ep.*2.1.245-250, see Feeney (2009a, 364-368). Horace refers in *Carm.*4.12.13 to *Vergili*, of whom Putnam (1968, 206) states "in line 13, in which it is possibly the poet Virgil who is apostrophized"; the line does not give us an indication about the friendship. In *Ars.*53-59, Horace discussing neologisms refers to Virgil, Varius and himself and asks "the indignant question" why they are not allowed to add new words. See Oliensis (2009b, 468-469).

been written about patronage and *amicitia*, and the position of Horace. In particular, DuQuesnay (1984, 19-58) discusses in detail the complexities of the relationship between Horace and Maecenas.³² Horace gained access to leading figures at Rome, of whom the *princeps* was the most important. Obviously this gave him unrivalled sources of information. In Weeda (2015, 43-52) I included a general discussion of the issues of patronage and *amicitia*. In the next section I discuss Horace's relationship with Maecenas.³³

1.4 Horace and Maecenas: Patronage or *Amicitia*?

The word “patronage” has become the common expression in secondary literature to describe the relationship between a wealthy man and a poet in Augustan Rome and later. White (1978, 78-82; 1993, 32-34) points out that the word *patronus* is never used in Latin to describe the literary relationship. White (2007, 196) remarks that Horace

applies the word [*amicus*] to these relationships [socializing with others] more than twice as often as all other terms combined, and without apparent regard for status differences. “Friend” is how he describes himself in relation to, among others, his junior protégé Septimius [*Carm.*2.6.24], the influential knight Maecenas [*Carm.*3.8.13], the senators Pollio and Messalla [*S.*1.10.85-87], and the prince Tiberius [*Ep.*1.9.5].

Pollio is C. Asinius Pollio (76 B.C. – A.D.4), a military man, consul in 40 B.C., and retired from politics soon afterwards. He was a convinced Republican and a supporter of Julius Caesar. It is likely that he was involved in the land expropriations in Northern Italy after Philippi (see also note 122). He was also a literary critic, author of a historical work and poet of tragedies and founder of the first public library in Rome. Messalla is M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus (64 B.C. – A.D.13), soldier, orator and patron of several poets, amongst whom were Tibullus and Ovid (see also note 45). He followed Brutus in June 43 B.C. into Macedonia, at Philippi he fought under Brutus, and came to Marc Antony in Alexandria. In 40 B.C. he joined Octavian's party and fought against Sextus Pompey at Sicily. He fought also at Actium on Octavian's side. He was one of the greatest orators of his time and wrote bucolic and elegiac poetry in Greek.³⁴

In this section, I will explore whether the terms suggested by White, *amicitia* and *amicus*, are not a more appropriate way of defining the relationships between men in

³² For the relationship between Horace and Maecenas, see also Anderson (2010); Bowditch (2001, 19-24; 31-63; 2010); DuQuesnay (1984); Gold (1982; 1987, 115-141; 2012b); Lyne (1995, 14-20; 132-138); White (1978, 1982, 1993, 2005 and 2007); Williams (1968, 41-46; 1993, 258-275).

³³ Parts of this section are literal citations of Weeda (2015, 43-52).

³⁴ For C. Asinius Pollio, see also Gundel (1964). For M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus, see also Hanslik (1969).

influential positions and poets than the terms patronage and patron. Writers in the third and second centuries B.C., who were often slaves, freedmen, or descendants of freedmen, were generally financially dependent on either public officials (*aediles*) or were given protection, money and lodging by Roman aristocrats.³⁵ For example, Terence was a slave, later freedman, who was enabled by the payments of a public official to write his early work. In exchange for the payment, the official received his drama that he could have performed at festivals and thus attract votes to further his career; this arrangement was a form of (official) patronage. Livius Andronicus was most likely an example of someone who as a slave was taken in the household of the Livii, later manumitted but staying in the household as a teacher and a poet celebrating the great deeds of the Livii and others. The exchange here was protection and lodging for honouring a patron.

Towards the close of the second century B.C., when drama declined, free authors emerged who were either members of the rich upper class, like Lucilius (180 – ab.102 B.C.), or had the opportunity to associate with leading personalities in Roman society, like Catullus (84 – 54 B.C.) and Cornelius Gallus (ab.70 – 26 B.C.).³⁶ There existed also an intermediate form that is worth mentioning: the writer who came from abroad, often from Greece, not as a slave but as a free man. This was the case with the Greek Archias, who was taken into the Lucullus' household, soon after arriving in Rome. He became a respected poet, who wrote panegyrics for Lucullus' campaigns against Mithridates. Eventually, he had many Roman supporters within the elite. Cicero wrote a speech in defense of him, *Pro Archia*, and wrote about him in *CIC.Att.1.16.15: et Archias nihil de me scripserit* (and Archias has not written anything about me). Both contemporary sources tell us a lot about patronage of writers in the first century B.C.³⁷ Most of the Augustan poets were also members of the social elite, although not necessarily of the aristocracy or administrative and political establishment, such as highly placed public servants or members of the senate. Many of the Augustan poets aspired to use their poetry and their free position to express their opinions about socio-political issues in Roman society. Thus, they expected from their association with men who had achieved a position with authority in public affairs, like Maecenas, access to a network and to information, not money and protection.³⁸ It may be argued that Horace's own words in the opening lines of the *Carmina* indicate that he considers Maecenas his protector, one of the roles of a patron. *Carm.1.1.1-2*, a

³⁵ For the social positions of the writers in the third-first centuries B.C., and patronage in Rome, see Gold (1987, 39-67). Apart from Terence and Livius Andronicus, she discusses in some detail the third-second centuries B.C. writers like Caecilius, Plautus, Naevius, and Ennius.

³⁶ For important events in and aspects of Lucilius' life, see the discussion at the appropriate places, e.g. S.1.4.5, S.1.10.53-64.

³⁷ Conform Gold (1987, 73-86). See also Quinn (1982, 122-124).

³⁸ For the positions of the writers in the Late Republic/Early Empire, see Gold (1987, 54-67). She discusses a.o. Catullus, Cornelius Nepos, Varro Atacinus, C. Cornelius Gallus.

dedication to Maecenas, reads: *MAECENAS [...],/o et praesidium et dulce decus meum*, (Maecenas, my help, my pleasure and my glory). The word *praesidium*, however, has indeed the meaning of defence or protection, particularly in a military context, but in a general sense the word means help, assistance. Horace's words about this matter in the *Sermones* also indicate that he sees the advantages of *amicitia* with Maecenas primarily aiding the advancement of his career as a commentator of political issues. I will argue at S.1.4.133-137 (in section 2.2.2), that he intends to write critical commentary on contemporary issues and that he does not exclude Octavian and Maecenas if necessary, which is apparent from the book of *Epodi*, that contains seven critical poems (see note 174). Further, we will see towards the closure of the present section that although he received the "gift" of the Sabine farm, he wishes to retain his independence. We will also see that he tells Maecenas in the final lines of S.1.6 that he prefers a life outside the limelight of the political business.

Horace himself provides us with evidence that he and his father were not poor. Firstly, in S.2.753-54, he lets his slave Davus refer to his status as an *equus*: *tu cum proiectis insignibus, anulo equestri/ Romanoque habitu* (You, when you have thrown away your regalia, the knight's ring, and your Roman dress). The economic and social relationships at the level of the extended family encouraged mutual dependencies of the family members, where the services of many were bartered for food and protection by the few. The result was that in the economic unit of the family barter was the norm, just as this form of economic exchange was common in many parts of society at large. Such was the economic environment which the poet knew and of which he was a privileged member.

Did the poet have any earning potential? The answer is clearly that this was not the case. Firstly, in a time when the mass production of books did not exist and where the markets for selling books were minimal, the turnover of the few booksellers and therefore the opportunity for the poets to generate an income were limited. A source of income was writing for the stage, particularly for pantomime, which had become popular. However, this was not regarded a serious occupation for a serious poet and was frowned upon. In some cases, poets seem to have received payment for theatre productions, the best-known case being Horace's *Carmen Saeculare* in 17 B.C.; but these cases were few and far between. Secondly, the poets came from and worked in an environment where payment for any service was uncommon. In particular, payment for intellectual services, such as writing poetry or oratory, was seen as demeaning, as it brought the artist or professional down to the level of a trader. Thirdly, we saw above that most of the Augustan poets did not need any payment for their work anyway, as they had sufficient income from other sources, especially Virgil and Horace, who were relatively rich. Horace was pardoned for fighting at Philippi and obtained a salaried position a few years before he met Maecenas. According to White (2007, 198), "subsequent largesse from Maecenas and others is best seen as an enhancement of his income rather than the foundation of it." This is contrary to the view that poverty forced Horace to start writing poetry, as could be concluded from

the letter to Florus (*Ep.*2.2.51-52): *paupertas impulit audax/ ut versus facerem* (poverty forced me so daring, that I wrote poetry).³⁹

The ancient sources tell us little about the precise nature of patronage at the end of the first century B.C., but it is unlikely that the relationships between the poets and the members of the Roman elite fit the *patronus-client* model. Although the economic and social background of a rich and often influential man differed greatly from that of a poet, the special bond between the two was generally founded on *amicitia*. In this section, the concept of *amicitia* will be discussed in more detail and will be set against the model of patronage. *Amicitia* and *clientela* are sometimes put on a par or mixed up. An example where the two are not clearly distinguished is found in the work of Campbell (1970, 89-94), that was originally published in 1924. On the one hand, he (1970, 90) writes (re. S.1.6) that Horace “was again summoned [by Maecenas nine months later], this time to be told that he might consider himself Maecenas’s *friend*; in other words, that he need not in future consume his genius in the effort to earn his own living. A *friend*, however, in the most intimate sense, he very soon became.” On the other hand, he (1970, 93) writes (re. S.1.5): “and on one of these [journeys to Brundisium], partly for social distraction and partly doubtless to observe him [Horace] further, he [Maecenas] took his *newly-adopted client* with him, besides, of course, a considerable and distinguished suite, including Virgil and Varius.”⁴⁰

Amicitia therefore was more than just mere affection; Brunt (2004b, 355) notes that it bound people together “in bonds of obligation and honour.” *Amici* did not take for granted that they were members of the same social set or held the same political conviction.⁴¹ Brunt (2004b, 356) also states that “*amicitia* often purports to describe sincere affection based on a community of tastes, feelings and principles, and taking the form, where opportunity permits, of continuous and intimate association.” We will see below that there is often a shared intellectual interest and familiarity between the members of a circle of *amici*. Thus, *amicitia* is not the same as *clientela*; the latter

³⁹ Armstrong (2010, 13-14) presents some estimations of the wealth of Virgil and Horace. He asserts that both men easily met the property requirements to be *eques* or *senator*, and he (2010, 14) states that “Virgil, another rich knight, died worth twenty million sesterces, richer even than Atticus [who was very rich].” See also White (2007, 197-198). For a discussion of the view that poverty forced Horace, see Wistrand (1964, 260-269), who rejects the poverty argument. I concur with Wistrand’s (1964, 266) view that Horace tells us in the same letter to Florus (*Ep.*2.2.55-57), written at the end of his life, that “youthful passion was the force that inspired his poetry, so that it is only natural that, at his present age, he should have to abandon verse-writing like other juvenile occupations.”

⁴⁰ For the poets as clients, see Mayer (1989, 6-7). Another issue of the work of Campbell is that he interprets the poetry of Horace as entirely autobiographical. The *italics* in the quotes of Campbell are mine.

⁴¹ Conform Konstan (1997, 123-124), who approvingly quotes Brunt (2004b, 352 = 1988, 352) “In an elegant and richly documented study, Peter Brunt (1988 [orig. version 1965] challenged the assumption that ‘if a Roman called a man *amicus*, it meant that he was a political ally’ (1988:352). In fact he argues (367), ‘complex personal relationships could cut across political discords’.”

is generally based on a difference in social status and a *cliens* pays respect to his *patronus* and there is no feeling of being equals. A *cliens* is expected to fulfil his duties for his *patronus* in return for his protection. We will see later in section 2.2.3 that Horace himself gives his view on patronage in S.1.6.119-121 when he describes the statue of Marsyas in the Forum that he sees as a symbol of the relationship between a typical patron and his clients. He prefers Maecenas as *amicus* as he abhors patronage, particularly because he does not feel comfortable in the company of the average client.

Descriptions of *amicitia* can be found in several works of Horace, such as his *Carmina* and *Sermones*.⁴² An example is the following selection from the *Carmina*. We saw that the opening lines of the *Carmina* testify to Horace's feelings of friendship for Maecenas; *Carm.*1.1.1-2, a dedication to Maecenas, reads: *MAECENAS [...]/ o et praesidium et dulce decus meum*, (Maecenas, my help, my pleasure and my glory). In *Carm.*1.20.1-5, Horace invites Maecenas to drink wine with him.⁴³

*VILE potabis modicis Sabinum
cantharis, Graeca quod ego ipse testa
conditum levi, datus in theatro
cum tibi plausus,
care Maecenas eques,*

(A cheap Sabine you will drink from ordinary cups, a seasoned wine that I myself sealed with pitch in a Greek jar on the day when you were given an applause in the theatre, dear knight Maecenas)

In this short poem of twelve lines, Horace expresses his feelings of *amicitia* towards Maecenas. He offers him good wine, that has been stored away since the day of Maecenas' return to public life after a dangerous illness. This shows how much Maecenas had been in the poet's thoughts.

*Carm.*2.17.3-4, which describes that the destinies of Maecenas and Horace are linked, reads: *Maecenas, mearum/ grande decus columenque rerum* (Maecenas, you are the great glory and pillar of my existence). Further, in book 3, in *Carm.*3.16.29-30, Horace voices his joy with the Sabine estate, a "gift" of Maecenas (see below): *purae rivus aquae silvaque iugerum/ paucorum et segetis certa fides meae* (A stream of clear water, and a few acres of woodland, a promise of my cornfield that never fails).

In the Ode to Maecenas (*Carm.*3.29.25-26; 32-34) Horace expresses his concern for Maecenas' well-being:

*tu civitatem quis deceat status
curas et Vrbi sollicitus times
[...]. quod adest memento*

⁴² For the *amicitia* between Horace and Maecenas, see also Konstan (1997, 141-144); Mayer (1989, 7; 9-14); Schlegel (2000, 109-114).

⁴³ The Loeb edition has *clare* in line 5, and the translation given is: 'Maecenas, illustrious knight.'

*componere aequus; cetera fluminis
ritu feruntur,*

(You trouble yourself about what form of government is suitable for the state, and being anxious for the capital you are fearful of [...]. Do not fail to put right what arises with even mind. Everything else is taken away like a river does)

Horace tells his friend not to fret about matters of state and counsels him to take life more calmly. In *Carm.*4.11.18-20 he expresses joy for the celebration of Maecenas' birthday: *ex hac/luce Maecenas meus adfluentis/ordinat annos* (from this day my dear Maecenas records the increase of his years).

Although there are some doubts about the transmission of the next text, another source of the *amicitia* of Horace and Maecenas is a passage of Suetonius in his *Vita Horati* 2.2 (Rostagni, 1944, 112-113):

Maecenas quantopere eum dilexerit satis testatur illo epigrammate:

*Ni te visceribus meis, Horati,
plus iam diligo, tu tuum sodalem
nimio videas strigiosorem;*

sed multo magis extremis indiciis tali ad Augustum elogio: "Horati Flacci ut mei esto memor."

(How much Maecenas loved him is demonstrated sufficiently by this epigram:

If I do not love you, my Horace,
more than my own flesh, you may consider your comrade
very much poorer than a scrag;

But he said this much more strongly to Augustus in this short sentence in his last will: "Remember Horatius Flaccus as much as you will me.")

In S.1.5.40-42 Horace describes the value he attaches to being in the company of friends. The party is supposed to be on the way to Brundisium to attend a meeting between Octavian and Marc Antony.⁴⁴ Maecenas has joined them early and a few days later the other *amici* arrive. About the reunion with the latter, among them Virgil, he writes:

*Plotius et Varius Sinuessae Vergiliusque
occurrunt, animae qualis neque candidiores
terra tulit neque quis me sit devinctior alter.*

(Plotius and Varius meet us at Sinuessa, and Virgil, men such as neither the earth bore brighter, nor to whom another is more devoted than I)

Whether the story in the fifth *sermo* is historically true or poetic fiction, it testifies to the value that Horace attached to the company of friends. I will return to the subject of the historicity of the journey in section 2.2.3.

⁴⁴ For the historicity of S.1.5, see Anderson (1955/1956); DuQuesnay (1984, 40); Gowers (2009, 157-160; 2012, 182; 183; 186); Fraenkel (2002, 105) Musurillo (1955); Rudd (2007, 54); Williams (1968, 569-570).

Thus, generally the poets were part of circles of friends, and belonged to the retinue of members of the Roman elite, together with other intellectuals who had not wished to pursue or had not been accepted in a political or judicial career.⁴⁵ Although gifts from the magnates were forthcoming, as Maecenas' gift of the Sabine farm to Horace shows, it was not financial support that the poets expected. In a barter economy such as the Roman one, the transfer of goods was common, and people were used to this form of exchange, but this is not to say that I see the gift as a form of payment for services rendered. The rich elite, the "patrons" (rather *amici*) of the poets, expected the companionship of the latter and a place in the poet's verse. Through their association with the powerful, the poets hoped to receive recognition and publicity for their work. In these "salons," they recited their work, but presumably also discussed all kinds of subjects and their opinions might be sought once they had acquired the confidence of their *amicus*.

At some time before 31 B.C., Horace received from Maecenas his Sabine estate near Licenza (some 20 kilometres north-east from Tibur, modern Tivoli) which changed his economic circumstances substantially. There is an archaeological site in the region, nowadays called *Villa Horati*, which perhaps was the location of Horace's estate. Frischer (2010, 89) concludes on grounds of the latest archaeological investigation (1997-2003) of the site that

below the structures visible on the site – which, as we have seen, mainly date to the first and early second centuries CE (and not to the Augustan age, as previous scholars thought) – earlier remains were found dating to the first century BCE. Doubtless many other features are lurking that probably date to the same period.⁴⁶

Frischer states that further work is required before a definitive answer whether Horace owned the site can be given, but he does not disallow the possibility. Horace testifies to his estate in many of his poems, amongst other *S.2.6*, *Carm.1.20*, 2.18, 3.8, and *Ep.1.14*.

⁴⁵ White (1993, 35-63) gives a list of recorded friendships of poets. To the circle of Maecenas belonged: Domitius Marsus (latter half of first century B.C.), Fundanius (comic poet), Horace, Melissus (comic poet), Plotius Tucca, Propertius, L. Varius Rufus (latter half of the first century B.C.), Virgil and the brothers Visci. To the circle of Messalla Corvinus belonged: Horace, Ovid, Sextilius Ena (latter half of the first century B.C.), Sulpicia (late first century B.C.; in the Tibullan corpus there are some poems about a romance; see White (1993, 91)), Tibullus, Valgius Rufus (consul in 12 B.C.; see Horace's *Carmen* 2.9) and Virgil.

⁴⁶ Frischer (2010, 75-90). Mols (2006, 271) concludes: "Thus far the villa has not yielded any fragment of decorated wall or ceiling fresco painting dating to the period in which Horace lived. But as already noted, not everything at the Licenza site postdates Horace: in area 23 were found three fragments of simple red ground fresco on an *opus incertum* wall that the excavators report is datable to the first century B.C."

One might rightly ask whether the gift of an estate in the Sabine hills is not rather excessive compared to the return gift of being the addressee in a few poems or of being in the presence of poets.⁴⁷ However, the nature of this “gift” is often misunderstood. Maecenas, who was at the centre of power, “gave” the villa at a time when much property was being expropriated, for various reasons, and perhaps Horace’s Sabine estate was one of such properties. The ownership of the villa was presumably not transferred to Horace, but the poet enjoyed the free use of the property.

Obviously, this raises the question about the independence of the poets; Maecenas, for instance, may have encouraged poetry in praise of Augustus.⁴⁸ This does not make the poets dependent lackeys, and I differ from Watson (2007) and Bowditch (2001, 2010), who respectively argue that Horace traded his independence away for his admission as a member of Maecenas’ circle or for the gift of the Sabine estate. Watson (2007, 97) states: “In 38 BCE, according to the accepted dating, Horace’s artistic promise saw him taken up into the entourage of Octavian’s man of affairs, Maecenas, *with all the obligations to trade mutual benefactions that such a relationship entailed, in Horace’s case the composition of politically engaged poetry*” (*italics are mine*). Bowditch (2001, 15) argues that “philosophers and poets alike avoid the language of patronage, and the corresponding diction of *clientela* or ‘clientship’, when describing relations between those of elite social status. Literary patronage, as I [Bowditch] discuss in more detail below, was referred to almost exclusively in terms of *amicitia* or friendship.” In her (2001, 16) opinion, Horace was only autonomous on “the level of poetic representation,” and she argues that “Horace experienced all the constraint and obligation – the sense of debt, gratitude, and compulsion to return – that such an [gift] economy would impose on him.” In her (2010, 73) essay she also states that “whether in response to such power [the power which compels, not only if it invites but even if it beseeches] or to the more subtle persuasion of gifts, Horace wrote poems that cannot be dissociated from the socioeconomics of patronage.” She overlooks, however, Horace’s independent attitude, which is evident through the contents of the many critical poems which he wrote until the end of his career. Bowditch (2001) analysed a total of forty-nine of Horace’s poems: I consider eight of these as critical, but she does not discuss the critical content of these.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Gold (2012b, 309-310); White (2007, 198, note 13) quotes Bradshaw (1989, 160-186) with respect to Maecenas’ gift of the Sabine estate: “Bradshaw (1989) rightly insists that Horace does not unambiguously describe the Sabine farm as a gift from Maecenas and that the scholiasts, who do, cannot be proved to have possessed information independent of Horace’s words. Cairns (1992, 107-109) is equally right to say that the conventional view may nevertheless be correct.”

⁴⁸ Anderson (2010, 51) states that “Book 1 of the *Epistulae* is a decisive refutation of the theory of Horace’s incorporation in the so-called Circle of Maecenas,” and “he [Horace] is polite and friendly to Maecenas in three letters, but Maecenas does not control them, and indeed Horace presents himself from the start as choosing the genre [*Epistles*] in spite of Maecenas’ wishes.”

⁴⁹ Bowditch (2001, 278-280). She has analysed 4 *Sermones* (1.1, 1.6, 2.2 and 2.6, of which 2.2 is critical),

Contrary to what has often been stated, the involvement as an *amicus* in a circle of *amici* worked as a guarantee of their independence. As accepted members of the circle of friends, the poets, who were financially independent, were seen as having a contribution to make, and the writing of poems about political or social questions emanated naturally from their position of intelligent observers and participants in the arguments, and not from an order to write propagandist material. This is a very different picture from what Griffin says about “Horace in the Thirties.” I concur with him when he (1993, 3) states that Horace did not hope “to find a patron and attain comfortable circumstances.” The poet is very clear about the matter in, for example, S.1.6.119-121, when he imagines in a clever scene the statue of Marsyas as his patron. However, I differ from Griffin’s view that Horace’s losses of his father’s house and land and his humble status of a freedman’s son “made him reckless, and he didn’t care what he said” (Griffin, 1993, 3). His position as one of the intelligent observers and participants in the arguments in the circle of Maecenas is also very different from what Nadeau (2004) in the title of his book calls the “safe and subsidized” poet by a patron: the scenario of *amicitia* is far more subtle. It is part and parcel of the social relationships in the late Republic and the early Empire. As White (1978, 92) says: “Once established in the *amicitia* of a rich man, poets received material benefits which were the perquisites of friends rather than the due of poetry.” I intend to demonstrate that Horace’s objective was to become an independent political commentator, not a writer of political propaganda. I will discuss this in the next section 2.1. His political commentary is also apparent from his other work of the 30s B.C.; I will present in section 3.3 a limited synopsis of the political content of *Sermones* book 2 and the *Epodi*.

It is known that Augustus held Horace in high esteem, so much so, that he offered him the job of private secretary. Suetonius (*Vita Horati*) quotes from a letter of Augustus to Maecenas: *nunc occupatissimus et infirmus Horatium nostrum a te cupio abducere* (now very hard at work and in poor health, I wish to take our Horace from you). Horace declined the offer.

Horace’s life probably ended on 27th November in the year 8 B.C. He survived Maecenas by 59 days.⁵⁰

3 *Epodi* (1, 7 and 16, of which 7 and 16 are critical), 28 *Carmina* (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.9, 1.12, 1.16, 1.17, 1.20, 1.22, 1.30, 1.35, 1.37, 2.1, 2.7, 2.13, 2.16, 2.18, 3.1-3.6, 3.22, 3.29, 3.30, 4.11 and *Saec.*, of which 1.35, 2.1, 3.6 and 3.29 are critical) and 14 *Epistulae* (1.1, 1.2, 1.7, 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.19, 1.20, 2.1, 2.2 and *Ars*, of which 2.1 is critical). For my analysis of the critical nature of S.2.2, see Weeda (2010, 141-142); of *Epod.* 7, see Weeda (2010, 157-159); of *Epod.* 16, see Weeda (2010, 166-169); of *Carm.* 1.35, see Weeda (2010, 179-180); of *Carm.* 2.1, see Weeda (2010, 182-183); of *Carm.* 3.6, see Weeda (2010, 199-201); of *Carm.* 3.29, see Weeda (2010, 209-210); of *Ep.* 2.1, see Weeda (2010, 233-236).

50 Bradshaw (2006, 16) states: “we cannot be as sure of this date as we can be of the poet’s birthday.”

2 The *Sermones* (Satires): Preparing for the Future as a Political Commentator

2.1 Introduction to the Chapter

Horace wrote two collections of *Sermones*, the name he gave his poems which are generally known as *Satires*.⁵¹ Book 1 of the *Sermones* is his debut. It is generally held that he began writing the book in 42 or 41 B.C. (although I will argue below that 38 B.C. is more likely), and that this was probably released in 36 or 35 B.C. Book 2 appeared five years later.⁵² He wrote the *Epodi*, and some of the *Carmina* and *Epistulae*, in the same period. In this monograph I will focus on the first book of *Sermones* (S.1). However, I will briefly consider in section 3.3 the political issues he raised in the second book of *Sermones* (S.2) and in two other genres he wrote in the period of 38 B.C until 30 B.C., the *Epodi* and a number of *Carmina*.

The name of *Sermones* is a more appropriate representation of Horace's intentions than the name of *Satires*. I suggest that Horace wrote in S.1 a lot about satire, but that it is not satiric blame poetry levelled directly at an audience: adapting the words of Schlegel (2005, 6) "he presents the bite [in S.1], but does not do the biting." The view that Horace in S.1 didn't write much satiric poetry is contrary to that of Freudenburg in 1993, where he presents Horace as "the satirist," but conforms Freudenburg's view in 2001. For example, he (2001, 7) makes the point that S.1.1-1.3 fail to bear evidence of satiric poetry: "But neither is he [Horace] much of a satirist."⁵³

I will interpret S.1 from a functional point of view, and I intend to show that Horace's main purpose in writing S.1 is to show that he is and intends to remain a trustworthy member of the circle of Maecenas. Hence, the title of this monograph: Horace's *Sermones* Book 1: Credentials for Maecenas. Thus, when Horace explored, particularly in S.1.1-1.4, in S.1.6 and in S.1.10, the most effective way of presenting his message, he also depicted, both openly and by allusion, a well-considered view on

⁵¹ For Horace's poetry in general, see: Von Albrecht (1997, 565-587); Fraenkel (2002); Rudd (1993b). For his *Sermones*, see: Brown (2007); Freudenburg (2001, 15-124; 2010); Gowers (2003; 2005; 2012); Griffin (1993); Kiessling (1886/1959); Lefèvre (1993, 37-60; 85-111); Lyne (1995, 21-26); Muecke (1993; 2007); Oliensis (1998, 17-63); Rudd (2007). For the different literary influences on Horace's *Sermones*, see: Barchiesi (2001); Ferriss-Hill (2015); Freudenburg (1993, 103-108); Harrison (2015); Muecke (2005); West (1974, 22); Zetzel (2006, 38-52). For the names *Sermones/Satires*, see Freudenburg (2001, 2); Gowers (2005, 48-49; 2012, 12-15).

⁵² For the dating of the *Sermones*, see Gowers (2003, 59; 2012, 1-5) (book 1); Freudenburg (2001, xii) and Muecke (1993, 1-2) (books 1 and 2).

⁵³ The suggestion that Horace in S.1 is not much of a satirist is contrary to Oliensis (1998, 17-41), who (1998, 20) writes for example "that Horace's satiric eye, so sharp to see the failings of the man in the crowd, etc.."

specific contemporary social and political evils which were in evidence in definite groups of Roman society. He identified those distinct social groups not only to determine the poetic genre he would use and the style that would be most suitable for his future role as political observer, but also to demonstrate to Maecenas that he did not adhere to the views or support the actions of a number of those groups, for example the Stoics or worse: the new rich. After all, he was himself a freedman's son who had achieved some financial independence, but who did not share their cultural views. His commentary on the conduct of those groups is often misinterpreted as satire. When he writes about the character of satire, for example about Lucilius' poetry, it is neither because he sees himself as a successor to Lucilius as a satirist nor because he explores whether satire is the right genre for his commentary. I interpret those lines as part of his main purpose, that is that he gives thought to the manner in which to deliver his message. Further, he prepares himself and his audience within the circle of Maecenas for his future role as political observer and commentator. In other words, his search for his poetic orientation was not the focus of S.1; the most important focus was his self-presentation.⁵⁴ There is also a gradual shift in focus; in S.1.1-1.4 the emphasis is on self-presentation in order to become an acceptable member of the circle of Maecenas, in the later *sermones* (S.1.5 and S.1.7-1.9) the poet operates as one who sees the desired goal within reach. Lefèvre (1993, 85-111) gave his chapter on S.1 the appropriate name of Selbstfindung: Das erste Satiren-Buch (Finding himself: the first book of *Satires*). Both the discussion about his views on socio-political issues and his self-presentation are not public ones, as he regularly asserts, but it takes place with his associates of the circle of Maecenas. This also explains his choice of the name *Sermones* (Conversations or Discussions). Consequently, contrary to common practice I use the latter name in this book. I will also examine Horace's relationship with his associates not only in the present section below, but also in the analyses of many of the individual poems of S.1. As a result of my assumption of the purpose of writing S.1, I suggest that Horace started the writing of the majority of the *sermones* of the first book most likely from 38 B.C., the year that he was admitted to Maecenas' group. I will argue below that his membership of this group was not a matter of course. A few years before he was invited to join the group, he fought at Philippi on the losing side with Brutus. In addition, his social background was not impressive.

Horace does not only set out his theory and programme of writing in book 1 of the *Sermones*, but he also gives some initial political commentary. I will review Horace's views on the genre of satire – which in his case I rather call commentary writing – with the aid of the extensive scholarly literature that considers Horace's poetry within the literary frame.⁵⁵ I intend to add to the discussion about the poetic nature

⁵⁴ For Horace's self-presentation in the *Sermones*, see also Harrison (2007c).

⁵⁵ For Horace's views on the satiric genre and the influences of his predecessors, see Anderson (1982, 14-27); DuQuesnay (1984); Freudenburg (1993; 2001, 1-51; 2005b, 7-11; 2010, 273-276); Gowers

an examination of his political objectives within the functional frame. His political views become apparent by examining the social and political issues he raises, often only briefly or by allusion. When Horace presents his critical commentary on political issues, I note that he makes a distinction between several social and political groups he describes. I will identify those by distinguishing four groups, that is Maecenas' circle and his friends, the political elite, the new classes of nouveau riche in Rome (like the pushy fellow of S.1.9), and the Roman populace.

The nature of Horace's poems in S.1, and his relationship to Ennius (239-169 B.C.) and Lucilius (180 – ab.102 B.C.), the first Roman poets to write satire, and other predecessors is much discussed.⁵⁶ Originally, the genre that later developed into satire drew from a variety of, among others, Hellenistic genres with differing subject matters and meters. Quintilian saw the genre of satire as being typically Roman, so much so that he began his section on Satire in the *Institutio Oratoria* (10.1.93) with the famous lines *Satura quidem tota nostra est* (Satire, indeed, is entirely ours).⁵⁷ Quintilian points out already that Horace is special in being less caustic and vindictive, and recognized the unsatirical character of the latter's *Sermones*. He places Horace firmly within the group of Latin satirists like Lucilius and Persius. He says in *Inst.*10.1.94: *Nam et eruditio in eo mira et libertas atque inde acerbitas et abunde salis. Multum est tersior ac purus magis Horatius et, nisi labor eius amore, praecipuus* (For he [Lucilius] has an extraordinary learning and candor, and hence satirical severity and an abundance of wit. Horace is much more correct and purer of style, and he is special, unless I am mistaken by my love for him). Much later, the nineteenth century scholar Kiessling wrote in his commentary:

Der Satiriker Horaz ist kein ergrimmtter Kämpfer wie Lucilius, der in heiligem Eifer mit den Waffen verletzenden Spottes oder beißenden Witzes seinen Gegner zu vernichten trachtet: er [Horace] ist kein strafender Richter der einen Delinquenten vor sein Tribunal zieht und unbarmherzig züchtigt, kein Prediger, der dem Sünder zu Herzen und ins Gewissen redet: er ist vielmehr der menschenkundige philosophische Beobachter (The satirist Horace is not an angry fighter as Lucilius was, who in holy fire using the weapon of hurting derision or caustic mockery tries to demolish his opponent: he [Horace] is not a punishing judge, who drags a culprit before his court and merciless chastises him, not a preacher, who appeals to a sinner's heart and conscience; he [Horace] is much more the philosophical observer with insight into human character).⁵⁸

I mention above that my working assumption is that Horace's S.1 displays some of his views on contemporary political issues, but that the focus is on self-presentation and marking out his role as a political observer and commentator. Yet, at this point, I

(2005; 2012, 6-14); Muecke (2005); Oliensis (1998, 17-63); Rudd (2007, 86-131); Schlegel (2010).

⁵⁶ For Roman satire before Horace, see Muecke (2005); see also my discussion at S.1.4.1-2 in section 2.2.2, and that of S.1.10 in section 2.2.5. For general scholarly literature, see note 51.

⁵⁷ Winterbottom (1970, 586).

⁵⁸ See Kiessling (1886/1959, xiii). Translation is mine.

will review the opinions in the scholarly literature on the political context of Horace's "satirical" poetry. Within the context of this book the question whether he wrote about socio-political issues in S.1 is closely related to that whether he wrote political *satire* or not, as S.1 is considered satirical poetry by many. However, political satire is one of many appearances of political commentary. Horace also wrote political commentary in other genres such as the *Carmina*, *Epodi*, or *Epistulae*. The reverse is also possible, that is to write satiric poetry about issues that are not related to politics, such as love-affairs or the literary qualities of comedy. Although Heinze recognised in the 1959 edition of the commentary (Kießling/Heinze, 1959, xiv) to some extent the political content of the poems, he did not interpret the *Sermones* as political poems. Sallmann (1974, 186) argues that neither in the first nor in the second book of *Sermones* many examples "einer politischen Satire" can be found. He states that "Politik war ein Gebiet, das Horaz den Oden vorbehielt" (Politics was a domain that Horace reserved for the *Carmina*). According to Muecke, DuQuesnay (1984) was the first modern scholar to challenge the prevailing view that the *Sermones* were apolitical.⁵⁹ I agree with Muecke's point that S.1 is without question a book with a political content, although in S.1 Horace's direct censuring of political evil in Roman society is limited. Gowers (2012, 4) states about the latter point that "the part H.[orace] allows for contemporary politics in Satire I is ostensibly small." I will argue that the obvious political content of S.1 should not be read primarily as satire, but as his self-presentation. Poems in which he addresses directly political issues presenting his critical commentary also appear in the *Epodi*, and later in the *Carmina and Epistulae*. I postulated already in section 1.1 that S.1 is Horace's way-maker for his future role as political commentator, as his objective in writing S.1 is to establish his reliability as a member of Maecenas' circle. Harrison (2015) demonstrates in his essay about "Horace's poetic career" that from S.1 up to and including the *Epistulae* "we find the Horatian literary career paralleling his socio-political positioning" (Harrison, 2015, 44). He (2015, 45) states about the first and formative phase of Horace's poetic career, that is roughly the period until Actium in which he wrote S.1, S.2, *Epod.* and some *Carmina*, that this phase

is marked by a rhetoric of literary and socio-political ascent. Horace rises from the humble exponent of rough Lucilian satire, refining it in Callimachean terms, through Archilochean iambus [*Epod*], tempered for new times, to the brink of lyric operations, matching the movement from Republican defeat at Philippi and loss of property to the generous patronage of Maecenas and political engagement with the interests of the young Caesar.

Harrison writes here about S.1 on which I focus in this chapter, and about the *Epodes* which I briefly discuss in section 3.3. I will also discuss in section 3.3 the political content of some poems of *Carm.*1 which Horace wrote before 30 B.C. Harrison

⁵⁹ Muecke (2007, 115-120). She discusses the views of DuQuesnay (1984) and of Freudenburg (2001, 71-124). See also Bond (2009, 138-142).

(2015, 46-52) also considers the match of Horace's poetic ascent and his socio-political stance in *Carm.*1-3 and *Ep.*1. For example, he (2015, 48) mentions the poet's "quieter approach to both metre and subject matter: a set of poems in which moral philosophy is prominent" in *Carm.*2, and as the latter "comes to a close, it shows some anticipation of the national and grave themes of the Roman Odes at the beginning of [Carm.] Book 3: in particular 2.18, with its criticism of luxury." Next, Harrison (2015, 52-58) discusses the political meaning of Horace's later work written in the last ten years of his life, between 17 and 8 B.C., the celebratory *Carmen Saeculare* and *Carm.*4 with its nationalistic themes of Roman military achievements. Concerning the poet's career, Harrison (2015, 55) sees that in *Carm.*4 "the main emphasis [...] is undoubtedly that on the mature poet at the zenith of his career who has established himself in a public and national role." Finally, Horace in his last three poems, *Ep.*2.1, *Ep.*2.2, and *Ars Poetica*, looks back on a distinguished career "who combines proud self-elevation [...] with a beguiling touch of self-deprecation" (Harrison, 2015, 58).

It is apparent from what I wrote in section 1.4 that I differ from Harrison's view on the relationship between Horace and Maecenas, which I see as one of *amicitia* and not one of "generous patronage," and that I recognize the poet's independent and critical posture with respect to the interests of Octavian. Nevertheless, I regard Harrison's views about Horace's poetic career and his socio-political positioning as consistent with my working assumption that he wrote S.1 as credentials for Maecenas: a preparatory step in his career as a future political commentator establishing himself in a national role. He bore out the latter role in his poems in different genres beginning with the *Epodi* and maintaining the role until the end of his life. Horace emphasizes in both S.1 and the *Epodi* that he writes for an audience of friends: Maecenas and his associates. This is apparent from the opening lines of *Sermones* book 1 and the *Epodi* when he addresses Maecenas in both cases by name. We will also see that he speaks warmly about his associates and about being accepted by Maecenas and the members of his circle in quite a few of the individual *sermones* (in S.1.3-1.7, S.1.9 and S.1.10). In this book, I will not discuss in detail Horace's poetic development and choices; this has been done amply in the scholarly literature, for example by Freudenburg (1993) and Harrison (2015). I present briefly some aspects of Horace's poetic choices when relevant for the purpose of this study, for instance when I discuss S.1.3.29-34 and the opening of S.1.4. Yet, at this stage it is appropriate to say a few words about the place of Greek *iambus* in and its influence on Horace's books of *Sermones* and the book of *Epodi*. Freudenburg (1993, 103-104) states that "Horace is a writer of iambs, both in his *Epodes*, which fit the metrical qualification, and in the *Satires* [i.e. *Sermones*], which do not. As a satirist [i.e. the author of S.1 and S.2], he could quite reasonably consider himself as writing in the same tradition as the great writers of Greek iambic poetry." In my view, Horace recognized the qualities of the *iambus* for his own purposes, and thus he chose the iambic genre for his self presentation in S.1, and for the *Epodi*, his training in the role as a political commentator (for examples of political *epodi*, see section 3.3). The *iambus* was a good literary choice for delivering critical poetry about

norms in society and socio-political issues in *S.1* and the *Epodi*; this is in accordance with Heyworth (2001, 130), who points out that elements of archaic Greek *iambus* were among other things “the use of anecdote,” “passion in friendship and enmity,” and “frankness of expression (especially in sexual matters).” Horace himself addresses the nature of the *iambus* in *Ars.*79-82, and “clearly defines iamb” (Barchiesi, 2001, 143-147). He refers undeniably in three places in his oeuvre to Archilochus and Hipponax as poets of invective iambic verse and as sources of inspiration. The reference to both Archilochus and Hipponax is found in *Epod.*6.11-14, and to Archilochus only in *Ep.*1.19.23-25 and *Ars.*79. Mankin (2010, 96) states that the ancient Greek *iambus*

was, in essence, “blame poetry” that in various ways and with varying degrees of hostility found fault with conduct that was considered inappropriate or dangerous. The sense of what merited blame was determined not so much by the individual iambist’s personal experience and sensibilities as by the norms of his society or social group.

However, Horace’s inspiration by Archilochus, Hipponax and successors like Callimachus was not only a literary preference to the iambic, but this also represents two functional choices meant to achieve what he considered the right manner of addressing an audience of friends. The first functional choice lies in the nature of the genre *iambus* in ancient Greek poetry. The Greek *iambus* of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. as practised by Archilochus, Hipponax and others goes back to old Greek cult songs. Mankin points out that *iambus* in archaic Greece was written among others for the symposium, an audience of *φίλοι* (“friends or fellow citizens”), and was “meant to remind the *philo*i of the basis for their *philotes* [*φιλότης*] (“friendship,” “fellowship”) by calling attention to and blaming what might be perceived as threats to the customs, institutions, and modes of conduct that united them as an audience” (Mankin, 2010, 96). For Horace, his amicus Maecenas and the latter’s circle of *φίλοι*, many of whom he mentions in the closing lines of *S.1.10*, were his audience for both *S.1* and the *Epodi*.

Horace had a second reason to choose the iambic genre; this choice is related to what Watson (2003, 18-19) describes as “the manifest sympathy of Maecenas for the *novi poetae*. The fragments which survive of his [Maecenas’] poetry, albeit scanty, give clear evidence of this.” Hierche (1974, 155; note 41) already recorded Maecenas’ sympathy for Catullus. He states “dans le premier groupe [i.e. les *épodes* qui s’adressent à Mécène 1, 9, 14], les réminiscences de Catulle sont certainement provoquées par le goût que Mécène manifestait pour sa poésie [i.e. de Catulle]” (“In the first group [i.e. the *epodi* 1, 9, and 14 addressing Maecenas], the allusions to Catullus have certainly been brought about by the predilection that Maecenas showed for his (Catullus’) poetry”). In order to understand Maecenas’ sympathy, we must consider at this stage the iambic poems of Catullus. Heyworth (2001, 130-135) analyses the above-mentioned elements from archaic Greek *iambus* in Catullian poems. These elements can also be found in *S.1* and the *Epodi*. I single out one of

the elements, namely “the use of anecdotes,” that Heyworth (2001, 131) instances in Horatian poems “as teasing identification of the poet and his target,” such as in *Epod.4*, where “he attacks the freedman who has risen to the rank of *tribunus militum* and now parades along the *Via Sacra*,” the opening of *S.1.9*, where Horace himself strolls along the same way when he comes across the “bore,” and Canidia and her witchcraft in *S.1.8*, *Epod.5* and 17. Watson (2003, 17-19), writing about the *Epodi*, also addresses the convergence of Catullus’ and Horace’s work by evaluating the influence of Neotericism and the *poetae novi* in the *Epodi*: in my view his conclusions also hold for *S.1*. Watson quotes several scholars, of whom the first one is Gagliardi (1971, 61) who argues “that Neotericism is the key to reading the *Epodes*.” Watson (2003, 17) continues by paraphrasing Gagliardi that “it is unthinkable, he [Gagliardi] insisted, that Horace, in taking over as he did the poetic ideals of Callimachus, should have bypassed the *poetae novi*,” and in particular Catullus whom he “adapted” (quoting Watson) and adopted extensively in the *Epodi*. Watson (2003, 17) also considers Heyworth’s (2001,117-119) views stating that he

has rightly insisted that there is much that is demonstrably Archilochean and iambic in the Catullan corpus: [...] it is thus possible to argue that Horace drew inspiration from the twin conduits of Archilochus and ‘Archilochean’ Catullus, even if the latter debt went unacknowledged.

Watson (2003, 19) quotes two of the poems by Maecenas (fragments 2 and 3, Courtney, 2003) addressed to Horace with “explicit echoes of Catullus.” Thus, we find in Horace’s *Sermones* and *Epodi*, which were written in 30s B.C., and also in Maecenas’ poetry echoes of Catullus. It is very plausible that Horace knew of Maecenas’ sympathy for the *poetae novi* and Catullus and that he saw the potential of Maecenas’ preference for his own purpose. Hence, he interlaced both *S.1* and the *Epodi* with Neoteric and Catullian elements to please Maecenas in order to enhance the chance of success of his self-presentation: in other words, the Catullian allusions are subtleties within the iambic genre for the connoisseur Maecenas.

I examined Horace’s political engagement in my thesis entitled *The Augustan Poets: Their Master’s Voices?* (Weeda, 2010, 238-243). Although I would not now agree with some of the approach in the latter study, I regard my conclusions about Horace’s role of political commentator as still valid. I (2010, 239) argued that Horace “maintained his output of engaged political poetry at a constant level during his life.” About a quarter (44 poems) of his total output has a topical political content; half of those are concerned with the civil war and his expectations of better times under Augustus’ leadership. Fifteen poems are supportive, twelve are critical of Octavian or of the regime in general. However, there is a significant difference. The supportive poems are almost absent before Actium and nearly all are written after 27 B.C. The critical poems are evenly distributed between 42 and 11 B.C., indicating the poet’s independence: Horace was not Augustus’ voice in a putative propaganda programme. Up to the present, the view that the *Sermones* contain political messages has not

been generally held. For example, Lowrie (2007, 80) argues that Horace's political involvement starts with the *Epodi* and reads the *Sermones* as showing "[Horace's] private stance in satire, and the consistent depiction of his participation in Maecenas' circle as non-political." However, I agree with DuQuesnay (1984, 57) who argues that Horace expressed in a number of *Sermones* his views on contemporary social and political developments, but that at the time he did not yet write "as a detached observer, but as the friend of Maecenas." He (1984, 57) regards the poems as an expression of the poet's genuine belief that Octavian was the best hope of "achieving peace, prosperity and freedom."

A colleague observed in a private communication that Horace himself "constantly refers to Lucilius as his predecessor." He mentions S.1.1, S.1.4, S.1.10 and *Ep.*2.2 as evidence, which I will examine in section 2.2. He states that Horace "plays with the word *satis* and its connection with *satura* (S.1.1.120: *iam satis est*)." In my analysis of S.1.1 in section 2.2.1, I consider S.1.1.119 (*satur*) and S.1.1.120. I will argue that these lines do not refer to satire, as attributing satiric characteristics to the *Sermones* is presumably post-Horatian, perhaps even post-Quintilian. These lines are primarily an intertextual allusion to the last lines of Virgil's *Ecl.*10 thus delivering the message of the latter, that is a critical commentary on contemporary politics. Discussing S.1.4 in section 2.2.2, I note that unlike Lucilius (and Juvenal) Horace never addresses in S.1 wrong-doers directly. In the same sermo, he doesn't wish to imitate Lucilius, but he does not say either that he wants to be a satiric poet. The colleague refers also specifically to S.1.4.78-80 of which he claims that Horace "notes that his [Horace's] criticism has ruffled feathers (S.1.4.78-80)" meaning that in those lines he is accused of malicious backbiting, in other words writing sharp satire. I will present below in section 2.2.2 a very different reading of these two lines, namely that this passage relates to the poet's view on behaviour among friends.⁶⁰ They should certainly censure each other if necessary, but this should be done in a civilized manner, and the passage is just the opposite of a case for satire. In my view, S.1.10 is least of all an example of Horace referring to Lucilius as his predecessor. I will argue in section 2.2.5 that he in S.1.10.48-49 states that he does not presume to take the crown of satirical poetry from Lucilius. Those two lines are not "a mock-deferential bow from the inheritor to the inventor of satire" (Gowers, 2012, 328), but they tell us that he does not want to be the inheritor and that he does not intend to write satiric poetry. Finally, the colleague cites *Ep.*2.2.60 as evidence that Horace himself sees some of his work as satire. This line is part of a passage (*Ep.*2.2.55-65) about old age: *tendunt extorquere poemata* ([the years] tend to take away from my poems). He asks what to do knowing that not everyone has the same taste (*denique non omnes eadem mirantur amanti*).

⁶⁰ With thanks to an anonymous reviewer of this book. For the significance of Horace using three times the word *niger* (or word-forms) in the passage S.1.4.78-103 for my interpretation, see my discussion in section 2.2.2 and note 167.

Then, he mentions in lines 59–60 three of the genres he engaged in and which have different followers: you like the *carmen* (*carmine tu gaudes*), the one takes pleasure in iambics (Horace's *Epodi*) (*hic delectatur iambis*), and the other delights in *sermones* like those of Bion with their wicked wit (*ille [delectatur] Bioneis sermonibus et sale nigro*). Horace makes two intertextual allusions to S.1 in *Ep.2.2.60*: the first one to his title of S.1, *Sermones*, and the second to the word *niger* in S.1.4.85. One should note that Horace used again the word *Sermones* and not *Saturae*. The second allusion (*niger*) is to S.1.4.85, a line that closely follows the very same lines which the scholar quoted earlier as referring to satire, which I discussed above. I will also argue in section 2.2.2 below that Horace gives in S.1.4.78-85 a catalogue of malice that in his view cannot be tolerated among friends. Line 85 closes this passage with the warning that one should stay clear of the man who is malicious to his friends: *hic niger est, hunc tu, Romane, caveto* (he is the wicked, of him, true Roman, take heed). Taking the two allusions in *Ep.2.2.60* together, I suggest that Horace indicates that he prefers that one reads S.1 as conversation pieces (*Sermones*), and that some men may like Bionian satires, but that he does not share their liking and would not wish to produce poetry “with wicked wit (*sale nigro*).” I will present my interpretation of Horace's attitude towards Bionian satires in section 2.2.3 when I discuss his *libertino patre natum* (a freedman's son) in S.1.6.45-52. As an aside, we will see in the discussion of S.1.4.85 that I also interpret the words “*hunc tu, Romane, caveto*” as Horace's functional reference to his belief in the old Roman values, *mos maiorum*, which are for him an inspiration for his moral guidance.

Muecke (2007, 117), among others, poses the question “why, in a specific political and cultural context, Horace turned satire away from political invective towards quietism and witty, but unthreatening, moral criticism.” Gowers (2012, 11) also remarks that Horace turned satire “from a bursting, angry genre into a slim and contented one.” Horace wrote indeed a less biting and more friendly form of poetry because he had a specific objective in mind.⁶¹ This was not a literary objective, but a functional one. He wanted to write his political commentary for Maecenas and his new circle of friends in recognisable literary forms. It is likely that Horace felt that his contribution to the debate about political issues should not be delivered in the manner of Lucilius, as he may have been of opinion that the traditional invective style used in satires at the time was counter-productive in getting his political views across. Freudenburg (2001, 20-21) explains the less invective nature of Horace's *Sermones* by pointing out that the latter above all seems to be motivated by his own social career. He states that Horace's self-interest is apparent from the dedication of the first book of *Sermones* to Maecenas: *QVI fit, Maecenas, ut nemo* (how can it be, Maecenas, that nobody). He (2001, 21) refers to Oliensis (1998, 17-18) by stating “recently, Ellen Oliensis has remarked on the obvious irony that inheres in naming Maecenas so prominently in the first half-line

⁶¹ Anderson (1982, 13-28); Freudenburg (2001, 4-9; 15-23); Gowers (2012, 6-12).

of a poem [S.1.1] where social climbers are freely abused: the act of naming Maecenas lets us see the social climber in Horace himself.” Oliensis (1998, 18) says indeed that “it was presumably by means of poems such as *Satires* 1.1 that Horace courted and won the favor of Maecenas. The satirist climbs the social ladder by poking fun at social climbers.” However, on the same page she states that “it is impossible either to convict or to acquit Horace of the charges – unscrupulous ambition, opportunism, materialism, parasitism – to which his autobiography made him vulnerable.” By this last statement, she leaves the question whether Horace should be seen as a social climber open. Although Horace made indeed a dazzling career from a loser at Philippi to a member of Maecenas’ circle of friends, I will present my arguments that he should not be seen as a social climber in my discussion of S.1.6.111-128, a typical day in the poet’s life. Freudenburg (2001, 21) also states:

His book’s dedication to Maecenas, while blunt and minimal, the least elaborate dedication in all Latin literature (a single word), carries powerful implications for the speaker’s self, and the way his lessons will be received: it puts him squarely inside a world of Roman social relations where promising young poets look to men of means to provide them access to books, learned audiences, and facilities, as well as abundant political and financial rewards.

As mentioned above, Horace’s *Sermones* are less abusive than for example those of Lucilius. Nisbet (2007, 9) states that “his ambiguous origin and new-found caution [after his involvement with Brutus’ party] kept him from attacking important people in either genre [*Satires* and *Epodes*].” I concluded in Weeda (2010, 240-241; 340; 396) that the poet was critical of the leadership and the policies of Octavian in a number of the *Sermones* and *Epodi*, and that he did not trade away his independence for his admission as a member of Maecenas’ circle or for the gift of the Sabine estate, nor that the nature of his relationship with Maecenas was such that he felt obliged to hold back in his critical commentary (see the closure of section 1.4). Gowers (2012,1) states in the opening sentence of her commentary that “*Satires* I, published around 36/5 BC, is Horace’s debut, a point of departure, in which he explains how he arrived where he is and where he might be going in the future.” Gowers’ statement can be read as an interpretation of S.1 that comes pretty close to mine.

Schlegel (2005, 3-18) suggests a different incitement for Horace’s style of poetry. She (2005, 6) also raises the question of which “authority inheres in the satirist that justifies his hearers’ attention.” She argues that

The listener looks to the source of the speech, the speaker of blame, to justify his attention to such speech; and the result is that the satirist himself is as much the object of attention as his speech.

I [Schlegel] argue that Horace creates a persona for himself, as the satiric speaker in book 1 of the *Satires*, which can be understood as a response to the tensions inherent in the operation of hostile speech. Readers of Horace’s *Satires* have often seen his poems as anomalous to the genre of satire. Horace’s satire is mild, not harsh, and presents none of the risky sting that we expect from satiric speech; Juvenal, far better than Horace, conveys the tone we associate with satire.

Yet the poems of *Satires I* delve more deeply into the crucial issues inherent in the genre than do those of any other Roman satirist.

What type of *persona* does Horace create? Although he identifies audiences as targets for blame poetry, he does not censure those in a direct confrontation. Schlegel (2005, 7) recognizes that Horace intends to avoid conflict when she observes “what the poems of book 1 do, rather than enacting conflict – that is, speaking invective against an audience – is to present the issue of powerful speech and domination that inhere in satire.” In her view, Horace’s “satiric” *persona* reveals the unequal power between speaker and hearer, that is “the power of speech to menace, control and overpower the hearer.” Horace mitigates this burden of inequality by not addressing his targets by himself, but by different speakers. I suggest that the appearance of those different speakers is not the result of a psychological need of Horace’s “satiric” *persona* to invalidate the threat of satiric speech, but of the poet’s symbolizing the different contributors to a conversation.⁶² Schegel (2005,10) also suggests that the attributes Horace grants to his “satiric” *persona* “from his tiny verbal output to his low social status, act as a counterweight to the expectation of a satiric speaker who exercises clout, *auctoritas* of an overweening kind, over his listener.” I read, however, in the poems many clear and critical expressions of ethical and political points of view.

Although the form and content of S.1 was determined in the first place by Horace’s objective to present himself as a reliable member of Maecenas circle, he nevertheless already gives in S.1 some of his first commentary on contemporary Roman social and political life to Maecenas. In addition, he recognizes that he should give his commentary without antagonizing his listeners by the traditional style of the satiric genre. Horace did not choose his style on literary grounds, or to achieve psychological effects, or to further his social career, but to further his professional career. We will see in the course of analysing the poems that he adopts the style of the gentleman commentator with some characteristics of a jester. In this way, he keeps the communication with his associates open, and their attention remains focused on the subject matter and not on the way of presentation. In addition he chose for book 1 of the *Sermones* the form of a *sermo* because he believed that this form was the most appropriate one to meet his functional objective: to make a contribution to a civilized discussion among friends about socio-political issues. The *Sermones* are a form of poetic conversation, a *sermo*, as Anderson (1982, 13-49) convincingly argues.⁶³ *Sermo* also has the connotation of a philosophical conversation. But, in my opinion, this should not be taken literally in the case of S.1. Horace writes indeed about matters

62 Schlegel (2005, 8-9) points out that Horace intends his satiric persona to take full account of his “principle of balance,” that is “the idea of limitation that must be embraced if one is to be content with merely *enough*.” However, I see this as one of the poet’s philosophical convictions, and not as one of his ideas for the style of his satiric genre.

63 For the *Sermones* as a form of poetic conversation, see also Gowers (2005, 48-50).

of moral virtue – like avarice, unbridled ambition, lack of restraint – or writes about frank criticism (*parrhesia*), which are firmly rooted in Hellenistic philosophy. Further, he adhered to the Epicurean circle of Philodemus and he identifies what he considers the failings of Stoic teachings. Apart from engaging Maecenas and his associates in a philosophical discourse, he also raises or alludes to those issues in S.1 in order to demonstrate that his socio-political views have a firm basis in contemporary moral philosophy acceptable to Maecenas. This raises the question of the audience or audiences of S.1, and it is useful to discuss this issue at this stage with the help of the classification of Gold (1992, 161-175).⁶⁴ She distinguishes in S.1 four audiences. The first one is the primary audience, that is the dedicatee of S.1.1, and also according to Gold (1992, 163) “probably of the book as a whole once it was put together.” The addressee is Maecenas, who is present one way or another in virtually each poem of S.1, and is a “prominent theme” who also happens to lend “dignity and authority to the poem by his name and presence.” However, I differ from Gold’s (1992, 164) view that Maecenas is presented in S.1.1 “as a friend who is interested in philosophical disquisitions on contentment and greed and is the suitable recipient of a diatribe on these subjects.” The same can also be argued for a number of the following individual *sermones* like S.1.2-1.4 and S.1.6, although those poems have different subject matters than S.1.1. I will argue in this book that Maecenas is indeed present as a (potential) *amicus*: however, not one for philosophical conversations, but one who must get acquainted with Horace and be convinced of the latter’s worth as a companion of the other members of Maecenas’ circle. The second audience, which Gold (1992, 164-165) calls the internal audience, is “the vague second-person addressee, recipient of Horace’s constant questions and exhortations. [...] It is also the group that displays the very set of qualities that Horace has set out to admonish and correct [...] and] which we, the actual audience, and Horace’s authorial audience can scorn and mock.” The latter statement by Gold, namely that the actual and authorial audiences of the *sermo* can scorn and mock the set of qualities that Horace has identified for his commentary and criticism, supports my view that he wrote the *Sermones* as “papers” for discussion with Maecenas and his associates. The first question is: who are the members of these two audiences? The second is: what are the qualities that are criticized? First, the authorial audience is Gold’s third layer audience consisting according to her (1992, 163) of “the first-century B.C. Roman upper-class writers and politicians to whose experience and values Horace appeals and who could be counted on to understand the full effect of Horace’s mixed signals and ironic tone.” I see the description of the group of men as applicable to Maecenas’ circle of associated writers like Fundanius, Melissus, Plotius Tucca, Propertius, L. Varius Rufus, and Virgil (see also note 45), the philosopher Philodemus and politicians like Cocceius Nerva, Fonteius Capito, and Lucius Licinius Varro Murena, Maecenas’ brother-in-law. Gold’s actual audience is

⁶⁴ I am indebted to an anonymous reviewer to bring her (1992, 161-185) work on S.1 to my notice.

the person who is reading or hearing a text at any given moment: in our case the contemporary readers of or listeners to a *sermo* of Horace. Second, concerning the question about the qualities to be criticized, Gold (1992, 165) gives us examples of those from S.1.1: “lines 4-8, 15-19, 43, 51, 64-67, 80-83, 95-100,” representing the vices of envy, discontent, greed, lack of restraint and ambition. Thus, I understand Gold to say that she reads S.1.1 as Horace’s account of the vices of the internal audience presented to Maecenas and members of his circle to be scorned and mocked by them. I broaden her interpretation – if I understand her correctly – and I will argue in section 2.2.2 (at the closure of S.1.3) that in S.1.1.3 the members of the elite, the new rich and the extreme Stoics constitute the internal audience. The *sermo* is Horace’s account of the vices of this internal audience presented to Maecenas and members of his circle in order for them to learn about Horace’s social status and political views. Horace’s purpose is not to admonish those groups as satiric poet.⁶⁵ When Horace mentions individuals or groups in a *sermo*, he does not intend to address them, but to consider with Maecenas and his associates the views, behaviour or actions of these individuals or groups. Interpreting the outcome of Anderson’s (1982) work in a functional frame, I identify four attributes of the *Sermones* which support this view. First, an indication that Horace intended his *Sermones* as a form of poetic discourse emerges from his choice of style having characteristics of the conversational mode. For example, Horace used simple language as this encourages the conversational style. In S.1.4.41-42 he wrote: *si qui scribat uti nos/ sermoni propiora* (if one writes more like conversational prose, as I do). That is not to say that Horace intended to write in a style similar to prose, as we will see below, when I discuss S.1.4.38-62 in more detail (see section 2.2.2). Horace shows there that his *sermones* – the word he used three times in the passage – can match the best of poetic standards.⁶⁶ He proves in the passage, especially in lines 39-44 and 56-62, his talent (*ingenium*) and skill of composition (*ars*), and especially his mastery in word-order. Oberhelman and Armstrong (1995, 244) discussing the comparison with Ennius made by Horace himself in lines S.1.4.53-62 say about the latter

that Horace has managed to prove [...] two points: that metathesis [changing the word-order] will destroy good poetry (and so Horace’s satires [in my view *sermones*] are good poetry), and that Ennius’ verse, while poetry, is not good poetry because the effects of metathesis are minimal.

⁶⁵ Contrary to Rudd (2007, 35), who argues that Horace speaks directly to his audiences. See also Gold (1992, 166-169), who (1992, 168) hints at my interpretation referring to S.1.1.19 where *nolint* “objectifies the people addressed here and makes them into a part of the story rather than direct addressees.” See also the discussion of line 19 in section 2.2.1.

⁶⁶ For Horace and the poetic qualities of his *Sermones*, see Anderson (1982); Freudenburg (1993, 145-150); Oberhelman & Armstrong (1995).

Thus, Horace's poetry matches that of the best of poets from the past. In addition, he uses simple conversational words, as Anderson (1982, 25) notes about S.1.4.39-44:

Now, looked at from a different side, these lines exhibit the special poetic possibilities of satire. Although the writer deals with a subtle argument, he explains his thoughts in simple language. [...] Horace makes sure that important words are assigned to the key structural points of the hexameter. [...] Thus, we might say that Horace here proves how different *sermo* is from epic, but he also subtly shows that his own *sermo*, because it does so much more than imitate conversation, deserves the title of poetry.

This passage in the fourth *sermo* suggests that Horace had carefully considered his approach. By writing down these lines in a very early stage of his poetic career, he defines his position with Maecenas and his confidants as a poet. A second indication is Horace's use of the first-person *persona* (see section 1.3.1). In the *Sermones*, he often refers to autobiographical events, but it is likely that many of the described events never actually took place. In the case of S.1 these "autobiographical" contexts may also have a specific purpose. Horace, a newcomer in the circle of Maecenas' confidants, may pretend that his socio-political commentary is based on "real" experience. In other words, stories about journeys to Brundisium, meetings with important people, or his youth in Venusia, are his credentials with which he supported his reliability and experience as an observer of political and social trends. Third, as we saw above, Horace dedicates the whole first book of *Sermones* to Maecenas by the address to him in S.1.1.1, and he addresses Maecenas again in S.1.6.1.⁶⁷ This also indicates that the poems were intended as conversation pieces for Maecenas.⁶⁸ The *Sermones* were not written for general distribution, but specifically for Maecenas, and through the latter for Octavian, and perhaps delivered to the addressee and a small group of trusted men in the latter's immediate circle.⁶⁹ According to Gowers (2012, 11): "H.[orace] writes for exclusive Roman coterie and shuns the crowd." Gowers' (2012, 19) conjecture that Horace's "'private' dialogues are broadcast well beyond his circle of chosen readers" may be right to some extent, but this was not the poet's intention writing these poems. This is also borne out by Horace himself who in S.1.4.22-23 says *cum mea nemo/ scripta legat vulgo recitare timentis* (while nobody reads my writings, and I fear to recite them in public). Fourth, comparing the programme proposed by Freudenburg (1993) with mine, I register that Freudenburg recognizes that the *Sermones* are not only poems

⁶⁷ The "address" in S.1.10.1fr. to Lucilius is most likely spurious as it is part of the first eight interpolated lines; see also Gowers (2012, 309). Further, Maecenas is mentioned in S.1.3.64; S.1.5.27, 31, 48; S.1.6.47; S.1.9.43; S.1.10.81. None of the poems of S.1 is dedicated to Octavian, although he is mentioned by name in S.1.3.4.

⁶⁸ See also Freudenburg (1993, 22; 2001, 20); Zetzel (1980, 62-64). For the question whether the *Sermones* were intended by Horace as teaching conversations, see Freudenburg (1993, 12-19); Gowers (2012, 12-15).

⁶⁹ Conform DuQuesnay (1984, 57).

with moral lessons, but also have much to say about aesthetics.⁷⁰ In his own words (1993, 185):

Yet even the diatribes, which seem, at times, half-witted, the most unsophisticated of all the poems of Horace, conceal a second side, a metaphorical dialogue exposing the aesthetic values of the poet and his commitment to writing elegant, highly allusive poems in the Callimachean tradition.

Freudenburg gives many examples of this second side. I suggest that in addition to the two sides that he proposes, the moralizing and the aesthetical, Horace's *Sermones* have a third side, that is the political, on which I focus.

2.2 *Sermones*, Book 1: Conversation Pieces

I mentioned that Horace wrote a less biting and more friendly form of poetry with a socio-political purport than for instance Lucilius as he had a specific objective in mind, that is that he wanted to raise political questions for debate with Maecenas and the circle of his newly found friends. It is likely that Horace felt that his opinion should not be delivered in the aggressive manner of Lucilius. However, Horace may have had primarily a different, special, reason to write a somewhat subdued first book of poetry. He was probably admitted to the group connected with Maecenas in 39/38 B.C., which was only four years after his ignominious role at the battle of Philippi.⁷¹ Only three to four years later, he released book 1 of the *Sermones* in 36/35 B.C. When Horace started writing his first *Sermones* in the late forties or early thirties B.C., he, at the relatively young age of twenty-seven, was launched into Maecenas' group presumably without much experience in writing poetry with a socio-political content. I intend therefore to explore whether the first book can be read as a collection of poems in which he not only offers his credentials as a loyal member of the group, but also practices the art of writing poetry with a critical political content, that is acceptable for Maecenas and his entourage. Therefore, he may have considered the genre of the *Sermones* suitable for using the instrument of what I call the functional reference. I have discussed the notion of the functional reference above in section 1.2. I will identify many examples of Horace using those references when he makes a political point.

The first three *Sermones*, also called Horace's diatribes, are according to Rudd (2007, 1) "sermons of a rather special kind. They do not call for allegiance to any divine

⁷⁰ For "Morals and Aesthetics in the *Satires*," see Freudenburg (1993, 185-198).

⁷¹ For Horace's involvement in the battle of Philippi at Brutus' side, see *Carm.*2.79, *Carm.*3.4.26, and *Ep.*2.2.49. See also section 1.3.2.

power or any sacred writings, nor do they urge us to repent and seek salvation. Their only appeal is to common sense. What is it, they ask, that makes man unhappy?”⁷² In the diatribes the place of individuals in society and their behaviour in a moral sense are at issue, not that of the institutions. In these three poems, the poet directs his criticism at different people and he is concerned with ethical lessons of all kinds. In what follows, however, I do not use the traditional classification of the poems, such as S.1.1-1.3 constitute the group of the “diatribe satires.” I propose an arrangement of the poems that follows Horace’s efforts to secure his newly found position as a candidate member of Maecenas’ circle. Horace presents his developing views on socio-political themes in the individual poems, thus enabling him to introduce himself to Maecenas through a range of subjects which the poet chooses himself for discussion. The individual *sermones* are very much related to each other; I concur very much with Oberhelman and Armstrong (1995, 237-239), who state that S.1 “should be read and considered as a whole” (1995, 237). In my opinion, this relationship is a result not only of Horace’s main objective, that is his self-presentation which shows in S.1.5-1.9 an increasing confidence that he will be accepted by Maecenas. It is also a result of his developing views on his place in Maecenas’ circle and his role as a future political commentator; it should be noted, that he often refers back, for example in S.1.4 back to S.1.1-1.3 and in S.1.10 to S.1.4. I arranged the poems in the following groups of two: *Sermones* 1.1 and 1.2: The cynical ways of the aristocracy and the nouveau riche (section 2.2.1). *Sermones* 1.3 and 1.4: From censuring the elite and the nouveau riche to a serious conversation with friends (section 2.2.2). *Sermones* 1.5 and 1.6: Horace’s credentials for Maecenas continued: a journey to Brundisium; youth and education in Venusia and Rome (section 2.2.3). *Sermones* 1.7 and 1.8: Threats from the East: Parthia and Egypt (section 2.2.4). *Sermones* 1.9 and 1.10: Maecenas’ circle: no place for nouveau riche. Horace’s literary programme for several genres, the literary schools revisited (section 2.2.5).

2.2.1 *Sermones* 1.1 and 1.2: The Cynical Ways of the Aristocracy and the Nouveau Riche

Horace, after dedicating in the **first *Sermo*** his book to Maecenas with only three opening words *QVI fit, Maecenas* (how can it be, Maecenas), directs our attention to the discontent of many who envy other people. They complain as they believe that

⁷² For S.1, see Anderson (1982, 13-41); Ferriss-Hill (2015); Freudenburg (1993); Gowers (2005, 48-57; 2012, 1-28); Lefèvre (1993, 85-111); Oliensis (1998, 17-40); Schlegel (2005); Shackleton Bailey (1982, 10-31). For *Sermones* 1.1-1.3, see Freudenburg (2001, 15-27); Turpin (2009). For individual *sermones*, see Ferriss-Hill (2015); Freudenburg (1993); Rudd (2007) and the commentaries of Brown (2007) and Gowers (2012).

other men do always better than they and that they stand a poor chance in life. Lines 1-3 read:

*QVI fit, Maecenas, ut nemo, quam sibi sortem
seu ratio dederit seu fors obiecerit, illa
contentus vivat, laudet diversa sequentis?*

(how can it be, Maecenas, that nobody lives content with the lot that he either chose himself, or chance threw his way, but has praise for those who pursue other courses?)

In lines 4-12, he gives us examples: the soldier envies the trader and the reverse, the jurist the farmer, and the countryman the city dweller. Horace claims in S.1.1.13-14 that he can give many more examples: *cetera de genere hoc, adeo sunt multa, loquacem/ delassare valent Fabium* (other examples of this type [of men], so many are they, could even wear out loquacious Fabius), who according to Gowers (2012, 66) “may be Fabius Maximus (according to the scholiasts a Pompeian and a Stoic – allowing H.[orace] to kill two birds with one stone), the Theophrastus of his day.” Similarly to Horace in the opening of S.1, Fabius also recounted in his writings the conduct of different types of men (*genere hoc*). Fabius, however wrote from a Stoic point of view, and Horace makes through the functional reference to Fabius immediately clear at the start of his book that he does not wish to be associated with the latter’s Stoic views. He will reiterate this point in S.1.3.96-98 where he criticizes the Stoic view that all sins are equal and in S.1.3.124-128 where he ridicules the Stoic paradox (see section 2.2.2). We saw in section 1.1 that Horace’s objective in writing S.1 was to convince Maecenas that he was the right man to be associated with the latter’s circle and that he held the right political views, which were not those held by the Stoics. Horace wants to assure his readers that his association with the Republicans belongs to the past after Philippi. The Stoics were generally found within the camp of the Republicans and Pompeians. In addition, Horace describes Fabius as long-winded, as he presumably tired out his audience with his Stoic views. Horace, however, intends to write in a much more sophisticated and subtle manner, as he will appeal to his readers’ education and sophistication. This is apparent from lines 14-15, in which he used the word *deducam* in line 15. Freudenburg (1993, 111) called attention to the use of *deducam*; in my opinion it indicates both the poet’s intentions concerning style and those concerning his political posture. Freudenburg observes that Horace will present against Fabius’ garrulity and unbridled free speech – both attributes for which the Stoics were known – “his own refined practices (1.1.14-15): *Ne te morer, audi/ quo rem deducam* (‘lest I detain you, hear how I reduce the matter at hand’).” He suggests that the word *deducam* may allude to a *carmen deductum*.⁷³ We will see in the discussion

⁷³ For *carmen deductum*, see Deremetz (1995, 287-314); Freudenburg (2001, 36-38); Keith (2002, 246). For the meaning of *carmen deductum* in ancient historiography, see Rosati (1999, 246-247; 2002, 276);

of the final lines of this *sermo* that Freudenburg (2001, 37), comparing *iam satis est* (now, it is enough) in S.1.1.120 with Virgil's *haec sat erit* (it will be enough) in *Ecl.*10.70, and *saturae capellae* in *Ecl.*10.77, points out that in the final lines of Virgil's book of *Eclogae* the images of substance and fullness of the *capellae saturae* go together with "something delicate" and thin of the "just 'sufficient' muse." The metaphor, when applied to the closure of *Ecl.*10, is "about thickness just as much as it is about thinness." Freudenburg concluded from this concomitance of the two poetic voices that Virgil used the *carmen deductum* to refer to the rich intertextual memories of Virgil's contemporary readers. Deremetz (1995, 299) suggests something similar: "pourrait donc bien symboliser la tradition poétique antérieure" (could therefore indeed symbolize earlier poetic tradition). I argue in Weeda and van der Poel (2016), that the rich intertextual memories which Virgil prompts consist of allusions to the contemporary political situation. It is feasible that Horace, by using the *carmen deductum* in the early lines of his work (S.1.1.15), also refers to the rich intertextual memories of his readers. Further, an anonymous reviewer of this book brought to my notice that there is still another facet of the closure of *Ecl.*10 to consider. He states that "the Vergilian ending is part of a larger pattern of explicit linguistic allusions to closure." When I discuss S.1.1.119-120 below I will examine in more detail the likely meaning of Horace's closure of S.1.1 in the light of Virgil's closure of *Ecl.*10.⁷⁴

Returning to the *carmen deductum*, Horace achieves two objectives. Firstly, the poet makes a statement about his style as a politically engaged poet, "that is, the poet [Horace] resembles the spinner who carefully twists and spins a large tuft of carded wool into a fine, narrow thread. The satirist, unwilling to harangue his audience at length, 'reduces' his theme to the simple stage metaphor of lines 15-22" (Freudenburg, 1993, 111). Secondly, he confronts through Fabius a whole group of contemporary poets, Stoics, republicans and generally men of a very different political leaning than Horace.⁷⁵

Wheeler (2002, 170n23). For *VERG.Ecl.*10.70-77, see Weeda & van der Poel (2016), where this passage about the *carmen deductum* was discussed before.

⁷⁴ We suggest in Weeda & van der Poel (2016, 204-205), that Virgil alludes in *Ecl.*10.70-77 to the following: the image of the sated goats being taken home to rest when evening falls suggests that Virgil encourages the reader to take time to reflect on the grave matters which he broaches in this *ecloga* and indeed in the whole of the book by means of indirect or allusive references. Similarly, when I discuss below the closing lines of S.1.1, I will propose that Horace does not need to spell out his political views in the last two lines of S.1.1, but that he shows those by a functional reference to the final bucolic lines of *Ecl.*10 and through this to the whole of the tenth *Ecloga*, and indeed to the whole of the book of *Eclogae*. For the larger pattern of linguistic allusions, see Fowler (2000, 245-249); Hardie (1997, 142-151); Schrijvers (1973); Smith (1968).

⁷⁵ We will meet windbag Fabius again in the last line of S.1.2. Not counting his poet friends in S.1.5, Fabius is only the first of six contemporary poets mentioned by Horace in the first book of *Sermones*; the other five are Crispinus (in S.1.1.120; 1.3.139; 1.4.14), Fannius (in S.1.4.21; 1.10.80), Caprius and Sulcius (in S.1.4.65-66, 70). I do not count in these six his poet friends, Virgil, Plotius and Varius. For

Next, Horace shows in S.1.1.15-22 not only that his style will not be as bombastic and unrestrained as that of Fabius and others, but also that contemporary philosophies such as Stoicism, are not necessarily the only guides to responsible behaviour. The passage begins with *si quis deus 'en ego' dicat/ 'iam faciam, quod vultis'* (if some god should say “hello there, I will do what you want at once”). Horace forsakes the philosophers invoking in S.1.1.15 and in S.1.1.20 Jupiter. However, he does not expect much of such a course as he demonstrates in the simple stage metaphor of lines 16-22: even if a god were to offer the moaners of lines 1-12 to change places, there would be no takers. Lines 17-19, put in the simple language of a stage director, read: “*hinc vos,/ vos hinc mutatis discedite partibus: eia!/ quid statis?*” *nolint. atqui licet esse beatis* (you here, you there, move and change parts: get a move on! why standing there?” they will not do it. And yet, they could be happy). In lines 20-22, he describes the failure of the god’s involvement. The lines read:

*quid causae est merito quin illis Iuppiter ambas
iratus buccas inflet, neque se fore posthac
tam facilem dicat, votis ut praebeat aurem?*

(Why shouldn’t Jupiter rightly puff up both cheeks in anger at them, and say that never again he will be so compliant as to lend an ear to their prayers?)

Horace says in S.1.1.15-22 that there is nothing that brings those discontented to reason, not even a god who listens to their prayers and Jupiter’s anger. I interpret Horace’s metaphorical use of the god’s anger that he is convinced that the people who feel wronged refuse to act according to either philosophical tenets or to the old veracities of the traditional Roman values, as they follow their own course any way. He is not surprised that those people do not follow the Stoic doctrines, which indeed he also rejects. But, those people are to blame for rejecting the old Roman values, as a return to those values might contribute to greater political and social stability and coherence. Thus, summarising S.1.1.1-22, the opening of Horace’s first book of *Sermones*, I conclude that the passage contains a very important statement about the first book. When I discussed lines 13-14, I argued that those were written to convince Maecenas that he held the right political views, which were not those held by the extreme Stoics, of whom many were Octavian’s opponents (see also my discussion of S.1.3.124-142). By referring to the gods in lines 15-22, he adds to this the positive statement that the old Roman values are the foundation of his outlook upon life.

A brief interlude (lines 23-27) follows, in which the poet “apologizes” for his lack of serious talk when dealing with weighty issues. The interlude functions perhaps also as a form of literary “stage management.” Contrary to Gowers (2012, 68-70), who interprets this short passage in a literary frame, namely that “Horace continues to

the contemporary poets mentioned in the books of *Sermones*, see Freudenburg (1993, 109-119). For Fabius in S.1.1, see Freudenburg (1993, 110-111), and see also note 100. For Fannius, see note 141.

experiment with generic influences,” I interpret these lines as Horace wanting to recover his breath after he closed in line 22 his reflections on essential choices for his future. In the course of discussing the ten sermons of the book, we will see that Horace knows as to how the philosophical connects with the practical. Therefore, he may have considered presenting his views on the everyday ethical issues in the first poem of the book of vital importance.

I argued in section 2.1 that Horace identified in S.1.1 –1.6 distinct social groups not only to determine the poetic genre and the style he would use as political observer, but also to demonstrate to Maecenas that he did not adhere to the views or supported the actions of a number of those groups. He depicts in detail in the greater part that follows, S.1.1.28-107, the characteristics of distinct groups enabling Maecenas to judge the poet’s convictions. I will analyze the poet’s views and relate those to the characteristics of the groups by determining who speaks about a certain issue. He returns in line 28 to the subject with which he opened the satire: the discontent of many people, envying others. S.1.1.28-32 tells us why they are so restless:

*ille gravem duro terram qui vertit aratro,
perfidus hic caupo, miles nautaeque per omne
audaces mare qui currunt, hac mente laborem
sese ferre, senes ut in otia tuta recedant,
aiunt, cum sibi sint congesta cibaria*

(he, who with the strong plough turns over the heavy soil, and also the dishonest innkeeper, the soldier and the sailors, who rashly sail every sea, they say that they bear their labour with this in mind, that when old they may retire into secure comfort, when they have their provisions heaped up)

The discontented farmer, innkeeper, soldier or sailor have one thing in common, that is their desire to get rich and enjoy a comfortable retirement when old. Horace constructs in the following lines his own fable of the ant hoarding her wintersupplies by hauling all she can to the heap that she is piling up (*trahit quodcumque potest atque addit acervo/ quem struit*) (lines 34-35). However, in the end the greedy men differ considerably from the prudent ants, as they do not stop amassing riches. S.1.1.40 reads: *nil obstat tibi dum ne sit te ditior alter* (nothing can stop you, so long as you can prevent someone else from becoming richer than you).

From line 41, Horace censures greed for the next sixty-six lines, which according to Gowers (2012, 72) “comes to form the main body of the poem until the recapitulation at 107.” The poet asks in lines 41-43 the miser *quid iuvat immensum te argenti pondus et auri/ furtim defossa timidum deponere terra?* (What is a huge weight of silver and gold of use to you, if like a thief you get rid of it buried in the ground in fear?). The miser answers that his wealth will disappear, if he were to divide his hoard into small parts (*quod si comminuas*). Then, the poet asks in line 44 what is the beauty of such a pile, if the heap (*acervus*) remains intact. He explains in lines 45-60 that man ought not to cross natural borderlines, and that man does not need more food and drink than his

body can cope with. Even if the greedy man's wealth could give him a gigantic crop of grain, the man's stomach will not take more bread than the poet's (*non tuus hoc capiet venter plus ac meus*). And, even if the miser were to be the young slave (*venalis*) who had to carry the heavy bread-bag (*reticulum panis*) for the whole gang, he would not get an extra ration.

Next, the poet accentuates his arguments for restraint in satisfying natural desires by advocating to stay within nature's bounds. In lines 49-53 he suggests that when a man lives in harmony with nature it does not matter whether he ploughs a hundred or a thousand acres (*iugera centum an/ mille aret*), as long as he can take all he needs from the smaller piece of land: *dum ex parvo nobis tantundem haurire relinquis,/ cur tua plus laudes cumeris granaria nostris?* (as long as you allow us to take just as much from our little heap, why should you praise your granaries more than our baskets?). In lines 54-58 he gives a forceful impression of man's greed and the consequences of stepping outside nature's bounds in the allegory of the man who needs a cup of water, but takes the cup from a wild river rather than from a tiny brook. Their greed makes them blind for the burden of amassing more riches than one needs.⁷⁶

*ut tibi si sit opus liquidi non amplius urna
vel cyatho, et dicas 'magno de flumine mallem
quam ex hoc fonticulo tantundem sumere.' eo fit
plenior ut si quos delectet copia iusto,
cum ripa simul avulsos ferat Aufidus acer.*

(just as if you need no more than a jar or a cup of water, and you were to say "I would rather take such a quantity from a large river than from this little spring." Then it happens that wild Aufidus would tear away all those whom delight in more abundance than is justifiable, bank and all)

Gowers (2012, 74) remarks that "specifying the river's [Aufidus'] name makes this a cautionary tale such as H.[orace] might have heard at his father's knee." Horace's reference to the Aufidus (now Ofanto) has a special meaning indeed, although this is not just "the cautionary tale," which undoubtedly also is a message of the poem. The more important point of the allusion is that Horace takes us back to his youth in Venusia by mentioning the river. Gowers hints at this when she sees the child "at his father's knee." Apart from S.1.1.58, the poet mentions the river only three times. The most notable mention is in *Carm.*3.30.10, in the *exegi monumentum* (I completed a monument) *carmen*, the famous last one of the third book, when he remembers his childhood and his rural background. In the second mention, in *Carm.*4.9.2, he also refers to his origins, and he expects his poetry to remain just as the wide-echoing river will always be there. The last reference, in *Carm.*4.14.25 is a political allusion

⁷⁶ For the other frame in which this passage can be read, see Freudenburg (1993, 187-190). Freudenburg (1993, 189) interprets this as: "Horace buries other clues in the illustration to suggest that he intends the image metaphorically, as a jibe against the wild, unrestrained verbiage of his poetic rivals."

to Tiberius' military action in Gallia, devastating like the Aufidus.⁷⁷ Horace uses the functional reference to the river Aufidus to locate the allegory of the greedy man having a drink in the river in his native town. It is feasible that Horace refers here to what he experienced in his youth, when the greed and arrogant conduct of the new class of rulers, the military, called the shots in Venusia (also mentioned in S.1.6.72-75), and consequent destruction of the traditional social structure of his home town. I will further consider the significance of Horace's reference to the Aufidus at the end of the discussion of S.1.1.

In lines 61-63 Horace gives us one of his beliefs that for many people enough is not enough:

*at bona pars hominum decepta cupidine falso
'nil satis est' inquit, 'quia tanti quantum habeas sis.'
quid facias illi? iubeas miserum esse*

(and a good many men, deceived by false desire, says "one cannot have enough, for you are worth as much as you have." What to do to one who talks thus? Do not grudge him being miserable).

Who does the poet think is miserable? A subtle move in the targets of Horace's censure becomes visible. The poem started in lines 1-40 with the poet criticizing average citizens, like traders, sailors, soldiers, farmers, lawyers, innkeepers, but moves away from those in line 41 towards misers, who, obsessed by their fear of losing their money, can belong either to old families with large fortunes or to the increasing group of new rich. Apart from the reference to Fabius in line 14, Horace refers in lines 64-65 to an unnamed Athenian misanthrope, to Ummidius (line 95) and to Naevius and Nomentanus (lines 101 and 102); the passage S.1.1.41-107 does not give much certainty who the four men could be. However, some names certainly indicate that in the words of Rudd (2007, 138) "some of these characters may be classified by their attitude to money," referring specifically to Ummidius and characterizing him as the Roman counterpart of an unnamed Athenian miser (Rudd, 2007, 22).⁷⁸

Yet, I infer that Horace refers in lines 61-62 to the new rich in Rome on grounds of the specific choice of words. Using the words *bona pars hominum* (a good many men), Horace indicates that rather many people think that one cannot have enough, for one is worth as much as one owns (*nil satis est, quia tanti quantum habeas sis*). He wrote *bona pars* because he observed that this thinking was particular manifest within the large emerging group of the new rich, rather than in the circumscribed group of the old rich. In addition, Horace's rejection of the ways of the new rich is also

⁷⁷ For *Carm.*3.30.10, see also Nisbet & Rudd (2007, 374). For *Carm.*4.9.2, see also Putnam (1986, 160-161). For *Carm.* 4.14.25, see also DuQuesnay (2009, 272), and Putnam (1986, 245).

⁷⁸ For the unnamed Athenian misanthrope, see Gowers (2012, 75), who mentions that Timon of Athens was suggested by Ps.-Acro. For Ummidius, see Gowers (2012, 79); Rudd (2007, 22; 138). In Rudd (2007, 138) we read about Ummidius that he was "known to have been dead."

a theme in S.1.2, 1.3, 1.5, and 1.9, and indeed later in for example *Carm.*2.18 and 3.1.⁷⁹ Further, I will argue below that Naeivius and Nomentanus – and also the anonymous fellow (“the pest”) of S.1.9 (see the discussion of S.1.9) – refer to the spendthrift types belonging to the group of the new rich. In the next lines 63-91, Horace suggests that avarice is the cause of much misery for a rich man, who cannot enjoy the pleasure of having money, but worries about losing it. In S.1.1.69-75, Horace depicts with humour the miser gloating over his riches, who does not use his money providing for himself and his family buying only the daily necessities.

*mutato nomine de te
fabula narratur; congestis undique saccis
indormis inhians et tamquam parcere sacris
cogeris aut pictis tamquam gaudere tabellis.
nescis quo valeat nummus, quem praebeat usum?
panis ematur, holus, vini sextarius, adde
quis humana sibi doleat natura negatis.*

(if you change the name, it is your story; you go to sleep gaping at a pile of bags [of money] on all sides, and you must protect them as if they were sacred or delight in them as if they were pictures. Don't you know what cash is good for, or for what it should be used? For buying bread, vegetables, a pitcher of wine, together with other things that cause suffering for human nature if denied)

In the following lines, S.1.1.76-78, Horace tells us what befalls such a man: he is half dead with fear (*metu exanimem*) that he will be robbed.

*an vigilare metu exanimem, noctesque diesque
formidare malos fures, incendia, servos
ne te compilent fugientes, hoc iuvat?*

(Or to be awake half dead with fear, and to dread night and day nasty thieves, fires or slaves, lest they rob you and disappear, does this please you?)

The poet points out that wealth cannot buy health, happiness or love; the miser is left to his own devices in times of sickness, even by his wife and children. In lines 86-87 he tells us why, when with much irony he puts the rhetorical question: *miraris, cum tu argento post omnia ponas, / si nemo praestet quem non merearis amorem?* (are you surprised, if nobody shows you the love which you do not deserve, when you place money above all?).

In S.1.1.92-94 he summarizes the poem this far (lines 4-91):

⁷⁹ For a discussion of the nouveau riche constituting Gold's internal audience, see section 2.1. For a further discussion of the position of nouveau riche in Roman society at the time, see the summary of S.1.1. For Horace's rejection of the nouveau riche in *Carm.*2.18 and 3.1, see my discussion of S.1.2.

*denique sit finis quaerendi, cumque habeas plus
pauperiem metuas minus et finire laborem
incipias, parto quod avebas*

(briefly, let there be a limit to the search [for wealth], and now that you have more let your fear of poverty abate, and begin to finish your work, when you acquired what you wished)

His message in the next passage of this early poem (lines 95-107) is that one should not run to the other extreme, that is behaving in the same way as spendthrifts Naevius and Nomentanus (lines 101 and 102). According to Rudd (2007, 141-143; 147; 221-223) Naevius and Nomentanus cannot be identified positively. Nomentanus is perhaps a typefigure, but in S.1 and S.2 much evidence exists that Nomentanus anyhow was known as a spendthrift.⁸⁰ A Nomentanus also features prominently as a gastronomic connoisseur in the last *sermo*, S.2.8, the story of the dinner party with some dramatic effects, such as the awning which comes crashing down halfway during the meal and the departure of the guests before the meal had ended. The dinner was hosted by the unknown Nasidienus Rufus with Maecenas as guest of honour. The ostentatious display of wealth, however, is typical for a meeting of the new rich, which brings Horace in S.2.8.18 to a short, but sharp commentary: *divitias miseris!* (the misery of wealth). In S.1.1.95-107, Horace describes a certain Ummidius, an unknown wealthy miser, who for fear of poverty continued amassing wealth, which is often a typical characteristic of the new rich. Horace contrasts the wealthy miser with the spendthrift Nomentanus telling Ummidius that he should keep a middle course. However, in my view, there is another point that Horace makes. Nomentanus is someone who functions well in the milieu of the new rich, as his role as connoisseur in S.2.8 shows. It is noteworthy that Nomentanus features in both the very first and the very last *sermo* in contexts of great wealth, and therefore it is feasible that he is besides being the typefigure of a spendthrift he is also that of a nouveau riche, or a new rich himself, who continued to show his wealth in Rome during the period of writing S.1 and S.2. Horace makes a point of presenting those types as representatives of the new class of the rich, who could afford the most extreme opulence and indulge in excesses.

Line 106 gives us one of Horace's most fundamental beliefs: *est modus in rebus* (there is measure in things). In the final passage from line 108, he returns to his starting point and repeats that avarice makes a man unhappy and envious of his neighbour. Some scholars argue that lines 117-120, near the finale of the poem, are an

⁸⁰ For Nomentanus as a spendthrift, see Gowers (2012, 80): "Elsewhere in H.[orace], Nomentanus is usually a spendthrift." Muecke (1993, 156): "Nomentanus is the standing example of the spendthrift." He features in S.1.8.11: *Nomentanoque nepoti* (spendthrift Nomentanus), in S.2.1.22: *Nomentanumque nepotem*, in S.2.3.174-175: *extimui [...]/ tu Nomentanum, tu ne sequerere Cicutam* (I feared greatly, that you [the one] might follow [spendthrift] Nomentanus, and you [the other] the [money-lender] Cicutam), and in S.2.3.224-225: *luxuriam et Nomentanum arripe mecum;/ vincet enim stultos ratio insanire nepotes* (arraign with me extravagance and Nomentanus; for Reason will demonstrate conclusively that spendthrifts rage like fools).

allusion to the end of Virgil's *Ecl.*10.⁸¹ I will discuss this allusion in more detail below. S.1.1.117-120 reads:

*inde fit ut raro qui se vixisse beatum
dicat, et exacto contentus tempore vita
cedat uti conviva satur, reperire queamus.
iam satis est.*

(thus, it happens that seldom we can find someone who says that he lived happily, and who, once his time is fulfilled, will die in contentment like a guest who has eaten enough. Now, it is enough)

Horace shows with *iam satis est* that he knows when to stop. The poem ends with a dig at Crispinus, an endless Stoic babbler suffering from an affection of the eye, who very likely belonged to the Pompeian party. Horace says in lines 120-121 that one should not think that he pillaged the book-boxes of bleary-eyed Crispinus: he will not add a word more (*ne me Crispini scrinia lippi/ compilasse putes, verbum non amplius addam*). Knowing when to stop is something that the greedy and ambitious men, for whom enough is not enough, never do. Horace admonishes them of the limits in their search for power and wealth suggesting that they should follow the example of the well satisfied dinner guest, who does not stuff himself.⁸² We will meet the Stoic Crispinus again in S.1.3.139 and S.1.4.14 – and indeed many other Stoics at different places in the whole of S.1.⁸³ Horace brings them on the stage in a similar role as Crispinus in the present line, that is the role as a Stoic adherent of Sextus Pompey linked with the wrongdoings of certain groups. DuQuesnay (1984, 54) points out already that “the scraps of information [concerning the names in S.1 and the possibilities of links with for example the proscribed] tend to support the earlier speculation that Stoicism had a special connection with the Pompeian-Republican cause.” I intend to carry DuQuesnay’s “earlier speculation” a step farther by demonstrating that Horace indeed used the Stoic connection with the Pompeian cause to the full in S.1. I mentioned already in section 1.1 that Horace’s objective was to convince Maecenas of his trustworthiness by showing him that he was an Epicurean and that therefore his social background and political views were acceptable for joining the circle of Maecenas’ associates.

Summarizing S.1.1, I suggest that Horace’s mention of firstly avarice and ambition throughout the poem, secondly the allusion of the final lines of S.1.1 to those of

⁸¹ Freudenburg (2001, 27; 35-40); Putnam (1995, 314-315); although van Rooy (1973) shows that Horace alludes in most *sermones* of book 1 to Virgil’s *Eclogae*, he does not discuss this particular intertextuality.

⁸² For the image of the satisfied guest see, Freudenburg (1993, 112, 192-193; 2001, 36-37); Gowers (2012, 82).

⁸³ For Horace’s targets (including Crispinus) in S.1, see DuQuesnay (1984, 53-56). For Crispinus, see Freudenburg (1993, 112-113); Gowers (2012, 84-85); Rudd (2007, 133).

*Ecl.*10, and, thirdly, the reference to the river Aufidus in line 58 are significant for understanding the functional meaning of the poem.

Firstly, Horace's focus on *avaritia*, *ambitio* and *luxuria* is often seen as commonplace simple philosophy, but as DuQuesnay (1984, 32) already argues, "the themes themselves are the commonplace of Hellenistic philosophy, what is striking and novel is that these poems treat moral issues seriously and at length." Gowers (2012, 59) recalls DuQuesnay's work when she states: "though the wider historical context is largely written out of the diatribe satires, the disruptive activities they catalogue, like debt, greed, adultery and vindictiveness, happen to recall the charges of anti-social behaviour hurled about between the different sides in the civil wars (DuQuesnay 1984)." DuQuesnay (1984, 34-35) makes the point that Horace attacking the vices of *avaritia*, *ambitio* and *luxuria* echoes the contemporary hostile propaganda against the Triumvirs. He (1984, 34) states that "it may also be assumed that the Pompeians alleged that the Triumvirs (principally, of course, Octavian who was in Rome) were motivated by *avaritia*, *ambitio* and *luxuria* since these were the conventional and established characteristics of those who waged civil war." Horace depicts himself and Maecenas as very concerned about the erosion of moral standards, and its impact on the political situation. According to DuQuesnay it is likely, that this was a popular feeling at the time, and in attacking greed and ambition he recalls for instance Sallust, who in *Bellum Catilinae* 10-11 writes that Rome has achieved his power through hard work and justice, but that this will collapse if the present erosion of the traditional standards goes on.⁸⁴ *SAL.Cat.*10.2-5 says:

Qui labores, pericula, dubias, atque asperas res facile toleraverant, eis otium, divitiae, optanda alias, oneri miseriaeque fuere. Igitur primo pecuniae, deinde imperi cupido crevit; ea quasi materies omnium malorum fuere. Namque avaritia fidem, probitatem ceterasque artis bonas subvortit; [...]. Ambitio multos mortalis falsos fieri subegit,

(those who had found it easy to endure suffering, danger, uncertainty, and adversity, considered leisure and prosperity, desirable under other circumstances, a burden and a misery. Hence, first the greed for money, followed by that for power, grew; these had been, as it were, the source of all evils. For greed destroyed trustworthiness, honesty, and all other worthy qualities; [...] Ambition incited many men to become false)

Next, in chapter 11, Sallust instances and explains in greater detail the vice of *avaritia*. Although these kinds of complaints may seem worn out feelings, Sallust (and indeed Horace) most likely express a widespread view in Rome that the greed of the powerful has led to the contemporary problems of civil war and political and social strife. In Horace's opinion, however, it is the greed of the powerful in general from different layers of society (aristocrats, the new rich, freedmen and the military) that caused the

⁸⁴ For additional relevant sources by Sallust in *Bellum Iugurthinum* 3, and later testimonies by Plutarch and Cassius Dio, see DuQuesnay (1984, 34-35). For the text of Sallust, see Reynolds (1991).

contemporary problems, and not the actions of only the Triumvirs or Octavian. Sallust wrote these lines most likely at some time between 44 and 40 B.C., only a few years before Horace began writing the first book of the *Sermones*.

Secondly, Horace accentuates his words about the social and political risk of unrestrained greed and ambition of the elite by alluding through *satur* in line 119 and *iam satis est* in line 120 to Virgil's *Ecl.*10.70-77, that reads:⁸⁵

*Haec sat erit, diuae, uestrum cecinisse poetam,
dum sedet et gracili fiscellam textit hibisco,
Pierides: uos haec facietis maxima Gallo,
Gallo, cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas
quantum uere nouo uiridis se subicit alnus.
surgamus: solet esse grauis cantantibus umbra,
iuniperi grauis umbra; nocent et frugibus umbrae.
ite domum saturae, uenit Hesperus, ite capellae.*

(divine Muses, it will be enough for your poet to have sung, as he sits and weaves a basket of slender marsh-mallow: you shall make these verses for Gallus beautiful – Gallus, for whom my love grows hour by hour, as much as the green alder shoots up in a new spring. Let us get up. The shade is usually unpleasant for singers, the shade of the juniper tree is harsh, and shades also hurt the crops. Get home, my sated goats, get home; the Evening Star comes)

When I discussed above S.1.1.14-15, I mentioned that *iam satis est* (now, it is enough) in S.1.1.120 shows that Horace knows when to stop. But we also saw that there is more to that as Freudenburg (2001, 37) argues, namely the poet's appeal to the rich intertextual memories of Virgil's contemporary readers. The question is who refers in those lines to whom; does Horace refer to Virgil, or does Virgil perhaps refer to Horace? The latter wrote S.1.1 between 38 and 36/35 B.C., while Virgil most likely wrote *Ecl.*10 in 41/40 B.C. (see Weeda, 2015, 79). Thus, if Horace wrote (or adapted) S.1.1 after 38 B.C. the reference can be an allusion to a text by Virgil. If Horace wrote the first *sermo* earlier than 41/40 B.C., which is unlikely, Virgil may not have yet produced *Ecl.*10. It seems to me that the most convincing argument that the allusion was inspired by Virgil comes from the bucolic nature of Horace's lines. This is in line with Freudenburg's (2001, 38) argument, that the allusion to *Ecl.*10 makes us realize "that Horace can be just as subtle and allusive in his *Sermones* as he is elsewhere." But allusive to what? To pre-existing texts or to a common source, or to a discussion between the two poets? Freudenburg (2001, 38) questions the scholarly image of Horace, that as a poet of the *Sermones* "he leaves a lot to be desired," and the view that only "with the help of Virgil and friends, he transforms himself into that learned, densely allusive scholar-artist we know so well from the *Odes*." Freudenburg states that this view needs to be corrected, and that the significance of Horace's intertextual allusion to Virgil shows that he knows how

⁸⁵ For Virgil's *Ecl.*10, see also note 74, Weeda (2015, 76-83), and Weeda & van der Poel (2016, 204-205).

to use the dialogue with pre-existing texts. He (2001, 39) asserts that with the allusion Horace challenges our views of genre and that our “generic expectations [...] are given a thorough shake, and notions of genre are then necessarily reconfigured.” Yet, there is an additional aspect to Horace’s allusion to Virgil, that may be as important or perhaps more so than challenging our views of genre. My point is indeed that when the poet works within the functional frame, the instrument of a functional reference enables him to express the message of a text through an allusion to another text. Thus, Horace does not need to spell out his political views in the last two lines of *S.1.1*, but he shows those by a functional reference to the final bucolic lines of *Ecl.10* and by means of this to the whole of the tenth *ecloga*, and indeed to the whole of the book of *Eclogae*. I argued before that for Virgil’s *Ecl.10.70-77* “two functional interpretations may be appropriate: Vergil invites us to read his last *Eclogue* with both sympathy for Gallus’ tortured love that cannot be healed and with an awareness of the contemporary political situation. Firstly, the fellow-feeling is evident in the poem as a whole, as he implies, by mentioning Gallus’ name seven times, that he wants us to give thought to the fate of Gallus, and is also visible in lines 73-74, where he says that his love for Gallus grows hour by hour. Secondly, the image of the sated goats being taken home to rest when evening falls may suggest that Vergil encourages the reader to take time to reflect on the grave external matters which he broaches in this *eclogue* and indeed in the whole of the book by means of indirect or allusive references. In the *Eclogues*, Vergil offers a plate stuffed full (*satura*) of those references to the personal suffering and destruction caused by the civil war and the land expropriations, and to the general disruption of the economic and social structures, elegantly served in pastoral poetry.”⁸⁶ I mentioned above at the discussion of the *carmen deductum* that a reviewer pointed out that the Vergilian ending of *Ecl.10* may have broader significance (see also note 74). Fowler (2000, 246) describes “the phenomenon of supertextual closure” and gives as an example Horace’s *Carm.3.30* which “clearly closes the whole collection of the first three books of *Odes*.” If one applies the phenomenon to Virgil’s closure in *Ecl.10.70-77*, Virgil can be seen as closing not just the tenth *ecloga*, but the whole book. Following on from this, Horace may have recognised Virgil’s supertextual closure and refers to the whole book of *Eclogae* by means of his reference to *Ecl.10* in *S.1.1.119-120*. Therefore, Horace achieves two objectives by these final lines: firstly, a statement about his approach to writing poetry, namely that he does not carry on endlessly, but knows when to stop, and secondly the delivery of the message which the book of *Eclogae* expresses, that is a critical commentary on contemporary state of affairs. As it were, Horace associates himself with the political views of Virgil, who introduced him to Maecenas, and demonstrates thus that he is one of them.

Thirdly, I stated above that Horace’s reference to the river Aufidus also has a special meaning. Why did he choose the Aufidus, the river which flows near

⁸⁶ See Weeda & Van der Poel (2016, 205).

Venusia? This is similar to Virgil's reference in *Ecl.*10.47 to the river *Rhenus*, which flows near Virgil's hometown Mantua. I conjecture that Horace made indeed in *S.*1.1.54-58 a similar functional reference as Virgil did. I argued earlier (Weeda, 2015, 79-80; see also Weeda & van der Poel, 2016, 196-200) that Virgil's functional objective was to locate *Ecl.*10 in his native area. Therefore, he located the fictive absconding of Lycoris in his home region by referring to the river *Rhenus*. *Ecl.*10 is a poem about the destruction of the economic and social structures in Northern Italy caused by the civil war and the ongoing struggle for power. I suggest above that Horace uses the same instrument of a functional reference to the river Aufidus in order to locate the allegory of the greedy man having a drink in the river in his native town. Horace refers here to the greed and ambition of the new class of men in power, the centurions who in his young days called the shots in Venusia (also mentioned in *S.*1.6.72-75), and who lined their pockets through the expropriation of the assets of the indigenous population, whom they often also reduced to slavery, like perhaps Horace's father, making the poet technically a freedman's son (see also section 1.3.2 and note 25).

Thus, at the close of *S.*1.1 two lines come together. Firstly, Horace's criticism of greed and ambition and his concern about the impact of the loss of moral standards of both common people and the new rich on the political stability in Rome and Italy, implying that his worst expectations have come true. The poet's fascination with and rejection of the many *nouveau riche*, who say "one cannot have enough, for you are worth as much as you have" (line 62), suggest that these men were very visible in Rome gaining much influence and being accepted by many of the social and political elite. The appellation "*nouveau riche*" or "new rich," who were either the wealthy free-born (*ingenui*) upstarts or the new rich freedmen (*libertini*) and their sons, needs some elucidation. I use the term for those upstarts and military men, who often got rich by means of dubious commercial interests and of profiting by the land redistributions. Horace showed his concern about the threat of their materialistic attitude, their hunting for status, and lack of restraint to the stability in Italy combined with the effects of the ongoing power struggle after the end of the civil war. These effects were very visible in the land expropriations. Many of the new rich used their wealth unashamedly either for exorbitant private expenditure or for attempts to buy political office. In the time of the Late Republic, the number of new rich swelled considerably by the increase of the number of freedmen (*libertini*). They or their sons often won their wealth in an acceptable manner or otherwise either by their success in commerce and agriculture or by exploiting their position with a patron who held a high status. The wealth of these freedmen or their descendants could match that of the rich *ingenui*.⁸⁷ Obviously, the majority of the freedmen and their sons lived

⁸⁷ For the general position of freedmen, see Treggiari (1969). For rich freedmen, see Treggiari (1969, 239-240).

in moderate circumstances and were occupied in activities such as teaching, small trades, or managing their former master's estates.

Secondly, Horace alludes twice to *Ecl.*10; the one at the end of the poem, and the allusion to the Aufidus. I stated above that I interpret these allusions as Horace associating himself with Virgil's condemnation in each *ecloga* of the expropriations and the expulsions in Italy and of the destruction and social upheaval caused by the civil war and its aftermath.⁸⁸ One may wonder why Horace joins Virgil through those hidden allusions, and why he does not speak more openly. I suggest that at the time of writing S.1.1 Horace did not want to bring to light too openly a critical view of Octavian's involvement in the struggle for power. The outcome of the civil war was still undecided: Sextus was defeated at Naulochus in 36 B.C. and Actium still had to come in 31 B.C. Horace wrote S.1.1 before both events, between 38 and 36/35 B.C. Horace may have felt that as a new man in Maecenas' circle, blemished by his former allegiance to Brutus, he did better not to speak too openly in his first poem about delicate major political subjects in Maecenas' presence.

Sermo.1.2 begins with the funeral of the singer Tigellius, of whom Horace in line 4 says *quippe benignus erat* (seeing that he was generous).⁸⁹ The funeral procession consists of flute-girls, quacks, priests of Cybele, mime actresses, jesters, and all that kind of folk (*hoc genus omne*). Gowers (2012, 92) says of Tigellius, that he "throughout epitomizes the tasteless, ostentatious prima donna (against the reticent H.[orace]); he is also a model of inconsistency ([S.1]3.9) and adaptability ([S.1]3.130 *optimus... modulator*)." I do not concur with the second half of Gowers' statement that the Tigellius of S.1.2 was "a model of adaptability." In my view, the qualification of inconsistency applies indeed to the Sardinian Tigellius of S.1.3.1-19, who is the same man as the one described in lines 1 – 4 of the present *sermo*. I will discuss this more fully when I analyse S.1.3 in the next section 2.2.2. The qualification of adaptability, however, applies to a second man, namely Hermogenes. I will explain this in more detail when I discuss S.1.3.128-133. The Tigellius (of S.1.2), who is praised by his entourage for his generosity, is indeed a playboy in Rome of the first-century B.C., and symbolizes in S.1.2 the faults of the Roman patronage system which buys second-rate loyalty. Porphyrio (at S.1.2.1-3) wrote about him that "the talented musician Marcus Tigellius Hermogenes belonged to the household of Gaius Caesar, the dictator, and

⁸⁸ For political commentary in Virgil's *Eclogae*, see note 4, Weeda (2015, 54-84), and Weeda & van der Poel (2016). For the dating of the book of *Eclogae*, see Weeda (2015, 60). For the dating of *Ecl.*10, see Weeda (2015, 79).

⁸⁹ For S.1.2, see Freudenburg (1993, 40-46; 193-198); Freudenburg discusses S.1.2 from a literary perspective. He (1993, 193) states: "Trained in rhetorical theory, Horace knows the metaphorical terms whereby sex becomes a symbol for style, and he freely avails himself of these to set off his aesthetic values against those of his rivals." In section 2.1, I explained that my research is based on a functional perspective. For S.1.2, see also Gowers (2012, 86-118); Kemp (2016); Shackleton Bailey (1982, 10-14).

later to that of Cleopatra, because he sang pleasantly and jested wittily. Augustus liked him as well.” Nevertheless, the identity of Tigellius poses a problem.⁹⁰ A Tigellius also features in a number of other *sermones*, in S.1.3.4, S.1.4.72 (Hermogenes Tigellius), S.1.10.80 (Hermogenes Tigellius) and S.1.10.90. One of the reasons for the uncertainty of Tigellius’ identity is his funeral as reported in S.1.2.1-4, while in S.1.10 he appears to be alive. On grounds of S.1.10.17-19, scholars argued that Horace writes in S.1 about two different men.⁹¹ I will explain in my discussion of S.1.10.17-19 (in section 2.2.5) that I concur with DuQuesnay’s (1984, 56) view that it is likely that two men are involved. However, DuQuesnay is not clear whether he suggests that Horace writes about a dead Tigellius and a living Hermogenes at different places in S.1. I will argue at S.1.10.17-19 that Horace writes about the dead Tigellius only in S.1.2 and S.1.3.4, and about Hermogenes at other places (S.1.3.129, S.1.4.72, S.1.9.25, S.1.10.18, 80 and 90).

Horace accentuates the “generosity” of Tigellius by contrasting him in lines 4-5 with a man who does not give a penny to his needy friend fearing to be seen as spendthrift (*contra hic, ne prodigus esse/ dicatur metuens, inopi dare nolit amico*). Next, Horace describes the opposite, that is the extravagant man in lines 7-11:

*hunc si perconteris, avi cur atque parentis
praeclaram ingrata stringat malus ingluvie rem,
omnia conductis coemens obsonia nummis,
sordidus atque animi quod parvi nolit haberi
respondet. laudatur ab his, culpatur ab illis.*

(if you were to ask someone else why he wickedly through his insatiable gullet strips the ancestral estate of his grandfather and father, buying up brought-in provisions of every kind on borrowed money, he answers that he does so because he does not want to be seen as a cheapskate and mean. He is praised by some, reproved by others)

Rich Fufidius, a miserly moneylender, is his next target. He charged an extravagant interest on loans (five per cent a month), and he took the interest in advance. In lines 14-15 Horace writes: *quinas hic capiti mercedes exsecat, atque/ quanto perditior quisque est tanto acrius urget* (he deducts five times the [normal rate of] interest off the principal, and the more desperate someone is, the harder he presses). Even more reprehensible was that he ensnared vulnerable youths having strict fathers into borrowing money. One would think that Fufidius would spend a fair share of his income on his own pleasure and comfort, but in reality the miser is a not a friend to himself (line 20: *sibi non sit amicus*). Horace gives in lines 23-28 some more examples

⁹⁰ Porphyrio’s text (Meyer, 1874, 190) is: *Marcus Tigellius Hermogenes musicae artis scientia praeditus Gaius Caesari dictatori fuit familiaris, postea Cleopatrae, quia dulciter cantabat et iocabatur urbane. Augusto quoque ita placuit.*

⁹¹ For Tigellius and Hermogenes, see DuQuesnay (1984, 56); Freudenburg (1993, 114-117; 168-170); Rudd (2007, 139); Ullman (1915). See also my discussions of S.1.3.1-13, S.1.3.128-133, S.1.4.65-78, S.1.9.21-25 and S.1.10.17-19.

of people not knowing their borderline and searching for the extreme. For example, the street scene of unknown Maltinus and his opposite (line 25), who according to Rudd (2007, 143) represent respectively “an effeminate fop,” and the “extreme [...] of virile exhibitionism.” According to Rudd (2007, 143) and Gowers (2012, 95) the name Maltinus denotes apparently effeminacy and could be derived from *maltha* (tablet-wax). Warmington (1967, 240-241) gives the ancient commentary on Lucilius.⁷⁴⁴ by Nonius Marcellus (37.6) (after second, before fifth century A.D.): “Nonius, 37.6: ‘*Maltas veteres molles appellari voluerunt, a Graeco, quasi μαλακοῦς...* (Nonius: The old writers by using of men the term ‘*maltae*’ meant ‘soft,’ from the Greek, as it were *μαλακοί* (or *μαλθακοί* ?)...).” Lucilius.⁷⁴⁴ reads: “*insanum vocant quem maltam ac feminam dici vident* (they call him a madman whom they see to be known as ‘mollycoddle’ and ‘feminine.’).”⁹² Unmanly Maltinus walks with trailing robes (*Maltinus tunicis demissis ambulat*), and his unnamed macho opposite (*est qui*) in line 25 wears them raised as far as his obscene groin (*inguen ad obscenum subductis usque*). Horace closes the passage about objectionable manners in public with one line in which he contrasts Rufillus, smelling of lozenges (*pastillos*) used to give an agreeable smell to one’s breath, with Gargonius stinking of a goatish smell (*hircum*). The latter two names are most likely type-names, although they may have been two well-known characters walking the streets of Rome.⁹³ Rudd (2007, 137-138) remarks that the two men are depicted as contemporaries, and that the poet repeating the line with exactly the same words in S.1.4.92 “implies that it had given offence” in reality. In this passage Horace makes the point that those people run into opposite extremes, and do not follow a middle course: *nil medium est* (line 28).

The lack of a middle course is also very apparent from the ways of men who do not know how to choose wisely their preferred ways of sexual gratification, being the subject of the remainder of the poem. They go for either the extreme of adultery with a married woman (*matrona*), who wears “a gown fringed at the bottom with a flounce” or for that of a prostitute (*meretrix*) in a stinking brothel (line 30: *olenti in fornice*). Horace writes in lines 28-30:

nil medium est. sunt qui nolint tetigisse nisi illas

⁹² A reviewer points out that *μαλακος* is Attic and *μαλθακος* Aeolic. The renderings into English of the texts of Nonius and Lucilius are by Warmington. For Nonius Marcellus, see Lindsay (1903). Gowers and Rudd refer to ancient rumours that Maltinus alludes to Maecenas. Rudd (2007, 148) states: “the latter certainly dressed in an effeminate style, and the satire in question was written before Horace met him. *But if this was a genuine allusion it is hard to explain how Horace could have published the poem unchanged after enjoying Maecenas’ patronage for over three years.*” (italics are mine) Gowers (2012, 95) concludes that if Maltinus were to allude to Maecenas “his opposite, the priapic flasher, is a caricature of H.[orace] the satirist.” In my opinion, all rather unlikely.

⁹³ For Rufillus and Gargonius as type-names, see Gowers (2012, 96). For the two men, see also my discussion of S.1.4.92 below.

*quarum subsuta talos tegat instita veste;
contra alius nullam nisi olenti in fornice stantem.*

(there is no middle course. There are those, who would not want to have touched women unless she hides her ankles with a gown fringed at the bottom with a flounce; another on the contrary none unless posing in a stinking brothel)

Horace “quotes” in lines 31-36 Cato the Censor, who according to Gowers (2012, 99) “justifies brothels as a more straightforward outlet for natural lust than adultery, in rousing man-to-man language – unlikely endorsement by the tight-lipped censor.” Although Cato is known to have advocated moderation in visiting prostitutes, his approval may be the result of his strong opposition to extra-marital affairs. An unknown Cupiennius holds the opposite view; S.1.2.35-36 reads: *‘nolim laudari’ inquit/ ‘sic me’ mirator cunni Cupiennius albi* (“I would not want to be commended for that,” says Cupiennius, “an admirer of licentious matrons”).⁹⁴ The middle course, however, is also problematical. Kemp (2016, 134) states that “the fact that adultery is considered out-and-out wrong, and the seedy prostitute is, as Rudd (1966 [= 2007], 11) notes, ‘half condoned’, already suggests an unevenness in Horace’s use of the mean as a model for his argument which some have thought problematic.” Kemp (2016, 137) remarks that adultery is “practically forbidden” as it “is regarded as a non-virtuous, morally wrong choice” contravening the generally accepted “social and moral code of the time.” Horace recommends the freedwoman (*libertina*) as the favourable choice of middle course in lines 47-48: *tutior at quanto merx est in classe secunda,/ libertinarum dico* (but how much safer are the wares in the second class – of freedwomen, I mean), but according to Kemp (2016, 137) the poet finds the “mean difficult to attain there too.”

In the passage of lines 47-110, Horace introduces the subject of sexual scandals in Roman high society. We will see that the women and men who are depicted are members of the elite, and also that the context of their standard of life is that of the upper class: buying horses in line 86, domestic staff in line 98. The first one is Sallust, probably the historian, whom the poet makes a lover of freedwomen, although he is also known for his affair with Fausta, the daughter of Sulla, of whom we will hear more later. Next, in lines 55-63 the unknown Marsaeus – the lover of Origo (*amator Originis ille*), “Miss Newcome,” and according to Gowers (2012, 103) “an upwardly mobile mime actress” – appears. The reference to a *mima* (mime actress) is especially of interest, as

⁹⁴ The literal translation of *mirator cunni albi* is “the connoisseur of a white-robed pussy.” For the name Cupiennius, see Rudd (2007, 143; 145). Although Porphyrio (see Meyer, 1874,192) identifies Cupiennius as Gaius Cupiennius Libo Cumanus, whom he describes as *Augusti familiaritate clarus corporis sui diligentissimus fuit sectator matronarum concubitus* (famous for his friendship with Augustus; as he was very cautious with his body he chased married women to sleep with). I follow Rudd (2007, 145) who doesn’t find this identification credible: acc. to Gowers (2012, 99-100), Cupiennius is most likely a type-name “blending *cupere* ‘to desire’ with *Ennius*, anticipating the direct Ennian quotation in 37-8.”

at the time mime actresses were favourite girl friends of upper class men: I will discuss one special mime actress, Cytheris, below.⁹⁵ Marsaeus says in lines 55-57 that an affair with a *mima* is preferable to that with somebody's wife. S.1.2.55-63 reads:

*ut quondam Marsaeus, amator Originis ille,
qui patrum mimae donat fundumque laremque,
'nil fuerit mi' inquit 'cum uxoribus umquam alienis.'
verum est cum mimis, est cum meretricibus, unde
fama malum gravius quam res trahit. an tibi abunde
personam satis est, non illud quidquid ubique
officit evitare? bonam deperdere famam,
rem patris oblimare, malum est ubicumque. quid inter
est in matrona, ancilla, peccesne togata?*

(just as once Marsaeus, that lover of Origo, who gave his father's estate and home to an actress, said: "I will never get involved with the wives of other men." But [you do] it with actresses, with prostitutes, and as a result your reputation suffers more than your property. Or is it good enough for you to avoid the part [of adulterer], and not that what in any case stands in your way? To lose your reputation, to squander your father's estate is bad anywhere. What matters it whether you consort with a lady or with a whore?)

Horace explains in this passage that mime actresses are not a good middle course either: they tend to be expensive, destroy one's reputation, and squander one's money. Horace refers in lines 55-63 to Marsaeus' irresponsible and extravagant conduct squandering his father's inheritance on his mistress or mistresses: line 56 *qui patrum mimae donat fundumque laremque* (who gave his father's estate and home to an actress). He also says in line 58 briefly and to the point: *verum est cum mimis* (but you do it with actresses). Brown (2007, 107) remarks on the possibility of an allusion to Marc Antony's well-known affair from 49-45 B.C. with Cytheris, a famous mime actress, also known as Volumnia as she was bought out of slavery by Volumnius Eutrapelus. However, Brown does not further discuss the possible allusion.⁹⁶ A colleague made the point that "given that their [Antony's and Cytheris'] relationship had ended in

⁹⁵ For the affairs mentioned in S.1.2.47-110, see Gowers (2012, 102-113). Two names in this passage cannot be identified, i.e. Cerinthus in line 81 and Catia in line 95. However, acc. to Gowers (2012, 108; 110) both are described as members of the elite.

⁹⁶ Acc. to Gowers (2012, 103) Marsaeus is unknown, but "perhaps there is a link with the satyriasis of satyrs, a taste for *libertas* matched by a taste for *libertinae*," or the name of Origo "may also be a specific allusion here to Cato's *Origines*, Sallust's pet text [...]: Marsaeus' favourite book will have been *Orig.2*, where the origins of the Marsi are discussed." The Marsi were a people in Latium, known as wizards and snake-charmers. If Gowers' conjecture is developed further, one speculation could be that if Cytheris (her name refers to Cythera, famous for the worship of Venus) is seen as having strong seductive powers, Marsaeus may well allude to Antony's powers of enchanting women. Gowers (2012, 103) in her commentary on the next line 56 hints at Cytheris: "mime actresses (cf. 2) were often *libertinae*: e.g. Antony's friend Cytheris (Cic. *Fam.* 9.26.2)."

45 [B.C.], its topicality ten years later seems dubious.” I consider Brown’s suggestion very credible as Antony’s affair (*est cum mimis*) had been very much in the spotlight and was at the time of writing of the satire still fresh in the collective memory. Several ancient testimonies relating to the affair survive, by Plinius the Elder (*Nat.*8.55) and by Cicero (*Att.*10.10.5, *Phil.*2.24.58; 2.25.61; 2.25.62; 2.26-27; 2.28.69). Plinius’ lines, in his chapter on lions in the book about zoology, provide a powerful argument that the relationship between Antony and Cytheris was still very topical in AD. 76/77, when he wrote *iugo subdidit eos primusque Romae ad currum iunxit M. Antonius, et quidem civili bello [...], non sine ostento quodam temporum, generosos spiritus iugum subire illo prodigio significante, nam quod ita vectus est cum mima Cytheride, super monstra etiam illarum calamitatum fuit* (Marc Antony brought lions under a yoke and he was the first in Rome to put them to a chariot, during the civil war indeed [...]. This was not without a certain sign of those times, as this spectacle indicated that noble spirits would be brought under the yoke: riding around like that with the actress Cytheris beat even the calamities of that time). If Plinius could write this some 120 years after Antony and Cytheris went apart, it is likely that it was still a topical issue in 37 B.C.

I see in the functional reference by Horace to Marc Antony’s affair with Cytheris a parallel with his criticism of Octavian in S.1.1 by means of his allusions to Virgil’s *Ecl.*10 (see the discussion at the end of the section on S.1.1). This is an example of the use of a functional reference: triggering by a hidden allusion the contemporary reader’s association with topical issues. This kind of criticism of Marc Antony was not uncommon, and I refer to Cicero’s *Epistulae ad Atticum* and to his second book of the *Philippicae*. In *Att.*10.10.5, written in May 49 B.C., he mentions Cytheris only briefly: *hic tamen Cytherida secum lectica aperta portat, alteram uxorem; septem praeterea coniunctae lecticae amicarum [eae sunt amicorum]* (but meanwhile this man [Marc Antony] is carrying along with him in an open litter Cytheris, a second wife; they are joined by seven more litters with the girls of his friends). In the later book, the *Philippicae*, written in 44 B.C., the story about the litter returns and Cicero gives an extensive account of Antony’s infatuation with Cytheris/Volumnia. As one would expect, his picture of the relationship between Antony and Cytheris in the *Philippicae*, written for an address to the Senate (although not delivered) criticizing his rather common habits, is rather subjective and not very positive, but the passage contains much biographical information. Cicero mentions the affair in *Cic. Phil.*2.24.58: *inter quos aperta lectica mima portabatur [...], sed Volumniam consalutabant* (amongst them a pantomime actress was carried in an open litter [...], but they greeted her as Volumnia). In *Phil.* 2.25.61 we read about Antony’s journey to Brundisium: *Venisti Brundisium, in sinum quidem et in complexum tuae mimulae* (You went to Brundisium, indeed into the lap and the loving embrace of your little actress). He criticized Antony’s shameful passion for Cytheris again in *Phil.* 2.25.62: *Italiae rursus percursatio eadem comite mima* (again a travelling through Italy with the same actress as companion). The latter line, however, continues with a reference to Antony’s scandalous behaviour in a disgraceful orgy of pillaging of gold, silver

and particularly of wine (*in urbe auri, argenti maximeque vini foeda direptio*). After his criticism of Antony's common conduct in his affair with Cytheris, Cicero refers extensively in the next paragraphs (*Phil. 2.26-27*) to Antony's shameful involvement in 46 B.C. at a public auction of the property of Gnaeus Pompey (Magnus) after his death in 48 B.C. In *Phil.2.27.66* Cicero writes:

Incredibile ac simile portenti est, quonam modo illa tam multa quam paucis non dico mensibus, sed diebus effuderit. Maximus uini numerus fuit, permagnum optimi pondus argenti, pretiosa uestis [...]. horum paucis diebus nihil erat. (incredible and almost monstrous how much of that he squandered, not – I say – in a few months, but in days. A very large quantity of wine, a very great weight of the best silver, valuable clothes [...]. In a few days nothing of these remained).

The *mimae* were also present as Cicero testifies in *Phil.2.27.67*: *alia mimi rapiebant, alia mimae; domus erat aleatoribus referta, plena ebriorum* (actors carried some things off, actresses other; the house was crammed with dice players, full of drunkards). Antony's relationship with Cytheris did not finish when he married Fulvia in 47 B.C. *Phil. 2.28.69*, *illam (mimam) suam suas res sibi habere iussit, ex duodecim tabulis clauis ademit, exegit* (that actress of his he [Antony] "divorced," under the Law of the Twelve Tables he took away her keys, and drove her out) refers to Antony's repudiation of Cytheris in 45 B.C.⁹⁷ I proposed above that Horace's unknown Marsaeus refers to Marc Antony. I also suggest that Horace did not express his disapproval of Antony's affair, but that Horace particularly blamed Antony's blatant and unabashed behaviour which was not fitting for a member of the Roman aristocracy. I mentioned above that Sallust in lines 47-49 pretends to be a lover of freedwomen, although he is known for his affair with Fausta, Milo's wife, who had several lovers. In lines 64-72, Horace refers to another scandal of Sulla's daughter Fausta. Two of her lovers, Villius, perhaps Milo's friend Sextus Villius, and the unknown Longaremus are mentioned. Horace saw this behaviour as typical for the degeneration of standards within the elite.

In *S.1.2.73-78* one reads young Horace's words of advice:

*at quanto meliora monet pugnantiacque istis
dives opis natura suae, tu si modo recte
dispensare velis ac non fugienda petendis
immiscere. tuo vitio rerumne labores
nil referre putas? quare, ne paeniteat te,
desine matronas sectarier,*

⁹⁷ The Latin texts are from the following sources: *PLIN.Nat.8.55* is from Teubner, Mayhoff (1967, 96-97); *CIC.Att.10.10.5* from Teubner, Shakleton Bailey (1987, 403), and *CIC.Phil.2.24-28* from Budé, Boulanger & Wuilleumier (1959, 120; 121; 124-125; 126). In *CIC.Att.15.22*, he refers to Cytheris by calling Antony *noster Cytherius*. Plutarch (*Ant.9.4*) mentions also Cytheris as Antony's mistress. For Cytheris, see also Blume (2015); Kierdorf & Müller (2015); Schmidt (1969); Weeda (2015, 77-78); Weeda & van der Poel (2016, 191-192).

(but how much better is the course that contradicts this, but that nature – rich in her own way – teaches, provided that you will manage things in the right way, and not mix what must be avoided with what is to be desired. Do you think that it does not matter whether your troubles are due to your own fault or to circumstances? Therefore, stop pursuing married women, lest you will be sorry,)

Nature is rich in her resources, and thus there is more choice than affairs with married women. Kemp (2016, 139), referring to lines 73-76, remarks that “Epicurean sentiments first begin to surface,” namely the poet’s “recommendation to adhere to the dictates of nature.” We will see below that Horace gives the Epicurean sentiments a follow-up in lines 111-116, 120-122, and 125-127. In my discussion of S.1.2.120-122, I will explain my view on Horace’s motives for referring to Epicurean tenets.

In the next lines 78-105 the poet firstly summarizes his assurance that affairs with married women (*matronae*) only give trouble (*laboris*) and pain (*mali*), rather than enjoyment (*fructus*), followed by his exposition of the advantages of seeking sexual gratification with a girl in a toga (line 82, *togatae*) – a prostitute or a woman, not a *matrona* who is available. A maid’s *femur aut crus* (thigh or leg) are not less attractive than those of a lady. A prostitute shows openly what she has for sale (*aperte/ quod venale habet ostendit*, lines 83-84). Next, the poet draws an unsubtle parallel arguing that a maid can be inspected undressed whereas the *matrona* can show off her attractive bodily parts and hide the less attractive. Thus, seeking the pleasures of a *matrona*, who can seduce by only showing her attractions, is like the rich men’s practice of buying horses that are covered up for inspection. Horace describes this in lines 87-89 as if he often had seen such inspections:

*ne si facies ut saepe decora
moli fulta pede est emptorem inducat hiantem,
quod pulchrae clunes, breve quod caput, ardua cervix.*

(so that if an elegant form supported on a weak foot, as often is the case, may not lure the buyer as he gapes at how beautiful the haunches are, how small the head, and how long the neck)

In other words, the man in search of his sexual satisfaction must first see what he buys, and should better be careful. From line 94, Horace returns to the *matrona* and presents in lines 98-100 a catalogue of obstacles when seeking a lady of easy virtue:

*custodes, lectica, ciniflones, parasitae,
ad talos stola demissa et circumdata palla,
plurima, quae invidiant pure apparere tibi rem.*

(bodyguards, sedan-chairs, hair-curlers, parasites, the ankle-length stola and the long wrap, very many things which deny you a clear sight of the goods)

The next lines put it plainly: *altera, nil obstat: Cois tibi paene videre est/ ut nudam* (the other [*togata* = the prostitute], nothing stands in the way: in her Coan [see-through silk] you may see her almost as if naked).⁹⁸ In S.1.2.105-110 Horace's passionate lover sings a paraphrase of an epigram of Callimachus telling that a genuine Roman lover does not want an easy lay, just as a genuine hunter follows the hare in deep snow; he does not want to touch ready game lying in his path (*leporem venator ut alta/ in nive sectetur, positum sic tangere nolit*). However, the poet supposes that verses like these do not lift the torment from the lover's breast (*curasque gravis e pectore pelli*). One should be realistic about satisfying one's sexual desires. In line 111, Horace begins presenting his views on the best choice. He calls in nature's aid when he poses the question in S.1.2.111: *cupidinibus statuatur natura modum quem* (what limit does nature put on desires), answering in S.1.2.113 that one should not *inane abscindere soldo* (separate the void from the solid). According to Gowers (2012, 113) "i.e. learn to distinguish illusory desires and pleasures from real ones. H.[orace]'s appeal to realism is couched in the language of Epicurean physical theory: atoms and void." The poet continues the Epicurean analogy in the next lines comparing the pains of sexual desire with hunger and thirst. When one is thirsty and hungry, a simple meal will do. Horace makes in line 113 also a significant political point referring to his Epicurean beliefs against the extreme Stoic views of Octavian's opponents.

Horace continues the discussion of the options for sexual gratification in line 116: *tument tibi cum inguina* (when one has a stiffy; lit. when your privates are swollen), one can satisfy the sexual hunger on the spot with a girl servant or a boy, rather than remain hungry for a lady. In S.1.2.119, Horace writes: not for me, because I like love that is readily available and an easy lay (*non ego: namque parabilem amo venerem facilemque.*). *Venerem* symbolizes that the poet expects her to be fair and beautiful. The woman who dodges him with all kinds of pretexts is not for him, but for the Galli, the castrated priests of Cybele, or for Cornelius Gallus, the elegiac poet.⁹⁹

Horace quotes Philodemus approvingly in lines 120-122:

illam post paulo: sed pluris: si exierit vir

Gallis, hanc Philodemus ait sibi quae neque magno

stet pretio neque cunctetur cum iussa venire.

("a little later," "it's not enough," "if my husband is not at home" – such a woman is for the Galli, says Philodemus; for himself he wants one who doesn't ask a high price, and does not hesitate to come when bidden)

Philodemus says that he wants for himself a woman who is available. He wants something between a prostitute and a married woman; is she the *libertina* of line 48? Horace states in the next lines some of the physical attributes he likes the woman

⁹⁸ For prostitutes and their Coan dress, see Griffin (2004, 104; 123).

⁹⁹ For the Gallus' suggestion, see Freudenburg (1993, 196).

to have, and he closes the passage with the conclusion that when he makes love to such a woman, she changes into an Ilia or an Egeria, the arch-matrons of Rome. He says in lines 125-126 *haec ubi supposuit dextro corpus mihi laevum/ Ilia et Egeria est* (when she has arranged her left side under my right, she is an Ilia or an Egeria). Kemp (2016, 140) remarks that “these sentiments [...] may have come via Philodemus, to whom Horace has just referred.”

According to Kemp (2016, 141), Horace offers these Epicurean views on sexual behaviour “in pursuance of the moderation argument.” I concur with Kemp that Horace promotes the Epicurean principles because he has problems defining an acceptable mean of sexual behaviour and wants to give his appeal for moderation a philosophical foundation which he himself upholds. But, in my view, Horace has an additional reason. He shows in the present passage to Maecenas for the first time in S.1 his philosophical credentials, that is that his views on the right sexual behaviour are supported by the right philosophical conviction, Epicureanism. Maecenas was an adherent of Philodemus and Horace wanted him to know that he upheld the same philosophical ideas. I will return to this subject when I discuss S.1.3.124-142 and S.1.4, S.1.5 and S.1.6.

The lines 127-134 at the end of the poem, run like scenes of the comic theatre. The poet repeats his advice not to seek a *matrona* as there is always a chance of being caught out as we read in line 127: in the case of making love to an easy lay *nec vereor ne dum futuo vir rure recurrat* (I have no fear that, when I fuck her, a husband may run back from the country). To be caught having sex with a married woman can result in a hasty retreat, as Horace writes in lines 132-133: I must run with my tunic ungird and barefoot, for fear that I lose my money or my buttocks or at least my reputation (*discincta tunica fugiendum est ac pede nudo,/ ne nummi pereant aut puga aut denique fama*). The last line (134) runs *deprendi miserum est; Fabio vel iudice vincam* (it is terrible to be caught; however, I could prove it even with Fabius as a judge).¹⁰⁰ According to Gowers (2012, 117), Fabius, “a Stoic is presumably the chatterbox from [S.1.1.14.” Gowers poses the question whether “H.[orace] mean[s] that he has a strong enough case, enough examples (cf. [S.1.1.13), to tire windbag Fabius out in any debate?” Her suggestion supports the view, which I mentioned above, that Horace criticizes in this poem the moral standards of Roman society, like he did in S.1.1. Fabius symbolizes the generally held view within the Roman elite that extra-marital affairs are acceptable, as “Porph.[yrio] speculates that H.[orace] cunningly shows Fabius as a supporter of the adulterer because he is one himself” (Gowers, 2012, 117-118).

Horace places the events of the second *sermo* clearly within the Roman upper class. He introduces many names in S.1.2.¹⁰¹ Although many are presumably type-

¹⁰⁰ For Fabius, see at S.1.1.14. (see note 75). I used the rendering of Gowers (2012, 117).

¹⁰¹ Rudd (2007, 132-159) discusses many of the names in Horace’s *Sermones*. Rudd (2007) mentions (in varying degrees of detail) Crispinus at 133; Cupiennius at 143, 145; Fufidius at 138; Galba at 143 note

names (see Gowers, 2012 ad S.1.2), some can be identified. Horace introduces two groups of men. The first group belongs clearly to the aristocracy or at least to the political/social elite, for instance Galba (line 46), Sallust (line 48), Villius (line 64), or Longarenus (line 67) and indeed Fausta, Sulla's daughter. I incorporate also in this group Marsaeus (line 55), because I interpret him as a functional reference to Marc Antony. The second group is that of the wrong men within the retinue of Roman patrons, men like the playboy Tigellius (line 3), who was befriended to Julius Caesar, and probably fictitious Cupiennius (line 36), the *mirator cunni albi* (admirer of licentious matrons), or the nouveau riche like Fufidius (line 12), and the three fictitious men, effeminate Maltinus (line 25), scenting Rufillus and smelly Gargonius (line 27). The poet writes with disdain about these parvenus, which is very different from the note he strikes writing about the members of the aristocratic class, how much he may disapprove of their actions. A number of other allusions also supports the conclusion that we are seeing the upper classes in action. In lines 16-17 the moneylender Fufidius is censured for the way he treats the young sons who borrow of him; it is very likely that the vulnerable youths are sons of the elite. The second half of the poem, when Horace from line 73 depicts the risks of an affair with a married lady, does not have many names, but has a number of references to the lifestyle of the upper class. For example, in line 86 he refers to the buying of horses, in line 98 to the servants of the lady, in line 105 to the leisure pursuit of game, and finally at the end of the poem to the comic theatre, the supplier of girl friends for young gentlemen. The new rich – Maltinus, Rufillus and Gargonius – are not so much criticized for their sexual misconduct, but rather ridiculed for their common behaviour in public. Thus, although it appears that the poem concerns chiefly the pursuit of sexual extremes, I propose that Horace's commentary covers the broader field of the common and unmannerly conduct of an increasing number of members of the upper class, but particularly that of the urban nouveau riche with their materialistic attitude, their hunting for status, and lack of restraint. I quoted above Gowers (2012, 92), who hints at the theme of Horace criticizing the lifestyle of the elite when she says of Tigellius, that he "throughout epitomizes the tasteless, ostentatious prima donna (against the reticent H.[orace]); he is also a model of inconsistency ([S.1.]3.9)." She adds in the same sentence that "the scenario [is] here, [that] international scum mourning a notorious playboy, defames the Roman patronage system." At the time of Horace writing this sermo, a protracted development of the structure of the Roman and Italian social upper layer had materialized in new classes of rich people besides the traditional *optimates*, the old aristocratic families and landowners, from whom the members of the Senate and consuls were recruited. In the late second and first centuries B.C. the *negotiatores* – the bankers, moneylenders, merchants and manufacturers in the

29; Gargonius at 137-138; Longarenus at 137; Maltinus at 143, 148; Marsaeus at 138, 138 note 13; Rufillus at 137-138; Sallust at 135-136; Tigellius at 139, 139 note 15; Villius at 132, 136-137.

provinces and in Italy – formed together with the aristocrats the economic mainstay of Roman and Italian society (see Brunt, 1971, 210-214; 221-222). But, “as a class the *negotiatores* were of little importance at Rome politically” (Brunt, 1971, 212). Further, in the first half of the first century B.C. two additional groups of men, who profited by the possibilities to make money through the expansion of the empire, emerged. These were the military men, who either managed to make their fortune in the areas where they settled after completing their time of service, or who enriched themselves by the sale of booty they stole in the wars overseas or confiscated in the proscriptions (see Brunt, 1971, 301-305; 322; Boatwright et al., 2004, 144-149). The second group was that of freedmen, who often acted as managers for the absentee landowners or as agents for the *negotiatores*, and of whom some gained considerable wealth. An appreciable number of *negotiatores*, military men, and freedmen belonged to the financial upper crust, but many of them behaved typically as upstarts, and differed from the aristocrats as they lacked their cultured upbringing and did not share the manners of the aristocracy. They were not “their sort of people,” and this was very visible in their common preferences, such as a lavish, but yet “cheap” lifestyle, a lack of elegance, and an inordinate interest in matters financial.

Horace gives his view on the lifestyle of the new rich, who show their wealth in extravagant enterprises, not only in the *Sermones*, but also in a number of the *Carmina*. In the latter, he particularly criticizes the building of luxurious villas at the seaside. *Carm.*2.15 is the first *carmen* in which Horace is concerned with one of his favourite themes: a denunciation of extravagance, especially luxurious building, as the farmer is expelled and villas are erected on fertile land. The poem starts with the powerful lines: *IAM pauca aratro iugera regiae/ moles relinquunt* (soon the high princely buildings will leave few acres for the plough). *Carm.*2.18 is again about opulent wealth, particularly in luxurious *villae maritimae*. Although the poem is not addressed to anybody in particular, Nisbet and Hubbard (2004, 287-290) suggest that Horace criticizes Maecenas’ private wealth. The poet begins with a passage in which he describes his own modest villa and his contentment with his talents and his life on his Sabine estate. Next, Horace describes the lavish building of *villae* in Baiae where the houses of the rich partly extend into the sea at the cost of confiscating farmland. In *Carm.*2.18.20-26, the poet paints a moving picture of the evictions of the poor:

marisque Bais obstrepentis urges
summovere litora,
parum locuples continente ripa.
quid quod usque proximos
revellis agri terminos et ultra
limites clientium
salis avarus?

(and you push to extend the coastline of the sea at Baiae, which shouts in anger against it, because the piece of land is not sufficient as it is enclosed by the shore. How is it, that you

continually remove the boundary stones of your neighbour's field, and that you in your greed leap over the boundaries of your tenants?)

In the fifth to eighth stanzas of *Carm.*3.1 Horace examines both the extravagant and greedy men who can not sleep because of their worries whereas in lines 21-22 the simple man enjoys a *somnus lenis* (gentle sleep), and the man who knows when he has had enough remains untroubled. We read in *Carm.*3.1.25-26: *desiderantem quod satis est neque/ tumultuosum sollicitat mare* (if one desires what is enough, the tumultuous sea does not disturb him). With these words the poet wants to tell us that “the man of limited desires is undisturbed by the bad weather that harasses the acquisitive merchant.”¹⁰² The behaviour of the man who leads a simple life contrasts greatly with the arrogant man who builds his villa, not at the seaside, but in the sea. Finally, *Carm.*3.24, probably written in or around 27 B.C., deals with moral extravagance in different forms and the need for constraint. The carmen begins again with one of Horace's favourite subjects to which he took offence, namely the luxurious building of *villae maritimae* which will not take away the dread of death.

In summary, both S.1.1 and S.1.2 have a political theme besides the theme of his self-presentation. In the first *sermo*, Horace condemns the greed of the common people and in particular the new rich and the political instability this causes. S.1.2 has a similar theme: is not just a treatise on moderation in sexual relationships, but is much more than that. Its main theme is the poet's criticism of the vulgar conduct and materialistic attitude of the elite and nouveau riche alike, and the threat of their lack of restraint pursuing their own interests to political and economic stability. The political statements in S.1.1 and S.1.2 are part of Horace's design for the whole of book 1, which I interpret as his endeavour to show Maecenas his political reliability. S.1.1 and S.1.2 are the first examples in which he demonstrates what he stands for politically speaking.

2.2.2 *Sermones* 1.3 and 1.4: From Censuring the Elite and the Nouveau Riche to a Serious Conversation with Friends

The singer Tigellius is an obvious link between **S.1.3** and S.1.2. Horace, referring to Tigellius in the opening lines of S.1.3, raises the subject of addressing an audience of friends.¹⁰³ The first four lines of S.1.3 read:

¹⁰² Nisbet & Rudd (2007, 3). Nisbet & Rudd (2007,4) argue that in *Carm.*3.1 “Horace rejects luxury because it does not lead to happiness, not because it is socially and politically unacceptable.” I concur with them as far as this *carmen* is concerned, but it does not enervate my point that Horace criticizes the elite for their pursuit of luxury and self interest.

¹⁰³ For S.1.3, see Freudenburg (1993, 29-33; 39-40); Gowers (2003, 71-75; 2012, 118-147).

*OMNIBUS hoc vitium est cantoribus, inter amicos
ut numquam inducant animum cantare rogati,
iniussi numquam desistant. Sardus habebat
ille Tigellius hoc.*

(this fault attaches to all singers, that when asked to sing among friends they can never be persuaded, but unbidden they never stop. That son of Sardinia, Tigellius, had this fault)

The words *inter amicos* in line 1 position this *sermo* within the protected entourage of a circle of friends, where singers or writers are more at liberty to stage when they feel like it and to say what they feel than when they have to perform in public. Tigellius is an example; Horace says in lines 4-7:

*Caesar, qui cogere posset,
si peteret per amicitiam patris atque suam non
quicquam proficeret; si collibisset, ab ovo
usque ad mala citaret, 'io Bacche!'*

(Caesar [Octavian], who could have forced him [Tigellius], if he should ask him on grounds of his [Tigellius'] friendship with his father [Julius Caesar] and with himself, would get no results; but, if the fancy had seized him [Tigellius], he would not stop calling "hurra Bacchus!" from the first course to the dessert).

The reference to Tigellius' friendship with Julius Caesar and Octavian, which Porphyrio also mentions in his commentary on S.1.2.1-3, is a clear indication that Horace describes the singer Tigellius of S.1.2. Horace says in these lines that even when Octavian should have asked Tigellius to perform among friends, Octavian would not have achieved anything, if the singer did not feel like it. However, if Tigellius fancied singing, all one got was "hurra Bacchus." The implicit message of this probably fictitious story situated within the private bounds of a circle of friends is that Tigellius was a very obstinate man, and that Octavian restrained himself and did not force the singer, who was not worth listening to anyway. Gowers (2012, 122) remarks that this is "the only direct reference to Octavian in the book, flattering his restraint, but still a sinister hint at his [Octavian's] powers of control and censorship. Octavian took the *cognomen* Caesar when adopted in Julius Caesar's will in 44 BC; when H.[orace] was writing *Satires* I [42/41 B.C. – 36/35 B.C.], he did not yet have supreme power."¹⁰⁴ I concur with Gowers' statement that Horace "flatters Octavian's restraint," but I differ from her point about Octavian's "powers of control and censorship" and about Octavian "not yet having supreme power." The story is set in the private domain, where powers of control and censorship can be exercised indeed. However, I understand Gowers' words "sinister hint" and those about Octavian's "supreme power" to mean that she refers to the public domain. I contend that at the time of writing S.1.3 (38/37 B.C.), Octavian did have powers of control in the public domain within the Triumvirate until 33 B.C., but

¹⁰⁴ For *Caesar, qui cogere posset*, see also Griffin (1984).

that exercising censorship was a different matter; a similar situation prevailed after 33 B.C. until 23 B.C., when under the so called “Second Settlement” his superior power was recognised and all men in office had to obey his commands. However, Octavian/Augustus could not yet establish supreme and absolute power as he could not rely on the army, the senate and the aristocracy, whom he did not want to alienate. Thus, when Octavian gained supreme power he used that power with restraint.¹⁰⁵ It is not clear to me whether Gowers refers to Octavian forcing Horace in 38/37 B.C. to write propaganda for him. It seems to me highly unlikely, as he in all his other *Sermones* (and indeed in his other work) wrote both supportive and critical poems about Octavian. Octavian/Augustus clearly condoned his critical poetry. I also do not take for granted that supportive poems are propagandist, as I define propaganda as the systematic and managed propagation of information, images or ideas by an interested party in order to encourage or instil a particular attitude or response. Propaganda generally emanates from a central source, in our case Octavian, who would maintain control of the putative propaganda machine ordering Horace to write positively about him and his policies.¹⁰⁶

The opening passage, S.1.3.1-19 shows Tigellius’ inconsistency and hypocrisy. In lines 10-15 Horace describes him as at some occasions having two hundred slaves, at other times only ten (*habebat saepe ducentos,/ saepe decem servos*), and at one time talking about kings and tetrarchs and everything grand (*reges atque tetrarchas,/ omnia magna loquens*), and at another time about the instruments of simple life such as a mussel-shell holding salt and a coarse coat to keep away the cold (*concha salis puri et toga quae defendere frigus/ quamvis crassa queat*). Horace closes this passage in lines 18-19 with the lamentation *nil fuit umquam/ sic impar sibi* (never was someone so whimsical). Gowers (2012, 119) states that “the poem might well at this point have expanded into a wider discussion of human inconsistency, but instead it turns specifically towards judgements about one’s friends,” as lines 19-20 show: *nunc aliquis dicat mihi: ‘quid tu?/ nullane habes vitia?’ immo alia et fortasse minora* (now someone may say to me: “what about you? You have no faults?” Yes indeed, but different and perhaps lesser ones). With the words at the end of line 20, Horace gives a jocular and relativizing reply setting the drift of the rest of the poem. In the next line he introduces two prototypes of the wrong men, with whom he would rather not associate in his circle of friends: the *improbus* (shameless) parasite Maenius, of good parentage but a rather self-loving spendthrift who according to Gowers (2012, 125)

105 For a brief outline of Octavian’s route to supreme power, see Weeda (2010, 25-30).

106 For Horace and propaganda for Augustus, see also Galinsky (1996, 72-73). For my definition of propaganda, see Weeda (2010, 1-2); for propaganda for Octavian/Augustus in general, see Weeda (2010, 2-4; 15-23, esp. 17-18; 48-49; 2015, 13-21). For Horace writing propaganda for Octavian/Augustus, see Weeda (2010, esp. 334-343).

“played surrogate satirist,” and the unknown upstart Novius.¹⁰⁷ Horace brings up a putative anecdote when Maenius was asked ‘*heus tu’/ quidam ait, ‘ignoras te?’* (“ho there, you,” someone said, “do you not know yourself?”) (lines 21-22) which is the same question that Horace posed in line 20 (You have no faults?). Maenius is censured by Horace for his arrogant answer in line 23 ‘*egomet mi ignosco*’ (“I forgive myself”).

From line 25, casuistry of conduct with friends follows. S.1.3.29-37 (the passage about the clumsy satirist) and S.1.3.63-66 (Horace bursting in on Maecenas in his study) are particularly important for understanding Horace’s message. In the following discussion of the poem as a whole I will focus in more detail on those two passages, which in my interpretation contain functional references to the style and manner which Horace envisages delivering his political commentary in the future. The final lines (139-142) are also an important functional reference to his efforts establishing a future position as a commentator, as he expresses his gratitude being accepted in the circle of Maecenas. Contrary to S.1.3.29-37 and S.1.3.63-66, I interpret those final lines as genuinely autobiographical. I will discuss the meaning of those lines at the end of this discussion of S.1.3.

In lines 25-37 Horace continues developing the point that it is easier to see the faults of your friends than your own. People are blind when looking at their own faults: line 25 says that they are blear-eyed, besmeared with ointment (*oculis [...] lippus inunctis*). Lines 27-28 conclude this part of the poem with the words: *at tibi contra/ evenit, inquirant vitia ut tua rursus et illi* (the result is that your friends in turn search for your faults).

I suggested above that the next passage of lines 29-37 is very important for understanding Horace’s functional reference. He relates in the following lines how he wants to position himself in the book of *Sermones*: in the role as a gentleman commentator with some attributes of a jester. S.1.3.29-34 reads as follows:

*iracundior est paulo, minus aptus acutis
naribus horum hominum; rideri possit eo quod
rusticius tonso toga defluit et male laxus
in pede calceus haeret: at est bonus, ut melior vir
non alius quisquam, at tibi amicus, at ingenium ingens
inculto latet hoc sub corpore.*

(he is somewhat easily provoked, less fitted to today’s condescending people; he could be laughed at because his hair is cut like that of a farmer, his toga hangs carelessly, and his loose shoe hardly clings to his foot: but he is a good man, none other is better, and he is your friend, and a great talent is hidden in that clumsy body)

107 For Maenius, see Gowers (2012, 125); Rudd (2007, 140; 293 note 17). Maenius is probably the same man as mentioned in HOR.*Ep.*1.15.26-41, where he is described as a *scurra vagus*, a doubtful buffoon. Acc. to Lewis & Short (1955, 1650) a *scurra* is “a city buffoon usually in the suite of wealthy persons, and accordingly a kind of parasite.” For Novius, see Gowers (2012, 125).

Horace showed in S.1.1 and S.1.2 his critical view of the conduct of the members of the Roman elite and the nouveau riche, and the threat to the stability in Italy caused by the effects of the ongoing power struggle after the end of the civil war. The latter was very visible in the land expropriations. Whereas in the first two poems he expressed a political opinion, in S.1.3.29-34 he contemplates how he should deliver such a critical political message. Horace's lines are not written by a clumsy and inexperienced philosopher and moraliser, but they present a very clever strategy as to how to conduct himself in the highly politically charged environment of the post Republican era and emerging Principate. Horace is often seen as a writer of satire and S.1.3.29-34 is interpreted as a presentation of his future style as a satirist. I read these lines differently, namely that he considers how to deliver critical commentary in general, not exclusively in the role of satirist, but that of the commentator of political issues in several genres. These lines anticipate S.1.10.46-49 in which he says that he does not intend to become the successor to Lucilius.¹⁰⁸ The lines are a poetic way of depicting the potentially most effective manner in which to convey his critical and potentially antagonistic commentary on contemporary social and political issues: the gentleman who adopts some of the manners of a jester. This makes the passage a functional reference to the manner of presenting his commentary. I owe the idea of a gentleman jester to Freudenburg's (1993, 27-51; 72-86) discussion about the influence of the comic stage on Horace's *Sermones*. The crux of the above passage is in lines 31-32, where a humorous description of the poet – in Freudenburg's opinion of the poet-satirist – is given: his haircut, his untidy clothes and his loose shoes. According to Freudenburg (1993, 32) this description

bears direct reference to the conventions of the comic stage, rendering the satirist a bumpkin or buffoon. As a moralist, then, we would expect some rather unbalanced, self-parodic sermonizing from this character, exactly as we have it in the diatribe satires of Book 1. [...] The idea of blending the characters of the Cynic moralizer and the bumpkin or buffoon was, in all likelihood, not original to Horace but was itself the legacy of popular comedy.

In his book, Freudenburg (1993) examines the iambographic tradition. Discussing in more detail the character and role of Cynic moralizer, he (1993, 80) states that “the Cynic, though he resembles the buffoon in his poverty, dress, and mordant wit, differs [from the buffoon] in the intent of his jest, which serves a larger, public censorial function.” I intend to demonstrate that the poet does not wish to present himself as a buffoon, as he sees such a character as uneducated and vulgar, not the sort of person he wants to get acquainted with. Horace displays his theory of commentary poetry – a mixture of Aristotelean and Hellenistic influence – fully in S.1.4. Thus, I will consider the poet's views on his own poetic programme in more detail in my discussion of

108 See also my discussion of S.1.10 in section 2.2.5.

the fourth satire.¹⁰⁹ At this point, I focus on Horace as a humorist. My thesis is that Horace wants to position himself as a gentleman commentator who does not shy away on the one hand from the humour and on the other from a sense of perspective. His style is not that of the professional jester of the comic stage, the *scurra*. Horace is in the *Sermones* not just simply a mixture of the seriousness of his political commentary with humour, but a mixture with a special kind of humour.¹¹⁰ Horace as a Cynic jester is the gentleman who can raise the most touchy issues hiding himself behind a façade of naïvety and simpleness. By this he can also make opportunity to vent the opposite or controversial political opinion, without taking sides. However, he did not keep silence in what he considered matters of crucial importance, for example his stand against Antony (and Cleopatra), particularly in S.1.7 and S.1.8. I will return to this point when I discuss S.1.6.

Freudenburg (1993, 33) states that “Horace was well aware of the comic tradition linking Cynic philosophers to professional jesters.” Referring to S.1.1.23-27 Freudenburg goes a step further when he says

the speaker [satirist] implies that he has sunk nearly to the level of professional jesters, the *scurrae* of the comic stage who earned their bread by jests and were in possession of some of the world’s earliest jokebooks. Rather than deny the comparison, the mock apology actually underscores the impression that the satirist is, in essence, a comic figure.

I differ from Freudenburg that Horace intends to say that “the satirist is, in essence, a comic figure.” Of course, one finds humour in Horace’s work, which is the result of the way he delivers his commentary by the persona of the comic jester. And there is certainly self-parody in the first book of *Sermones* – for example in this poem: S.1.3.29-37 (the passage about the clumsy satirist), S.1.3.63-66 (Horace bursting in on Maecenas in his study).

In lines 38-54, Horace returns to the subject of understanding one’s friends. He refers to a lover’s (Balbinus’) blindness to the faults of his girl Hagna (S.1.3.38-42), and a father’s tenderness about the disfigurements of his child (S.1.3.43-48).¹¹¹ In the last six lines of this section (S.1.3.49-54), one reads examples as to how friends’ faults can also be understood positively, and thus friendships can be strengthened. For example, lines 38-40 read: *amatorem quod amicae/ turpia decipiunt caecum vitia, aut etiam ipsa haec/ delectant* (that a lover, as he is blind, is deceived by the ugly defects of his girl, or is even pleased by them). In lines 43-44 Horace says *at pater ut gnati sic nos debemus amici/ si quod sit vitium non fastidire* (as a father [does not loathe the imperfections] of his son, so we ought not to be scornful of a friend’s fault, if there is

¹⁰⁹ For Horace’s theory of censure poetry, see Freudenburg (1993, 96-108).

¹¹⁰ See also Freudenburg (1993, 81-82); Leach (1971, 623-624; 629). For a detailed discussion of the *scurra* in Latin literature, see Corbett (1986); see also note 107.

¹¹¹ For Balbinus and Hagna, see Gowers (2012, 128-129).

any). In S.1.3.44-48, the poet gives four examples of parents' tolerance of children's imperfections. This is followed in lines 49-54 by four examples of forbearance to faults of a friend, for example in line 53 *caldior est: acris inter numeretur* (is he a hothead? consider him energetic). Horace argues in lines 53-54 that by emphasizing the positive side one makes friends and keeps them: *opinor,/ haec res et iungit iunctos et servat amicos* (in my opinion, this is how one makes friends and when made keeps them).

From S.1.3.55, Horace approaches the theme of the human inclination to judge people negatively from the opposite angle, that is that virtues are also often seen as faults. He opens this section by saying: *at nos virtutes ipsas invertimus atque/ sincerum cupimus vas incrustare* (but we misrepresent virtues themselves, and we want to besmear a clean vessel); according to Gowers (2012, 131) the metaphor refers to the soiling of a clean winejar and means that “we ‘upturn’ [*invertimus*] merits to make them into faults;” in other words, that man readily sees positive characteristics as negative traits. In lines 56-58 he gives an example:

probus quis
nobiscum vivit, multum demissus homo: illi
tardo cognomen, pingui, damus.
(there lives among us a honest man, a very unassuming man: him we give the nickname slow, stupid)

Next, in S.1.3.63-66, he presents a second self-parody, a “character sketch of a gauche intruder, which gradually comes into focus as another self-deprecating portrait of H.[orace] and his relationship with Maecenas.” (Gowers, 2003, 72-74; 2012, 132). Freudenburg (1993, 29) interprets the passage somewhat differently: he argues that “the suggestion [made by Armstrong (1989, 37-41) that in S.1.3 Horace describes himself] is attractive, for this is just the type of behaviour we have come to expect of the speaker, who is something of a social menace.” I concur with both Gowers and Freudenburg interpreting S.1.3 as a description of Horace himself, but I differ from them about Horace's self-portrait. Horace does not depict himself as either a clumsy provincial bumpkin or as a social menace. I suggest that this passage is a sequel to S.1.3.29-34, and a precursor to S.1.3.90-94; these are all passages in which he presents himself as a gentleman jester who takes the liberty to tell Maecenas whatever he thinks that the latter should hear, and that Maecenas knows how to handle those people.¹¹² S.1.3.63-66 reads:

simplicior quis et est qualem me saepe libenter
obtulerim tibi, Maecenas, ut forte legentem
aut tacitum impellat quovis sermone molestus:

¹¹² The theme of how Maecenas associates with the members of his circle also returns in Horace's reply in S.1.9.48-52 to the pest whom he meets in the Via Sacra.

'communi sensu plane caret' inquit.

(or there is one who is rather simple, the way I would often gladly show myself to you, Maecenas, as he breaks in upon you perhaps while you are reading or in thought and annoy you with one or other chat: we say "he is clearly without consideration.")

The words *qualem me saepe libenter obtulerim tibi, Maecenas* is a direct reference to Horace's conduct in the relationship with Maecenas. Horace concludes the scene, in which he bursts in on serene Maecenas reading and thinking, with the words "*communi sensu plane caret*" *inquit*. These words are an ironical disapproval of the facetious conduct of the jester, who suggests that he can afford almost anything, knowing that Maecenas will accept such behaviour, as masters of jesters do. Like the earlier passage (S.1.3.29-34), this one is not autobiographical, but a further specifying of the way Horace intends to present his messages in the first book of *Sermones*, and thus provides again a functional reference to his future style.

From line 68, Horace continues the theme of the meaning of friendship and the conduct among friends. No man is born without faults (*nam vitiis nemo sine nascitur*), but there should be give and take. Lines 69-72 say:

*amicus dulcis ut aequum est
cum mea compenset vitiis bona, pluribus hisce –
si modo plura mihi bona sunt – inclinet, amari
si volet*

(a dear friend, if he is fair, should weigh my qualities against my faults, and be favourably disposed towards the more numerous – provided that my qualities are the more numerous – if he wants to remain friends)

When one looks for the balance (*aequabilitas*) both ways, friendship will continue. In the passage starting at line 76, the argument moves away from the single theme of tolerance of the faults of one's friends. Horace introduces also the theme of balance (or the lack of it) in the execution of justice in society at large. The argument also moves gradually towards one with a philosophical and a historical angle (lines 99-124). Horace argues that the Stoic view that all sins are equal and deserve equal punishment is absurd. He gives examples of what he considers an excessive sanction for a minor misdemeanour. Horace appeals for reason (*ratio*) and balance (*ponderibus modulisque*) in lines 77-83:

*cur non
ponderibus modulisque suis ratio utitur, ac res
ut quaeque est ita suppliciiis delicta coercent?
si quis eum servum patinam qui tollere iussus
semesos piscis tepidumque ligurrierit ius
in cruce suffigat, Labeone insanior inter
sanos dicatur.*

(why does reason not use her own weights and measures, and holds in check offences with punishments according to each case? If someone should crucify a slave who, when ordered to

remove from the table a dish, feasted by stealth on the half-eaten fish and its cold juice, he would be called more insane than Labeo by sane men)

Horace displays in line 78 in a subtle way his Epicurean disposition with the choice of words *ponderibus modulisque* (weights and measures). Contemporary readers of these words would readily associate those with the Epicurean tendency to quantify and measure. The anti-Epicurean Cicero argued against this at many places, because he saw this tendency to measure everything as motivated by self-interest and as an inducement to avoid political involvement.¹¹³ I noted already in section 1.1 (General Introduction), that Horace in the last lines of this *sermo* expresses his gratitude being accepted in Maecenas' circle, and in S.1.5 and S.1.10 his appreciation of being admitted to an intellectual milieu of men with Epicurean leanings, of whom many did not shy away from political involvement. But, apart from showing his gratitude, Horace makes another point. By quoting the words *ponderibus modulisque*, he also shows Maecenas that he holds the right philosophical convictions. Horace's references to Stoic and Epicurean tenets in S.1.3 will be further considered below in my discussion of scholars' commentaries on S.1.3.76-124.

If someone were to crucify a slave for the minor misdemeanour of licking up the remains of a meal, he is worse than Labeo, who lost all sense of proportion trying to punish Metellus. Although the crucifixion of the slave is bad, Horace argues in lines 83-86 that rejecting a friend for a minor fault is even worse:

*quanto hoc furiosius atque
maius peccatum est! paulum deliquit amicus,
quod nisi concedas habere insuavis: acerbus
odisti et fugis ut Rusonem debitor aeris*

(how much madder and worse a sin is this! A friend has committed a minor fault, which, if you do not pardon it, will make you to be seen disagreeable: you [start to] hate him bitterly and keep away from him like a debtor keeps away from Ruso)

Horace likens the intensity of someone's grievance over a friend's rejection for a minor fault to the feelings caused by the bitter hatred felt for Ruso by a poor debtor unable to raise the money to pay off his debts.¹¹⁴ The latter keeps away as much as possible from Ruso, an unknown moneylender with literary aspirations, who forced

113 For Cicero and Epicureanism, see Hanchey (2013). Cicero discusses the association between Epicureanism and the tendency to measure in amongst others *Leg.*1.39, *de Orat.*3.285, *Fin.*2.85, *Fin.*5.93. For Cicero's views on avoidance of political involvement, see my discussion of S.1.6.111-128, the passage about a typical day in Horace's life.

114 Acc. to Gowers (2012, 135-136) the Labeo referred to is most likely "C. Antinius Labeo, a Republican tribune of the plebs who tried to punish Metellus for rejecting him from the senate by ordering him to be thrown from the Tarpeian rock in 131 B.C." For Labeo, see also Rudd (2007, 136-137; 137 note 11). For Ruso, see Gowers (2012, 136); Rudd (2007, 134).

his victims to listen to his boring stories. Horace – like a true jester – exaggerates that such a rejection of a friend is worse than the fate of the crucified slave. Next, Horace mentions more examples of offences among friends in order of increasing gravity, from harmless infringements of table manners to more serious delicts by friends such as theft or renegeing on a legal pledge. He poses the rhetorical question in lines 94-95 *quid faciam si furtum fecerit, aut si/prodiderit commissa fide sponsumve negarit?* (what to do if he [a friend] commits a theft, or if he betrays perfidiously a trust, or reneges on a legal pledge?). In the lines that follow he says (line 96) that the answer of the Stoics that all sins are nearly equal (*paria esse fere [...] peccata*) does not work in reality. Emotions, the moral sense of people, and custom are opposed to it (*sensus moresque repugnant*) (line 97). He concludes with the statement that justice and fairness are sisters.

In the following passage of lines 99-124, Horace turns again to Epicureanism to expound his views on the history of civilization and the origin of justice and fairness in contemporary society. In primeval times humans and beasts were very much alike: in lines 100-102 Horace depicts the first living creatures as follows: *mutum et turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter/ unguibus et pugnibus [...] pugnabant* (dumb and ugly beasts, they fought for their acorns and dens with nails and fists). Then, technology advanced and man learned to speak; lines 103-105 read:

*donec verba quibus voces sensusque notarent
nominaque invenere; dehinc absistere bello,
oppida coeperunt munire, et ponere leges*

(until they invented words and names which brought meaning to their cries and sensations; and from that point they began to cease waging war, started to build towns and make laws)

Horace considers the learning of speech a turning point in human development: man ceased acting according to the law of the jungle like the cave-men they were before, when fights over women were common, although not yet immortalized by Homer. In lines 107-108, he reminds us that the Trojan war was only recently fought by civilised men over Helen's adultery. Next (lines 111-117), Horace testifies his belief that the perception of right and wrong is not natural to man, and he states in line 111: *iura inventa metu iniusti* (justice was invented through fear of injustice).¹¹⁵ In line 115, Horace returns to the Stoic doctrine that all sins are nearly equal, to which he referred in line 96. In accordance with Philodemus' teaching in *De ira*, he suggests again that the severity of the penalty should correspond with the seriousness of the offence. He writes in lines 117-119 *adsit/ regula, peccatis quae poenas irroget aequas,/ ne scutica dignum horribili sectere flagello* (let there be a rule that imposes penalties which fit the crimes, so that you do not apply the terrible whip to what only deserves the strap).

¹¹⁵ See also Keane (2006, 87).

Scholars' commentaries on the passage S.1.3.76-124 focus on several aspects. Gowers (2012, 120) argues firstly that in this passage "a plea for tolerance" is presented, and that "behind this plea for tolerance lies recognition of the threat being posed to individual autonomy in contemporary Rome." Her second argument concerns the view that "the social contract [law in society] is presented [by Horace] as an expedient devised for mutual benefit, rather than as an innate instinct." In addition, she states that "one way to explain the chosen priorities of this history [of civilization from cavemen to the modern day in lines 99-112] is to see it as a carefully contrived parallel to H.[orace]'s own evolution." Keane (2006, 52-53; 86-87) emphasizes Horace's view (in lines 96-106) on the development of a system of justice "asserting that human culture (not nature, as the Stoics hold) has devised sensible laws for dealing with a range of offences" (Keane, 2006, 52). She (2006, 53) notes that "Horace's evolution narrative has implications for his self-presentation as satirist." Keane (2006, 87) also argues that the poet in this passage, which she sees as a "climax to the first three poems of *Sermones* 1, [...] does begin to explain satire's status as a *iustum poema*." Kemp (2009) focusing on the philosophical foundation underlying this passage asserts that Horace links balance with moderation to promote his own view of friendship, rejecting the Stoic rigidity. Finally, Freudenburg (1993, 26-27) questions whether S.1.3.96-124 should be read as one of Horace's philosophical arguments. He (1993, 26) states that the passage "is intended as a parody of Epicurean doctrine, a 'mock history of the social contract,' not as an effective argument against the Stoics." He (1993, 26 note 67) accentuates this when he says: "Noting the broad philosophical range of many such passages and the apparent irony of others, it is very difficult to make a case for Horace's Epicureanism on the basis of the diatribe satires."

In my view, Horace argues in lines 99-124 that the system of justice is the crown of the development of a civilized society and that tolerance, balance and wisdom should be essential elements of such a system. This leads him to the question of the choice of men who should be the leaders in society. Horace places in this passage acceptance of or intolerance to friends' faults and also extremism in the execution of justice within the context of Stoicism and Epicureanism. We will see below that he connects his commentary with the emergence of new men within the political elite, who are driven by personal gain. The references to Stoic and Epicurean tenets in S.1.3 are rather plain philosophy, and are not part of a philosophical discourse.¹¹⁶ My thesis is that these philosophical quotations are functional references. What matters are not just Horace's statements about friendship, tolerance, fairness, or balance, but more important are the men who make those statements or the men to whom Horace refers. Below, I will explore the social and intellectual standing of the men whom Horace quotes about both the issue of intolerance to friend's faults, and the issue of the absurd and severe punishments for small misdeeds. The wrong men, upstarts have gained too much

116 For Horace's handling of Epicurean and Stoic philosophy, see also Kemp (2010, 73 note 28).

influence. I will analyse later the contribution of each individual mentioned in this *sermo*.

I will first discuss the final section of the poem, lines 124-142, in which Horace ridicules the Stoic paradox that only the wise man (*sapiens*) is perfect and thus rich, free, beautiful and talented. Horace plays a very clever game in this passage. He does not only hold up to ridicule the paradox, but also censures the Stoics for the results of the paradox in the choice of leaders and thirdly he can, as an extra benefit, demonstrate to Maecenas, that they share the same philosophical framework thus subscribing to the same views on political matters. Horace plays in S.1.3.124-142 three times upon a word to caricature the Stoic paradox. The first is *sutor* (cobbler) in lines 125 and 128, the second *modulator* in line 130, and the third is *tonsor* (barber) in line 132.¹¹⁷ S.1.3.124-133 reads:

*si dives, qui sapiens est,
et sutor bonus et solus formosus et est rex,
cur optas quod habes? 'non nosti quid pater' inquit
'Chrysippus dicat: sapiens crepidas sibi numquam
nec soleas fecit; sutor tamen est sapiens.' qui?
'ut quamvis tacet Hermogenes cantor tamen atque
optimus est modulator; ut Alfenus vafer, omni
abiecto instrumento artis clausaque taberna,
tonsor erat, sapiens operis sic optimus omnis
est opifex solus, sic rex.'*

(if the wise man is rich, and a good cobbler, and only handsome and a king, why do you desire to possess what you have got already? He [the Stoic] answers “you do not understand what father Chrysippus means. The wise man has never made himself shoes or sandals. Yet, the wise man is a cobbler.” How? [The Stoic says] “Just as Hermogenes, although he is silent, is still the best singer and musician; and just as shrewd Alfenus, after throwing away all the tools of his trade and closing his shop, was still a barber. So only the wise man is the best artisan at every craft: he is king.”)

The *sapiens* is caricatured by the poet in lines 124-128 as being an expert cobbler (*sutor*). The Stoic’s response to Horace’s quip in lines 127-128 is: ‘*sapiens crepidas sibi numquam/ nec soleas fecit; sutor tamen est sapiens*’ (“the wise man has never made himself shoes or sandals. Yet the wise man is a cobbler”). The Stoic suggests that the *sapiens* is potentially an expert in all things.¹¹⁸ One may wonder why Horace chose the humble trades of cobbler, and indeed in line 132 that of barber, for making his point; both trades were low in the social scale. In my view, Horace not only wanted to express the absurdity of the potential of the opportunities for the wise man in the Stoic paradox, but also wanted to play upon the words *sutor* and *tonsor*. That is why

¹¹⁷ Meyer (1874, 206 = Porphyrio) gives in line 132 *sutor* i.s.o. *tonsor*.

¹¹⁸ Conform Brown (2007, 125); Gowers (2012, 144).

he says in line 128 with great emphasis *sutor tamen est sapiens* (Yet, the wise man is a cobbler) and in lines 132-133 '*sapiens operis sic optimus omnis/ est opifex solus*,' ("so only the wise man is the best artisan at every craft"). Firstly, I will discuss my views on Horace's use of *sutor* in lines 124-128, and next I will consider Freudenburg's (1993, 114-117) views on *modulator* and *tonsor* in lines 128-133; the idea that the poet's use of *sutor* was a similar case occurred to me by the latter's interpretation.

Horace plays upon the word *sutor*, that is generally translated as cobbler. *Sutor* is derived from *suere*, to stitch or cobble. The latter word suggests patching-up something, working hastily and delivering shoddy work. In other words, Horace says that the Stoic's claim is absurd and that they make a mess of things: the Stoic view leads to the selection of the wrong people for high positions in public life, as we will see in the discussion of lines 128-133 (Freudenburg's view). What else do the Stoics mess up? The extreme Stoics, anti-Caesarians and followers of the Pompeian cause, stood in Octavian's way and obstructed the latter's progress towards peace and stability.¹¹⁹ In particular, Horace has in mind the war waged at the time by Sextus Pompey, which stretched out the civil war.

In lines 129-130, Horace introduces Hermogenes, who is in S.1 the successor to Tigellius for Horace's wrath. We saw at our discussion of S.1.2.1-3 that he is "the second man," removing the dilemma of the Tigellius/Hermogenes identities. The fact that Horace presents him at this stage plainly as Hermogenes is an additional indication that he is somebody who is separate to Tigellius, whose funeral opens S.1.2. Freudenburg (1993, 114-117) examines Horace's references to Tigellius/Hermogenes in the *Satires*, and presents an interesting view on the poet's use of the word *modulator*. He remarks that the noun cannot only connote a songwriter, but he (1993, 115) also suggests "that the term carries the sense of an 'improviser,' that is, one who is able to measure quickly or 'adjust' his song." In the words of Freudenburg (1993, 116), Hermogenes of line 129 has a "remarkable ability to 'change keys' or 'adjust' himself to the changing political winds of the late Republic." DuQuesnay (1984, 56) considers the possibility that Hermogenes defected to Sextus Pompey, which gives Horace's words a major contemporary political weight.¹²⁰

I repeat lines 130-133 which I quoted before, where the Stoic presents a second person to prove his paradox, Alfenus. The lines read:

*'ut Alfenus vafer, omni
abiecto instrumento artis clausaque taberna,
tonsor erat, sapiens operis sic optimus omnis
est opifex solus, sic rex.'*

¹¹⁹ Conform DuQuesnay (1984).

¹²⁰ For Hermogenes in S.1.3.129-130, see also Gowers (2012, 144), who interprets Tigellius in S.1.2.3 and Hermogenes as the same individual.

“and just as shrewd Alfenus, after throwing away all the tools of his trade and closing his shop, was still a barber. So only the wise man is the best artisan at every craft: he is king.”)

According to Freudenburg, the lines refer to P. Alfenus Varus, *consul suffectus* in 39 B.C. and jurisconsult. He argues that the lines should not be interpreted literally meaning that Alfenus Varus was indeed a barber before becoming a lawyer. Freudenburg (1993, 51) points out that at Plautus and Terence *tondere* also “connotes deceit and intrigue, in the sense of to fleece, or rip off.”¹²¹ Thus, the lines can be read as “Alfenus, even though he has sold his shop to become a lawyer, is still the same old *shearer* [that is, crook] that he always was.” I concur with Freudenburg’s novel view on Horace’s use of the word *tonsor* in the case of Alfenus. However, contrary to the use of the word *modulator* in the case of Hermogenes, he examines *tonsor* within the context of stylistic theory. I interpret the use of the word *tonsor* in the first place as a reference to political issues.

It is not possible to identify Alfenus with certainty. According to Gowers (2012, 144-146), the name possibly refers indeed to P. Alfenus Varus, but a second option is P. Alfenus, who was *legatus pro praetore* in Achaea in 39 B.C. In my opinion P. Alfenus Varus is the most likely candidate. Horace wrote the third satire between 38 – 36/35 B.C., the same period in which Virgil wrote the *Eclogae*. Further, Horace and Virgil knew each other, and it is feasible that Horace knew Virgil’s *Ecl.*9, written in 41-40 B.C. In *Ecl.*9.27-28 Virgil refers specifically to Alfenus Varus and the events in Mantua in 41-40 B.C.: ‘*Vare, tuum nomen, superet modo Mantua nobis,/ Mantua uae miserae nimium uicina Cremonae*’ (“Varus, your name, let but Mantua remain for us, Mantua, alas, too much in the vicinity of unfortunate Cremona [the birthplace of Alfenus Varus]”). In addition to Virgil, three ancient testimonies about Varus’ involvement in the land expropriations in Northern Italy have come down to us: Donatus in his *Commentarii Vergiliani (in Eclogas)*.13 (on *Ecl.*9) , Servius in his commentary on *VERG. Ecl.*9.10 quoting “a passage from a speech by ‘Cornelius’ (presumably Gallus) against Varus” (Wilkinson 1997:31), and Suetonius in *Vita Vergili*.19.¹²² The latter testimonies

¹²¹ For the identification of Alfenus, see Freudenburg (1993, 50-51); Gowers (2012, 144-146); Rudd (2007, 136-137). Rudd (2007, 137 note 8) states that Alfenus being identical with Alfenus Varus “is the traditional view [...]. Such an eminent contemporary, however, seems rather out of place in this satire.” I concur however with Freudenburg (1993, 51) who argues that “the Alfenus joke, like the reference to Balbinus at *Satires* 1.3.40, illustrates the working of the comic analogy at its very subtlest and best.” For the use of *tondere* in Plautus, see also Fantham (1972, 103).

¹²² For the involvement of Alfenus Varus in the expropriations in Northern Italy, see also: Clausen (2003, 181); Jenkyns (1998, 170-171); Patterson (1987, 31-34); Wilkinson (1966, 320-324; 1997, 29-31); Hermes (1980, 212-257), who quotes the opinions of several scholars before 1977. For the involvement of high-ranking men in the expropriations, see Weeda, (2015, 56-57; 73-74); Weeda & van der Poel (2016, 202-203). For the text of Donatus, see www.intratext.com: *et per triumviros agris dividendis Varum, Pollionem et Cornelium Gallum* (and the three joint commissioners for the land division Varus, Pollio and Cornelius Gallus). The passage by Servius on *Ecl.*9.10 (Thilo, 1887, 110) reads as follows:

make it very likely that Alfenus was involved in some way or another, not necessarily in individual cases. For example, I argue in my book on Virgil's political commentary that it is doubtful whether Cornelius Gallus, Varus and Pollio were involved in the actual expropriations in the Mantua area and that Cornelius Gallus mediated between Virgil and Alfenus Varus, in an attempt to exempt the entire area of Mantua from confiscation. I quoted Bowersock (1971, 76) that "the scholia [Servius and Donatus] are worthless evidence for details of the land commission, and so is Virgil. That can only redound to the poet's credit. He has caught a mood, an atmosphere in his poems." Although the scholia may be unreliable with respect to the details of the land expropriations and although there is no independent confirmation of the precise involvement of the officials and the scholiast had presumably no other source than the poems, it does not necessarily imply that Varus was not involved in some way. Still, Virgil introduced certainly historical individuals, Alfenus Varus (*Ecl.*6.6-12 and *Ecl.*9.26-29) and Gallus (*Ecl.*6.64 and *Ecl.*10.1-10, *Ecl.*10.22-23 and *Ecl.*10.72-73) and indirectly even Octavian (*Ecl.*1.42-43). It is not clear whether Virgil (or his family) personally lost property in the expropriations, but it appears from a number of *Eclogae* (1, 6, 9 and indeed 10) that he was very well acquainted with what was going on.¹²³ I (Weeda & van der Poel, 2016, 203) suggest that Virgil used the names of Varus, Pollio and Gallus to symbolize the actual involvement of high-ranking officials, without specifying exactly who was involved where. Although Virgil's poetry contains references to real events, it does not offer historical precision.¹²⁴

It is feasible that Horace in *S.*1.3 copies Virgil and that the references to Hermogenes and Alfenus symbolize the many who tried to force their way into the

per iniquitatem Alfeni Vari, qui agros divisit (because of the unreasonableness of Alfenus Varus, who divided the lands). For the text of Suetonius, see Rostagni (1944, 84). The passage by Suetonius is: *maxime ut Asinium Pollionem, Alfenum Varum et Cornelium Gallum celebraret, quia in distributione agrorum, qui post Philippensem victoriam veteranis triumvirorum iussu trans Padum dividebantur indemnem se praestitissent* (particularly to praise in song Asinius Pollio, Alfenus Varus, and Cornelius Gallus, because – at the time of the distribution of the land, which beyond the Po was divided by order of the triumvirs among the veterans after the victory at Philippi – these men had saved him from the loss of his land).

123 For Alfenus Varus in *Ecl.*6, see Weeda (2015, 56-57; 65), and in *Ecl.*9, see Weeda (2015, 55-57; 73-74); see also Weeda & van der Poel (2016, 203). Jenkyns (1998, 169-172, at 171): "Certainly he [Virgil] is concerned for the distresses of his fellow countrymen, the Mantuans – so much is explicit – and to that extent personal experience enters into his allusions to the confiscations; and of course it remains possible that he himself lost some land, possible even that Caesar restored it, or compensated him in some other way. But that is pure speculation, nothing more; *Virgil does not suggest this to us, either directly or by implication.*" (my emphasis).

124 Gold (2012b, 305) makes a similar point writing about patronage and the *dramatis personae* in a poem: "Is Propertius [for instance] describing an historical figure when he addresses Maecenas at some length in poems 2.1 and 3.9, [...], or is Maecenas transmuted into a symbol of important ideas in Propertius' poetry?"

social and political elite. This theme returns in S.1.9, the story about the meeting with the nuisance when Horace strolled along the *Via Sacra*. The poet did not intend to make in S.1.3 a philosophical statement about the wrong of the Stoic ideal that the wise man (*sapiens*) is perfect and talented. The three keywords, *sutor*, *modulator* and *tonsor*, all point in the same direction: he had in mind to demonstrate by a functional reference that men like Hermogenes, who exemplifies unreliability, and Alfenus, who shows untrustworthiness and dishonesty, should not be welcome into the political and social elite, and are not deserving to hold office: Hermogenes who defected to Sextus, and Alfenus Varus who was “ripping off” the poor smallholders in Northern Italy. He emphasizes the moral and intellectual failure of the Stoic paradox once more by the pitiful picture in lines 133-139, when in the words of Gowers (2012, 145): “grandiose theory becomes ragged reality.” Horace depicts the Stoic philosopher on his way to have a bath on the cheap (*quadrante* is the customary price of a bath in a public place) mobbed (*urgeris*) by a hostile crowd of men (*turba*), with whom the poet does not wish to be associated. The escort of the wise man, alias king, is only Crispinus the babbler whom we met at the end of the first *sermo*.

We saw in the passage of lines 124-142 that Horace used his philosophical conviction to deliver his commentary on – what he sees as – social and political evil. In addition, the commentary enabled him to show Maecenas that he had the right political convictions to be a member of his circle of friends. The evidence of the interrelation between on the one hand Horace’s philosophical and on the other his political views can be seen at several places in S.1.1-1.3. For example, right away from the start in the first part of S.1.1 he refers (S.1.1.13-14) critically to the Stoic Fabius, thus rejecting the favourite philosophy of the political opponents of Octavian, the Republicans and Pompeians. Horace demonstrates immediately in S.1 what he stands for, that is support for the cause of Octavian. Further, he infers in S.1.1.15-22 that Stoic philosophy is not the only guide to responsible behaviour, but that the old Roman traditional values can well be an alternative; in political terms this can be seen as an appeal for the preservation of the traditional social structures and for calling a halt to the progress of the greedy new rich. Next, we saw that in S.1.2.111-134 Horace’s plea for realism in love affairs is couched in the language of Epicurean physical theory (e.g. in line 113 *inane abscindere soldo*, atoms and void). The political point is that he connects this Epicurean idea with what he sees as the degeneration of standards in Roman upper classes, that is the threat to political and economic stability by their lack of restraint pursuing their own interests. In S.1.3.96-98 Horace rejects the Stoic view that all sins are equal. He argues that this does not work in society. His Epicurean socio-political attitude causes him to state that justice should be organised in such a way that it goes together with fairness. We saw that Horace ridicules the Stoic paradox in S.1.3.124-142; politically speaking this means that he castigates the republicans who with their Stoic beliefs tend to despotism. One further example where Horace’s Epicurean conviction lies at the root of his political view is in S.1.6.111-128, the passage about a typical day in Horace’s life. He seeks to participate in politics

as a commentator. His Epicurean views make him aware that he needs the freedom to organize his life in his own way to be able to reflect and study.

Horace introduced many people in this poem, who can be divided into two groups. The first group is that of his friends, whom the poet quotes consistently in a positive manner in this *sermo*. For example, he refers to Octavian and Maecenas: in both cases he writes with appreciation. Horace compliments Octavian in line 4, and I do not read any criticism of putative supreme power exercised by him. The contexts of the passages where he refers to his relationship with Maecenas (S.1.3.29-37, S.1.3.49-75), and with his friends (S.1.3.139-142) are all positive descriptions of the benefits of friendship. In other words, Horace's aristocratic friendships are models of *amicitia*. The second group shows the opposite image with the names of the inconsistent singer Tigellius (line 4) and unreliable Hermogenes (line 129), shameless Maenius (line 21), a spendthrift from the past, the upstart Novius (also line 21), deranged Labeo (line 82), a Republican tribune of the plebs, Ruso, a moneylender and aspiring author (line 86), and Alfenus (line 130), most likely corrupt P. Alfenus Varus. It is worth noting that everybody who discusses how to judge one's friends – apart from Alfenus Varus – fits the category of new rich or other upstarts. Further we meet the Stoic Chrysippus (line 127), who is gently mocked, and finally there is Crispinus (line 139), the Stoic babblers. They generally take the “wrong” view as to how to treat one's friends, support Stoic ideas about the execution of justice resulting in excessive punishments for minor offences. When Horace compares friendship with love (S.1.3.38-48) showing the affectionate attitude of the lover for his beloved or of the father for his child as paragons for real friendship, the names which are introduced are impossible to identify. Unknown Balbinus, presumably referring to a wheedler, and the only woman Hagna (a common freedwoman's name) in line 40 cannot be identified.

Horace closes S.1.3 with a few lines (139-140) about his own fortunate circumstances. DuQuesnay (1984, 36) also argues that Horace at the end of this poem refers to himself: *et mihi dulces/ ignoscent, si quid peccaro stultus, amici* (and my dear friends will forgive me if I – fool I am – make a mistake). He was accepted within a circle of men of great charisma and importance, real friends. Gowers (2012, 147) mentions only in passing that “DuQuesnay 1984:36 reads a political appeal into these words.” DuQuesnay states that “among his [Horace's] *amici* were Caesar (Octavian) and Maecenas; among the faults which they pardoned, the reader will recall, Horace's adherence to the Republican cause at Philippi.” I am much in sympathy with DuQuesnay's view; I read the poet's words as confirming that he felt accepted within Maecenas' circle of civilised men. We will see that Horace shows his positive feelings about his position in the circle of Maecenas again at a very symbolic place at the end of the first book, S.1.10.81-90. He acknowledges many of his learned and his poet-friends, as well as Octavian, Maecenas and Messala among other politician friends, whose praise of him and his poems he values most.

The manner in which Horace conducts this discussion, his choice of participants and subjects, suggests that there is an (anti-Stoic) philosophical side to the poem.

Although at one level S.1.3 concerns indeed the conduct among friends – specifically the judgment about the inconsistency and hypocrisy of one’s friends – I suggest that the poem also contains a second point, that is how a message can be presented within a circle of friends, while at the same time preserving tolerance and dignity among the participants. In the next *sermo*, the fourth, Horace develops his ideas on the standards required for his future commentary on political issues to three distinct groups: the political elite, the nouveau riche and his friends.

DuQuesnay also sees a philosophical/political content in S.1.1 – 1.3. The poems show the Epicurean foundation of Horace’s philosophical conviction and a rejection of Stoicism, the popular philosophy of those who supported the Republican cause. In DuQuesnay’s (1984, 33) opinion, Horace wants to show that “the Stoics and the Pompeians have no monopoly of concern with morality.” The Republicans and Pompeians adopted the widely held opinion at the time that the Triumvirs – and Octavian and his associates in particular – did not act from high moral principles at all but from *avaritia*, *ambitio* and *luxuria*, which were seen as the cause of Octavian’s hunger for power resulting in the battle of Philippi, the Perusine War and the land expropriations. In the three *sermones*, Horace shows his concern about the growth of reprehensible urges like greed, unlimited ambition, pursuit of luxury and uncontrolled sex. He suggests that Octavian, Maecenas and his friends share his concern. S.1.1-1.3 also have an additional political aspect, namely that Horace divides the internal audiences (Gold’s terminology, see discussion in section 2.1) of his *sermones* in three distinct groups, the elite, the nouveau riche and the extreme Stoics. He singles out some of the aristocrats and the nouveau riche and other upstarts as unfit for political office, and he condemns those followers of extreme Stoicism, who belong to the Republican and Pompeian camp. Thus, the three *sermones* are political poems as they are in support of Octavian and his policies against the Republican adversaries. His circle of friends ought to set a good example by living according to the high-minded principles of the past.¹²⁵

Looking at S.1.1-1.3 from a different angle altogether, they divide into two groups: on the one hand S.1.1 and S.1.2, and on the other S.1.3. The two groups differ in the following way: Horace focuses in the first two poems especially on the impropriety and misbehaviour of the political elite and the new rich in matters of general conduct in society, such as greed, unlimited ambition, and uncontrolled sex, while he is less concerned with the method of his delivery of the poem. In the third *sermo*, however, his focus is much more on the conduct within a circle of friends, while the method of presenting the message gets more attention than in the first two poems.

¹²⁵ For the political content in S.1.1 – 1.3, see DuQuesnay (1984, 27-36).

In **S.1.4**, Horace continues the theme of the third *sermo*, namely how to conduct oneself in a civilized, but critical conversation about political issues.¹²⁶ Horace presents in the first four *sermones* a well argued view as to how he intends to write politically oriented poetry, that is that he submits his ideas with respect to three fields of his intended authorship: the style, the subject matter, and the targets of his critical poetry. In this *sermo*, he defines first his style in lines 1-62. Thus to begin with, I will focus on his ideas about style. I will consider the subject matter and the targets in more detail at the end of my discussion of S.1.4 also taking full account of what we have seen in the first three *sermones*. Further, it should be noted that many of the issues dealt with in S.1.4 return in S.1.10. Therefore, in the discussion of the latter *sermo* I will frequently refer back to S.1.4.

Significantly, the opening lines of the poem refer to the tradition of the Old Attic Comedy. Lines 1-2 say: *EVPOLIS atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae/ atque alii quorum comoedia prisca virorum est* (Eupolis and Cratinus and Aristophanes, true poets and the other men of principle of Old Comedy). Freudenburg (1993, 27-51) stressed the link between comedy and satire, which I addressed before in my discussion of S.1.3, where I mentioned that Horace postures himself as a gentleman commentator with the qualities of a jester. I stated there that in examining the fourth *sermo* I would further consider Horace's theory on critical political poetry, which is not necessarily satire. Freudenburg (1993, 52-108) discusses satiric poetry and its relationship with contemporary literary theory at the end of the Republican era, specifically the influence of Aristotelian theory (liberal jest) and Hellenistic theory resting on Old Comedy, New Comedy and Callimachus' *Iambs*. Freudenburg's (1993, 107) final conclusion is that Horace mixes several traditions.¹²⁷ When I discussed S.1.3, I considered the influence of the theory of the liberal jest; in this section I will briefly go through the other traditions which may have exerted an influence on the poet.

Concerning Old Comedy, the opening of S.1.4 with its references to Old Comedy and (according to Quintilian *Inst.*10.1.65-66) to its chief authors Aristophanes, Eupolis and Cratinus should not be seen as an example of Horace's ironic ineptitude. According to Freudenburg (1993, 98), it speaks directly for the [Hellenistic] tradition "of the later practitioners of the iambic idea." Horace reminds us that the poets of Old Comedy admonished wrong-doers openly and we will see below that he expressed explicitly in S.1.4.6-7 that Lucilius wrote in the same tradition. Freudenburg (1993, 99)

126 For S.1.4, see Ferriss-Hill (2015, 3-17; 103-104; 143-146); Freudenburg (1993, 33-39; 86-100; 119-128; 145-150; 156-162); Gowers (2012, 147-182); Leach (1971); Lefèvre (1993, 104-109); Schlegel (2000; 2010, 253-259).

127 For Horace and the tradition of Rome's first "satirists" Ennius and Lucilius, see Muecke (2005, 33-47). For Horace and the Old Comic tradition, see Cornford (1968); Ferriss-Hill (2015, 1-44; 195-203); Freudenburg (1993, 3-51); Gowers (2012, 148-149; 152-155; 316-318). For a detailed analysis of the Aristotelian theory and the iambographic tradition, and the position of Horace in S.1.4, see Freudenburg (1993, 52-108). See also Dickie (1981).

quotes with approval Dickie's (1981, 185-186) final assessment of Horace's view of Old Comedy as "derived from Hellenistic literary theorizing, that makes Eupolis, Cratinus and Aristophanes the canonical poets of a *genre whose defining characteristic was that of holding sinners up to opprobrium (reproach) and that it is in that literary and moral tradition that he [Horace] places himself.*" Further, the views of Ferriss-Hill (2015) are relevant. Examining Horace's place within the comic tradition, she (2015, 17-19; 217-228) also stresses that one of the fundamental characteristics of Attic Comedy to be found again in Roman Satire are the *komodoumenoi* – people who can be mocked and pilloried.¹²⁸ Contrary to Freudenburg, Dickie, and Ferriss-Hill, I do not interpret Horace's reference to Old Comedy in the opening lines of S.1.4 as placing himself in "that literary and moral tradition," if that place means mocking and pillorying individuals and "holding sinners up to reproach." Firstly, when Horace wrote S.1.4, he had not yet written any censure poetry in what has come down to us as S.1.1-1.3, and I intend to show that neither any satiric poetry bearing his name was going to appear in the rest of S.1. Secondly, although Horace accepted that the genre of satire should hold wrong-doers freely and openly to reproach, I do not find that Horace follows the tradition of the Old Comedy and Lucilius: he never addresses in S.1 wrong-doers directly, either in a mild or an agonistic Lucilian fashion.¹²⁹ Horace had a very different reason for quoting the poets of Old Comedy. He discloses the reason in the next three lines: the reason is the *libertas* (freedom of speech) with which the poets of Old Comedy wrote. I will explain below that Horace intends to speak and write with equal freedom both in his first book of *Sermones* – his credentials for Maecenas – and in his poetry in other genres. He sees *libertas* as an essential quality for good poetry. S.1.4.3-5 says:

*si quis erat dignus describi quod malus ac fur,
quod moechus foret aut sicarius aut alioqui
famosus, multa cum libertate notabant.*

(if there was anyone deserving to be described as a ruffian and a thief, as an adulterer or murderer, or as otherwise notorious, they censured him with great freedom of speech)

Scholars argue that Horace in S.1.4.3-5 singled out criminals as being severely censured by the poets of Old Comedy. For example, Gowers (2012, 153) states: "H.[orace] attributes republican-style powers of moral censorship to the Old Comedians, somewhat inaccurately, as they tended to pillory individuals – politicians and sophists, for example – rather than criminals." Horace brought up the poets of

¹²⁸ The other two characteristics which Ferriss-Hill discusses are the parabasis – the stepping forward of the chorus in Attic Comedy with the direct address of the listeners for conveying a message of the poet – , and the agonistic style. The *italics* in the quote of Freudenburg are mine. For parabasis, see also Dover (1972, 49-53).

¹²⁹ For the significance of Old Comedy, see also my discussion of S.1.10.

Old Comedy for the reason that Gowers suggests. I share her doubt whether lines 3-5 should be interpreted as Horace denouncing ordinary ruffians, thieves and murderers. These lines following immediately those referring to Old Comedy are meant to direct us to the same sort of people as censured by Aristophanes, Eupolis and Cratinus: the lines are a functional reference to individual politicians. In Horace's view, the behaviour of some members of the aristocracy, of many individuals of the political and social elite and the new rich does not contrast with that of criminals. The context of S.1.1-3 also points to this conclusion. We saw that in S.1.1 Horace is concerned not only about the loss of moral standards by both the common people and the elite, and the impact on the political stability in Rome and Italy, but also about the social destruction caused by the civil war and its aftermath. The main theme of S.1.2 is the poet's criticism of the immoderate behaviour in sexual relationships and the vulgar conduct and materialistic attitude of the elite and parvenus alike, and the threat of their lack of restraint pursuing their own interests. In S.1.3, he refers to Hermogenes, who exemplifies adaptability and unreliability, and Alfenus, who shows untrustworthiness and dishonesty symbolizing the many who try to force themselves into holding high office and are not deserving such. He continues this line of thought in the opening lines of S.1.4, when he mentions in S.1.4.3-5 "anyone deserving to be described as a ruffian and a thief, as an adulterer or murderer." Horace was not thinking of ordinary criminals, but of individuals in high office murdering opponents, appropriating property, and carrying out other criminal action. It was the time of the expropriations and confiscations when the most fertile land was given to the veterans and the resulting loss of continuity contributed greatly to the famines in Italy during the thirties B.C. Added to this, groups of desperadoes roamed the countryside, and smallholders were particularly exposed to land-grabbing. Last but not least, there were structural changes in the agricultural sector, where the farming estates, the *latifundia*, were established at the cost of the traditional farmers with the help of capital of the nouveau riche and old elite. Horace did not censure those corrupt politicians as a satirist, but intended to demonstrate to Maecenas that his political opinions were correct. He used in S.1 the instrument of the *sermo* to present in a civilized manner the reprehensible actions and ideas of several groups of wrongdoers in order to discover in discussion with Maecenas and his circle of friends the common political ground.

The poet makes a second noteworthy point in line 5. Horace says that the poets of Old Comedy censured criminals with great *libertas*, freedom of speech. When he wrote this in the 40s and 30s B.C., the issue of *libertas* was hotly contested. The concept of *παρρησία* (later *libertas* in Rome) originated in the political sphere of classical Athens expressing the right of freedom of speech for those who enjoyed full civic status. Later in Hellenistic times, *parrhesia* was not considered any longer a political right, but rather a private virtue, where rank and station became important and the term shifted from freedom of speech to personal candor. According to Konstan et al. (2007, 4)

The shift in the meaning is coordinate with the change from the egalitarian city-state to a regime of powerful rulers in a position to dispense patronage. With these changes, the figure of the flatterer became a key subject of ideological attention.

This shift is very relevant for understanding Horace's inference that the poets of Old Comedy censured with great freedom of speech (*multa cum libertate notabant*). Several different levels come together in those few words.¹³⁰

Firstly, within the political context, Horace entered a political battleground. He wrote those words at a time of great political changes in Rome, with the risk that the ruling classes discontinued the right of free speech. These changes were similar to those that had occurred in the Greek world with the rise of the Hellenistic kingdoms, and which was at the roots of the shift in meaning of the notion of *parrhesia* in the Hellenistic world. I refer here to the change in Rome from Republic to Principate with on the one hand its attempts to curtail free speech and on the other hand the arrogation of it by both Octavian and his party and the Pompeians. According to DuQuesnay (1984, 29-32), it may be assumed that Lucilius was used by the Republicans, who had adopted the position of being the defenders of free speech together with the hard-line Stoics and the Pompeians who promoted him as their man. The Pompeians set great store by the fact that Lucilius was a great-uncle to Pompey the Great. Lucilius was fostered as the defender of Republican *libertas*. Thus, Horace, the associate of Maecenas and Octavian, and a follower of Philodemus and the Epicurean school, touches with a discussion of freedom of speech upon a very sensitive political issue. If Horace's words about freedom were perceived as an attack on the traditional republican value, coming from someone near Octavian, this could well be taken as a further example of Octavian's attempts to establish a form of kingship by Republican-minded adversaries, of whom many were members of the Senate and other prominent political bodies. I concur with Anderson's (1982, 16) description of Horace's understanding of *libertas* as "ideally, the basis of freedom is a sense of responsibility, self-discipline which prevents one from interfering with the liberty of others."

130 Horace writes about friendship in *Ep.*1.18.1-9; see also my discussion of *S.*1.4.81-85. For Horace and *libertas*, see Anderson (1982, 15-17; 27-28); DuQuesnay (1984, 29-32); Freudenburg (1993, 79): "by Horace's day, the Cynics, iambic poets, and the writers of Old Comedy had been reduced to a single class, noted for their shared commitment to *παρρησία*, Latin *libertas*, the free citizen's right to open abuse without fear of reprisal." See also Freudenburg (1993, 86-92; 96-97; 2001, 15-23); Konstan et al. (2007) gives the texts of Philodemus "On Frank Criticism," and a detailed exposition on *parrhesia*. Gowers (2012, 150) summarizes the political environment in which Horace finds himself as follows: "H.[orace] also enters a still-vigorous Hellenistic debate about the proper limits of humour: Aristotelian supporters of the so-called 'liberal jest', gentle or gentlemanly laughter, versus Cynics or iambographers who justified frank and aggressive abuse as a moral duty. This debate had acquired a topical edge in the late republic, when *libertas* was brandished as a slogan by both factions in the civil war, but was increasingly difficult to uphold in a climate of tight state control." See also Gowers (2012, 149; 154-155).

Secondly, at a personal level, Horace, adhering to the Epicurean view, wanted to distance himself from Lucilius. We will see in the discussion of S.1.4.6-13, and later in that of S.1.10, that Horace judges the work of Lucilius positively with respect to its critical spirit, but rejects the invective manner of Lucilius; he prefers a more restrained way of expressing himself. He recorded in S.1.4.5 with approval that the poets of Old Comedy censured with great freedom of speech, and thus Horace stood up to Lucilius and the Stoics in an indirect manner. He claimed that he, like his associates, was also fully committed to support *parrhesia*.

DuQuesnay (1984, 30-32) makes an intriguing point suggesting that, although Horace distanced himself from Lucilian invective, it is feasible that he followed the same Lucilius as a model upholding the values of *libertas* (see also the discussion of S.1.10.67-71). Lucilius was a member of the circle around Scipio Africanus, who was among other things an important patron of the arts. DuQuesnay argues that Horace's claim to be the successor of Lucilius as the new defender of *libertas* prompts the reader to conclude that Maecenas' circle was the successor to the highly regarded Scipionic circle of the past. I add a further point to DuQuesnay's conclusion, that is that Horace means to say that not only the two circles match, but also that Maecenas therefore is the new Scipio.

Libertas reappears in lines 103 and 132, where Horace uses the word *liber* in passages concerning freedom of speech.¹³¹ I intend to demonstrate later in the discussion of S.1.4 that Horace recognizes two sources of inspiration for his moral guidance in matters of censuring: the first one is the notion of *parrhesia* and the second one the traditional Roman moral values as handed down by previous generations: *mos maiorum*, a token of Latin ethnicity.¹³² In his opinion, *parrhesia* is relevant both in the public and in the private domain. The public domain is obviously the one discussed above in connection with S.1.4.1-5, the censuring of public officials. When I discuss S.1.4.103-105 and S.1.4.132-133, we will see that Horace reflects on frank criticism among friends; he follows the teaching by Philodemus in his treatise *Περὶ παρρησίας* (On Frank Criticism) in carrying into effect his criticism. He sees *mos maiorum* as his moral guide of conduct among friends. The two go together. He touched already briefly upon his inspiration for moral guidance, *mos maiorum*, in S.1.1.15-22, and we will see that the inspiration by *mos maiorum* returns in S.1.4.81-85, S.1.4.93-103 and S.1.4.115-119.

Next, in lines 6-21, Horace considers the work of Lucilius in more detail. He places Lucilius squarely in the tradition of Old Attic Comedy. Firstly, in lines 6-7 he writes: *hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus/ mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque* (Lucilius wholly depends on them, and them he followed changing only metre and

¹³¹ *Liber* in S.1.4.89 refers to Bacchus, and *liber* in S.1.4.90 to a dinner guest who talks too freely when drunk.

¹³² Conform DuQuesnay (1984, 32).

rhythm). In lines 7-13, he gives his detailed commentary on Lucilius' work, who wrote some thirty books of satires. Horace will return to S.1.4.7-13 in the opening lines of the tenth *sermo*, and in S.1.10.56-71 (see section 2.2.5) he will tone down some of his criticism of Lucilius. S.1.4.7-13 reads:

facetus,
emunctae naris, durus componere versus:
nam fuit hoc vitiosus: in hora saepe ducentos,
ut magnum, versus dictabat stans pede in uno:
cum flueret lutulentus, erat quod tollere velles:
garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem,
scribendi recte: nam ut multum, nil moror.

(Lucilius was witty, keen, but rugged in the composition of verses: in fact in this [ruggedness] he was faulty: in an hour he would often dictate two hundred lines standing on his head [lit. standing on one foot = with great ease], as though it were a big deal: when he flowed in his muddy stream, there was much you would like to remove: he was garrulous, and too lazy for the toil of writing – I mean of writing properly. For I am not interested in quantity)

In S.1.4.7-8, Horace judges the work of Lucilius positively, whom he describes as witty, keen and rugged in the composition of verses, “implying that in his rugged word arrangement, just as in his clever, stinging wit, Lucilius consciously imitated the Attic masters of Old Comedy mentioned at *Satires* 1.4.1, showing all the traits of a good Atticist” (Freudenburg, 1993, 157). Rudd (2007, 91) states: “another point often overlooked is that 1.4 carries no condemnation of Lucilius’ spirit,” and that although Horace is positive about the manner in which Lucilius succeeded as a Roman successor to the best of the Old Comedy, he did not write his *Sermones* after the manner of Lucilius.¹³³ According to Freudenburg (2001, 19), the latter’s satires “were famous not for their ironic undercurrents, but for their searing abuse of Rome’s most prominent writers, political figures and men of high social standing, both living and dead.”

In the next line 9, Horace uses the word *vitiosus* (faulty), which is often understood to mean that the poet criticizes Lucilius for his ruggedness. I agree with Rackham, also mentioned by Freudenburg, that the poet did not mean a “straightforward negative assessment” (Freudenburg, 1993, 157) at all. Rackham (1916, 224) remarks about this: “In l. 9 I take ‘*hoc*’ to look backward, not forward: ‘In fact in the last of these three characteristics [*durus*] Lucilius was faulty’ – he carried roughness of versification to excess. This is developed in the loosely connected sentences [S.1.4.9-13] that follow: the fault was due to Lucilius’s rapid work.”¹³⁴ The rejection of refinement in the

133 For Horace and Lucilius in general, see Fiske (1966). For Horace and Lucilius in S.1.4, see also Fiske (1966, 277-306); Hendrickson (1900); Leach (1971, 623-624); Rudd (2007, 86-92). Schegel (2000, 93-107; 2010). See also the discussion of the opening of S.1.10.

134 For Lucilius’ style, see Freudenburg (1993, 150-162). For the translation of line 9 I follow Rackham

rugged style advocated by the Atticists stems from the Stoic views of a “rugged” word order. What did the Atticists’ rugged style stand for? According to Freudenburg (1993, 152), the Atticists stood for “a conscious effort to *dissolvere orationem*, that is to break apart the smooth collocation of words [...]. They wanted their every word to appear ‘tossed off’ (*abiectum*), that is, rugged and unstudied.” Atticists in particular held anticompositional theories as they rejected artificiality, although their ruggedness was anything but unstudied.¹³⁵ Freudenburg’s observations relate to what in essence is not only a matter of literary style, but also a matter of politics. Horace’s verdict alludes also to one of the many political confrontations between Republicans and Caesarians. It is feasible that Horace raised these points of style in S.1.4.7-10 not only as part of his argument with Lucilius about satiric style, but also as part of his dispute with the Stoics about their philosophical views. Thus, he continued his rejection of Stoic doctrines such as of those we saw in S.1.3 – that all sins are equal and the Stoic paradox that only the wise man (*sapiens*) was perfect – by also pouring scorn over their literary views.

Horace’s use of the flooded-river analogy is not by chance, as this analogy was often used in the debates on word arrangement; an issue on which he and his critics had such different opinions.¹³⁶ Freudenburg analyses extensively this stylistic element in S.1.4. He (1993, 160) refers to “Quintilian’s lengthy study of word arrangement in Book 9 of the *Institutes* which contains numerous references to the river analogy within a technical analysis of arrangement, and thus it serves to demonstrate the untold variety and serviceability of the metaphor in ancient compositional theory.” Freudenburg concludes that Horace’s criticism of Lucilius in lines S.1.4.6-13 fits the criticism coming from ancient compositional theory, and he (1993, 162) interprets the river analogy as that “much as a learned allusion to Callimachus, it is a well-worn, even trite illustration of ancient compositional theory, designed to make a technical point about the way in which Lucilius set his words side by side.” Horace also makes a different point criticizing in S.1.4.11-12 a second stylistic imperfection of Lucilius. The combination of *cum flueret lutulentus* (when he flowed in his muddy stream) in line 11 and *garrulus* (he was garrulous) in line 12 implies that in Horace’s view Lucilius lacks terseness (*brevitas*). Lucilius cannot write sharply worded thoughts. Horace will return to this point in S.1.10.9-10 when he reviews S.1.4 and gives his view on standards of good poetry, of which *brevitas* is one: *est brevitare opus, ut currat*

(1916, 224). In line 10, I follow the suggestions of Gowers (2012, 136) for “*ut magnum*” and for “*stans pede in uno*.”

135 Conform Freudenburg (1993, 150): “anticompositional theories, [...], gained increasing support in the early 40s B.C., especially among the Stoics, who somehow identified a rugged, natural style of arrangement, such as that which they knew from Lucilius, with Stoic virtue and the bygone values of the old Republic.”

136 For a summary of the use of the swollen-river analogy by Horace, see Freudenburg (1993, 158 note 86).

sententia neu se/ impediatur verbis lassas onerantibus auris (one needs brevity, in order for the train of thought to run on, and not to get entangled with words that overwhelm exhausted ears).

Horace's criticism of Lucilius in S.1.4.1-13 concerns Lucilius' skill (*ars*), and is not about the content (*res*) of the latter's satires (see also the discussion of S.1.4.38-62). Schlegel (2010, 258) draws the same conclusion when she relates her discussion of the opening of the fourth satire (lines 1-26) to the passage at the end of the poem where "Horace's father" gives his moral teaching to "his son" (S.1.4.105-143).¹³⁷ She writes: "Just as *notabant* (5) is redeployed in Horace Sr.'s *notando* [(106)], other words too from the beginning of the poem are borrowed to do new work at the end of the poem. *Lucilius was poetically vitiosus* [(9)], but it is examples of ethical failings (*vitiorum*, 106) that Horace's father now [S.1.4.105-143] marks." I will consider "Horace's father's" supposed advice with respect to these ethical failings in more detail below when I discuss the final passage of the poem, that from line 103.¹³⁸ I will argue that his aim is to demonstrate that his opinions accord with the traditions of the old Roman values.

Horace asserts in lines 5-7 with approval that Lucilius wholly stood in the tradition of the poets of the Old Comedy (*hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus*), who freely chose their targets and censured with great freedom of speech (*multa cum libertate notabant*). Horace will preserve his right to do the same and express himself freely, but in a very different style than that of Lucilius. In addition, he will adjust his style to his audiences. According to Freudenburg (2005b, 7): "Horace projects a far different sense of himself in his 'Conversations' than Lucilius did in his searingly nasty satires. He speaks in softer, more cautious tones, telling us that he means well by his criticisms, that he intends only to tell the truth, and that no one need take offense."¹³⁹ Horace says indeed in these lines, that he doesn't wish to imitate Lucilius, but he did not say either that he wants to be a satiric poet, not even one with a milder style. He says that Lucilius wrote in an invective style, but that such a style doesn't fit the purpose for which Horace writes his poetry.

In the second half of this passage, S.1.4.13-21, Horace gives a cheerful sketch ridiculing the verbosity of some authors. He depicts a challenge by Crispinus, presumably the same long-winded Stoic babbler we met in S.1.1.120 and S.1.3.139, to see who can write most (*'videamus uter plus scribere possit'*) (S.1.4.16), a contest of who can write with the greatest speed and thus recalling Lucilius' achievements of lines 9-10.¹⁴⁰ I interpret Horace's tongue-in-cheek words of S.1.4.17-18 *di bene fecerunt*

¹³⁷ Schlegel (2000) also observes in her paper several times that Horace criticized Lucilius on style. Examples are: (2000, 94) "distinguishing himself from Lucilius stylistically"; (2000, 102) "Lucilius, lazy with words, is ultimately no model for Horace"; (2000, 106) "In Satire 1.4 Horace creates a distance between himself and Lucilius, his literary father."

¹³⁸ *Italics* in the quote of Schlegel are mine.

¹³⁹ For the comparison between Horace and Lucilius, see also Gowers (2005, 54-55).

¹⁴⁰ For Crispinus, see also note 75.

inopis me quodque pusilli/ finxerunt animi, raro et perpauca loquentis (the gods be praised for creating me with a weak intellect and petty spirit, one that speaks rarely and scantily), that he intends to write with restraint and in simple language, thus “depreciating his talents in language that Crispinus would approve” (Oliensis, 1998, 22). In addition, that he will not write hastily, but in a polished and attractive style in which he considers his words carefully. Nothing certain is known of Fannius in S.1.4.21-22, of whom several scholars conjecture that he was a follower of Sextus Pompey. He was obviously an author of sorts, who perhaps either presented his works to private libraries or tried to market them through book dealers.¹⁴¹ This is not Horace’s way of doing things. He pretends that no one reads his writings (*mea nemo/ scripta legat*), and that he is afraid of reciting them in public, because some if not most do not like critical censure poetry, as they themselves ought to be censured. Horace states that there is not much benefit in writing such poetry for a large audience, as the crowd would not pay attention and thus would not get the message anyway. Further, his credentials, his *Sermones*, were aimed particularly at a select and small group of people. At other places Horace has testified which kind of audiences he preferred.¹⁴² For example, Horace writes later in this poem, in S.1.4.71-74: I want no bookshop to have my little books or column to advertise them, [...]. I do not recite to anybody save friends, unless I am forced, not anywhere or before whoever it may be (*nulla taberna meos habeat neque pila libellos./[...] nec recito cuiquam nisi amicis, idque coactus,/ non ubivis coramve quibuslibet*). Further, in S.1.10.73-74, which he probably wrote in the year 35 B.C., he also says that he does not attempt to reach large audiences: *neque te ut miretur turba labores,/ contentus paucis lectoribus* (and that you should not strive to get the admiration of the crowd, but that you be content with the select few as your readers). Horace made the same point in S.1.10.39; *nec redeant iterum atque iterum spectanda theatris* (these [his poems] should not come back again and again to be seen in the theatres). About twenty five years later he still held the same

141 For Fannius, see DuQuesnay (1984, 56): “if the Fannius of 1.10.80 is related to or even identical with C. Fannius, the adherent of Sextus;” Freudenburg (1993, 117) conjectures that Fannius of S.1.10.80 is the same man as the one in S.1.4.21: “In this [S.1.4.21] he [Horace] associates Fannius with Crispinus, suggesting that he [Fannius] too wrote in verse, perhaps on the themes of Stoic ethics. We know from *Satires* 1.10.80 that Fannius was, by reputation, a constant dinner companion [...] of Hermogenes.” The context of S.1.10.80 supports Freudenburg’s view that Fannius was an author. See also Rudd (2007, 101; 119-120; 132). Syme (2002, 228; 333-334) suggests a different option for the identity of Fannius. He could be one of the historical Fannii. One of them was a follower of Sextus Pompey, the other was of the anti-Caesarian party. For Fannius, see also the discussion of S.1.10.78-80. For the marketing of books in general, see Weeda (2015, 38-39). For Fannius and his desire to have his work published, see Rudd (1956).

142 See my discussion of Horace’s preference of audiences in section 2.1 w.r.t. his inspiration by Archilochus et al. and the role of *iambus* in archaic Greece that was written for the symposium, an audience of *philoï*. See also Weeda (2015, 41-42).

opinion.¹⁴³ In 12 or 11 B.C. he wrote a lengthy passage about three forms of poetry in his *Epistula ad Augustum* (*Ep.*2.1.156-218), in which he (2.1.214) asks Augustus to look favourably on his art, which is poetry for private reading (*lectoris credere*; to entrust themselves to a reader). In his earlier *Ep.*1.19, written between 23 and 19 B.C., Horace expressed similar feelings. In the lines 41-44 he says: *'spissis indigna theatris/scripta pudet recitare [...]/ si dixi, 'rides,' ait, 'et Iovis auribus ista/ servas'* (If I said, "I feel ashamed to recite my unworthy work in your crowded theatres," says he "you are merry, and preserve your work for the ears of Jove [Augustus]"). In his *Ars Poetica* – written either between 22-18 B.C. or towards the end of his life – Horace poured scorn again on the writing for large audiences and showed himself dismissive of the taste of large crowds either in the theatre or in someone's townhouse. In *Ars.*212-213 he wrote: *indoctus quid enim saperet liberque laborum/ rusticus urbano confusus, turpis honesto?* (What taste indeed would the man, ignorant and just finished with his hard work, have, a peasant mixed up with a man from town, the man without breeding with the respectable?). Lowrie (2009a, 11) takes a similar line when she argues on the ground of the opening line of the first Roman Ode: "When Horace sets a premium on poetry's aesthetic quality, he makes a similar gesture against entertainment in favour of a higher standard that separates him from popular culture (*'odi profanum uulgus'* (I despise the vulgar throng), *Odes* 3.1.1)."

As a result of the political situation in the 30s B.C. and after the composition of the Senate changed considerably and the traditional political rhetoric disappeared gradually. Rhetoricians had developed the practice of declamation and when the opportunity for political oratory dried up, declamation became a successful form of entertainment. The result was that the public that attended poetry grew fast. Poets followed the example of rhetoricians and sought large live audiences. Seneca (Maior) in his *Controversiae* (*Con.*4.2) testifies that Pollio in the 30s or 20s "became 'the first of the Romans to recite his works to an invited general audience'" (White, 1993, 59-63, esp. at 60; 2005, 322-323). The passages from Horace's poems tell us firstly, that large-scale recitations (*spissis theatris*) of poetry took place and that Horace detested these. Secondly, that he did not have much regard for the typical theatre crowds and did not want to cater for their tastes (*Ep.*1.19 and 2.1). Thirdly, that he was a lucky fellow as he could read his poetry to *auribus Iovis*, Augustus' ears.

Although I mentioned at the opening of my discussion of S.1.4 that I will focus in my examination of lines 1- 62 primarily on Horace's style, being an important topic of what is something approaching the first half of the poem, I cannot avoid considering occasionally his ideas with respect to the other two fields of his intended authorship,

143 Quinn (1982, 146, note 232) argues that Horace may have used the words *contentus paucis lectoribus* in S.1.10.74 as an argument answering public criticism of his fourth *Sermo* and that the words do not represent his preferred kind of audience. This is unlikely, as Horace repeats his preference several times during a period of 25 years or more. For the dating of *Ars Poetica*, see Nisbet (2007, 20).

that is the subject matter, and the targets of his *sermones*. I will consider those in more detail when I discuss lines 105-115. Horace continues to follow in the fourth *sermo* the path of the previous three *sermones*, that is defining the different groups of individuals who ought to be critically judged. In S.1.4.22-27, he introduces yet another class of wrong-doers who are to be considered:

cum mea nemo
scripta legat vulgo recitare timentis ob hanc rem,
quod sunt quos genus hoc minime iuvat, utpote pluris
culpari dignos. quemvis media elige turba:
aut ob avaritiam aut misera ambitione laborat:
hic nuptarum insanit amoribus, hic puerorum;
 (while nobody reads my writings, I fear reciting them in public, because this genre [censure poetry] pleases least, since most people deserve censure. Choose anyone from a crowd: either he suffers from avarice, or from a miserable ambition; one is madly in love with married women, the other with boys)

In this passage, Horace not only introduces a different class of people, but also a new form of criticism; it is the censure of social control and street gossip. Freudenburg (1993, 100) points out that in those lines Horace not only makes a significant shift in the sections of society to which he pays attention, but also that he introduces traits of “Cynic diatribe, where, from the street corner or market stall, the [Cynic] moralizer harangues and lampoons those given over to avarice, ambition, greed, and lust, which are hardly equivalent to murder, theft, and adultery.” Hunter (1985, 486-487) adds to this that Horace also brings in characteristics of New Comedy: “the verses [S.1.4.3-5 and S.1.4. 26-31] take us into the world of New Comedy and of Horace’s own satires, without actually abandoning Old Comedy entirely.”¹⁴⁴ He describes in lines 22-27 the behaviour of common people that appears to be the same as that which he saw in the upper layers of society in S.1.1 and S.1.2. For example, he depicted in S.1.1 the *avaritia*, *ambitio* and *luxuria*, and the social and political risk of unrestrained greed and ambition of the elite. In S.1.2 he continued this approach blaming the unabashed behaviour by members of the Roman aristocracy, which he saw as typical for the degeneration of standards within the elite caused by the growing influence of the urban nouveau riche with their materialistic attitude, their hunting for status, and lack of restraint. In S.1.4, he extends the class of people deserving censure from the elite to Roman society in general (*turba*): in S.1.4.24-25 he is very specific about this when he says *utpote pluris/ culpari dignos* (since most people deserve censure). Hunter and Freudenburg interpret this as the poet’s shift in his view, that is the recognition that

¹⁴⁴ For S.1.4 and New Comedy, see also Gowers (2012, 159-162). Freudenburg and other scholars generally call Horace “satirist,” and use the term “*satire*” for his poetry in *Sermones* 1. For the sake of clearness, I recall that I chose the term *sermo*, in accordance with what I regard the poet’s intention.

not only the severe public invective against the political elite and against criminal behaviour, but also the “softer” censure of the relatively minor misdemeanours of the people at large are part of censure poetry. The latter was a result of the practices of New Comedy. Freudenburg (1993, 100) summarizes this as follows: “This last point [by Hunter (1985, 487), namely taking us into the world of New Comedy, without actually abandoning Old Comedy entirely] is extremely important, for it suggests that Horace, as a theorist and practitioner of satire, does not simply dismiss one tradition in favor of another.” Freudenburg and Hunter interpret this passage in the literary frame, while I read Horace’s reference to the people at large in the functional frame. His approach in the above passage S.1.4.22-27 is similar to that in lines S.1.4.3-5. He continues his search for the behaviour of people deserving censure, because he seeks to convince Maecenas that he recognizes the social evil with which he does not want to be associated in all classes of society. Thus, I see the reference as his intimation to Maecenas that he does not exclude any section of Roman society from his scrutiny.

After criticizing people’s obsession with silver and bronze in line 28 *hunc capit argenti splendor; stupet Albius aere* (one is obsessed by the splendour of silver; Albius is stunned by bronze), Horace returns to the first *sermo* of the book in the following lines, censuring the avarice of traders.¹⁴⁵ S.1.4.29-30 reads: *hic mutat merces surgente a sole ad eum quo/ vespertina tepet regio* (another sells his goods from where the sun rises to where the western region is warmed [by the sun]). The trader works day and night, because he fears that his wealth will not grow (*metuens aut ampliat ut rem*) (line 32).

The lines that follow touch on the subject of defensive poetics.¹⁴⁶ S.1.4.33-35 reads:

*omnes hi metuunt versus, odere poetas.
faenum habet in cornu; longe fuge: dummodo risum
excutiat, sibi non, non cuiquam parcat amico'*

(Those people fear verses and hate poets. “He has hay on his horns. Don’t go near him! As long as he can extract a laugh, he will not spare himself or any friend”).

¹⁴⁵ The unknown Albius returns as faring poorly (*male vivat*) in line 109.

¹⁴⁶ For S.1.4.35 there are two readings in the original manuscripts: either *excutiat sibi, non hic cuiquam* or *excutiat, sibi non, non cuiquam*. I choose the latter option conform OCT (Wickham, 1957) and Gowers (2012,161): “with *sibi* (MSS), the sense and even phrasing have a close precedent in Arist. *NE.4.1128a33 – 1128b2*: ‘The buffoon (βωμολόχος) cannot stop jesting, and if he can cause a laugh he doesn’t spare himself or anyone else. And he says the sort of things the polite gentleman never says, and other things that he refuses even to hear’ (*excutiat* ~ εἰ γέλωτα ποιήσει; *sibi non* ~ οὔτε ἑαυτοῦ (ἀπεχόμενος); *non cuiquam amico* ~ οὔτε τῶν ἄλλῶν).” For S.1.4.33-35, see also Ferriss-Hill (2015, 144). Gowers does not interpret lines 33-35 as defensive poetics.

Dangerous animals, like mad bulls, were given hay on their horns to mark them out in the field. The satirist is like a mad bull. Scholars have remarked that satirical poets are often loathed by their targets, and that is what caused the satirists to write defensive poetry.¹⁴⁷ For example, Ferriss-Hill referring, among other poems, to S.1.4 concludes that Horace took up defensive poetics already in S.1.4 because he felt wronged by real or imagined criticism of his poetry. S.1.4 has indeed several references to people who are not pleased by the satiric genre. The first one is S.1.4.22-27 (see above), when he says in lines 24-25 *quod sunt quos genus hoc minime iuvat, utpote pluris/ culpari dignos* (because this genre [censure poetry] pleases least, since most people deserve censure). Then follows line 33, and later in the *sermo* S.1.4.91-93, what is seen as a form of defensive poetry when he says *lividus et mordax videor tibi?* (do you find me malicious and snarling?) (see below). Ferriss-Hill (2015, 144-156) gives more examples in S.1.10, S.2 and the *Epistulae*. However, I propose the following counter-arguments against her interpretation. My arguments stem from the contexts, not only that of Horace's objective of writing S.1 – his credentials for Maecenas – but also the context of the quoted passages within S.1.4. Concerning his objective for the book as a whole, I argue that Horace's reflections on the style and content are not the result of his search for his poetic orientation, but are part of his discussion about his political orientation with Maecenas and his circle. His pronouncements about the satiric genre are markers for his political and social views intended to convince Maecenas that he holds the right political opinions and that he has the right social background. In addition, he writes those for discussion within a limited circle. Looking at the passages in S.1.4, which are interpreted as supporting the view that Horace writes defensive poetry, I argue that the context of the poem does not lead to this conclusion. The context of lines 22-27 is the discussion with Maecenas about the moral standards of common people. The words in lines 24-25 “because this genre [censure poetry] pleases least, since most people deserve censure” (*quod sunt quos genus hoc minime iuvat, utpote pluris/ culpari dignos*) mean that common people would not like to hear what Horace thinks of those standards, but that he does not intend to make his views known publicly. Equally, the words in lines 33-35 “those people fear verses and hate poets” (*omnes hi metuunt versus, odere poetas*) and a poet “will not spare himself or any friend, as long as he can extract a laugh” (*dummodo risum/ excutiat, sibi non, non cuiquam parcat amico*) are a general statement about common people's perceptions

147 For the writing of defensive poetry, see Feeney (2009b, 20); Ferriss-Hill (2015, 121-143); Freudenburg (1993, 119-150); Gowers (2012, 162-163); For Horace and defensive poetry, see Ferriss-Hill (2015, 143-156). For S.1.4 and defensive poetry, see Oberhelman & Armstrong (1995, 237), who refer to a.o. Freudenburg (1993, 52-53); Kiessling (1959, xxi); Wili (1965, 71; 71 note 2); Rudd (1955a; 1955b; 2007, 88-89). Hendrickson (1900, 124) was the first to suggest that Horace did not write defensive poetics in S.1.4: “I do not believe that Horace is here justifying himself before the harsh criticisms of a public which felt aggrieved and injured by his attacks, nor do I believe that the contents of the satire and the criticisms of himself which it presents are drawn from life.”

of poetry. I consider S.1.4.24-25 and S.1.4.33-35 statements of facts in a discussion, not defensive poetry. We will see below in my discussion of S.1.4.91-93 that lines 91-93 are also statements of fact in a discussion, similar to lines 24-25 and 33-35. He puts in S.1.4.91-93 a rhetorical question within the context of a discussion about acceptable censure of the urban nouveau riche with their materialistic attitude, their hunting for status, and lack of restraint. His answer to the rhetorical question “do you find me malicious and snarling?” (*lividus et mordax videor tibi?*) is that he writes openly without malice. This is not a defensive reaction against criticism from people who felt wronged by him, as he had not written anything addressing them.

Next, Horace gives in reply to his critics in a long passage (S.1.4.38-62) his views on the writing of poetry considering the unity of natural talent (*ingenium*), and therefore skill (or the lack) of composition (*ars*), content (*res*), and style (*verba*). Horace also deals with matters of content (*res*) in the remainder of S.1.4.¹⁴⁸ The first eleven lines (S.1.4.38-48) of this important passage read:

*agedum, pauca accipe contra.
primum ego me illorum dederim quibus esse poetas
excerpam numero: neque enim concludere versum
dixeris esse satis; neque si qui scribat uti nos
sermoni propiora, putes hunc esse poetam.
ingenium cui sit, cui mens diviniior atque os
magna sonaturum, des nominis huius honorem.
idcirco quidam comoedia necne poema
esset quaesivere, quod acer spiritus ac vis
nec verbis nec rebus inest, nisi quod pede certo
differt sermoni, sermo merus.*

(come now, listen to a few words to the contrary. First, I might strike out myself from the number of those I would grant to be poets, for you might not say it is enough to round off a metrical line, and if one writes more like conversational prose, as I do, you might not hold him to be a poet. Someone with natural talent, or an almost divine intelligence and a grand voice, you might give that man the honour of that name [poet]. For that reason some have asked whether comedy would or would not be poetry, because [in their opinion] it lacks an ardent spirit and energy both in style and content, and except for the fact that it differs from conversational prose in having a rigid metre, it is pure prose)

In lines 39-42, Horace makes twice a statement in which he seems to strike himself out as a poet: *concludere versum*, that is being able to write metrically, or writing poetry like prose (*sermoni propiora*) is not enough to qualify. These lines, however, are not

148 See also my discussion of S.1.4.38-62 in section 2.1. For a comprehensive analysis of the poetic structure of this passage in which the ideas of metathesis, *ars/ingenium* and *res/verba* are discussed and also the poetic skill of Horace, see Oberhelman & Armstrong (1995). See also Freudenburg (1993, 150); Gowers (2012, 163). Marouzeau (1936) discusses word arrangement in Horace’s poetry in general. He does not mention S.1.4.

meant as a qualification of his own poetry, but as an introduction to the passage as a whole and should be read as: “I could not be considered a poet, if I were not to meet the following standards.” Hence, Horace recapitulates in lines 43-44 two of the requirements for true poetry, that is that somebody who lacks *ingenium* and *ars* cannot be a true poet. Next, in lines 45-48 he continues by extending the required qualities of poetry with those of content (*res*) and style (*verba*).¹⁴⁹ He does this in his answer to those who question whether comedy should be considered poetry. Horace gave his answer that comedy is poetry already in the opening lines of the poem where he says that Eupolis, Cratinus and Aristophanes are true poets (*Eupolis atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae*). Here, he specifies his previous answer by saying that poetry also needs spirit and energy in style and content and in the comic scene of the angry father in lines 48-52 he demonstrates that good comedy possesses both spirit and energy. Horace gives a gripping description of the father (*pater ardens*), fuming because his playboy son (*nepos filius*) madly in love with a courtesan girlfriend (*meretrice insanus amica*) spends his money on her and drink (*ebrius*) while he could marry a woman with a large dowry (*uxorem grandi cum dote recuset*).¹⁵⁰ Spirit and energy, passion galore making this short piece of comedy good poetry.

In addition, Horace adds in S.1.4.53-62 a fifth requirement for good poetry: word-order. The mastery with which he presents the word-order shows him to possess both *ingenium* and *ars* in abundance to make him a true poet. Horace demonstrates in this passage that the simple language of comedy and *sermo* can also make true poetry, but that words cannot be disarranged without damaging the poem.¹⁵¹ In S.1.4.53-56, the opening lines of the passage, he says:

ergo
non satis est puris versum perscribere verbis,
quem si dissolvas, quivis stomachetur eodem
quo personatus pacto pater.

(therefore, it is not enough to write at length in simple language such that, if you rearrange, any father you please could rage in the same way as the father in the play does)

I interpret these lines as: simple language (*puris verbis*) should be used in the writing of poetry, like that which is used by the *personatus* (the actor who wears a mask) in comedy: the *pater ardens* of line 48. In addition word arrangement should

¹⁴⁹ Conform Oberhelman & Armstrong (1995, 249-252).

¹⁵⁰ I owe the translations of “playboy” for *nepos*, and “madly in love with” for *insanus* to Gowers (2012, 166).

¹⁵¹ For *Sermones* in the context of Late Republican stylistic theory, see Freudenburg (1993, 109-184). For Horace and word arrangement in S.1.4, see Freudenburg (1993, 132-150); Oberhelman & Armstrong (1995). For Philodemus and metathesis, see Armstrong (1995). Brown (2007, 131) recognizes that Horace is “not seeking to elevate the style of satire into something more grand.” However, Brown does not discuss the issue of word arrangement.

be natural, so that meaning and structure of a verse match and are in harmony, as he demonstrates with lines 58-59 *et quod prius ordine verbum est/ posterius facias, praeponens ultima primis* (and you place the word that is earlier later, placing last things before first). Horace maintained at the beginning of lines 58-59 the natural arrangement (*prius* before *posterius*), but closed line 59 with *ultima* (last things) before *primis* (first), making structure a “mirror image of meaning” (Freudenburg, 1993, 147). Horace quotes at the close of this passage (S.1.4.59-62) a famous line from the *Annals* of Ennius.¹⁵² The four lines read:

*praeponens ultima primis,
non, ut si solvas 'postquam Discordia taetra
Belli ferratos postis portasque refregit,'
invenias etiam disiecti membra poetae.*

(placing last things before first, you would not find the limbs even of a dismembered poet as you would when you take apart “When disgusting Discord had broken up War’s iron posts and gates.”)

Horace says that rearranging verses is like murdering the poet. I interpret this as follows: by using metathesis – which he indicates by *si dissolvas* (if you rearrange) in line 55 and by *si solvas* (when you take apart) in line 60 – the meaning of Ennius’ lines can change. Horace expresses here Philodemus’ view (see my citation of Oberhelman and Armstrong, 1995, 244-245, given below). According to Freudenburg (1993, 149), Horace used an Aristotelian metaphor where

metathesis is described as a ‘butchering’ or ‘dismembering’ of a living whole. [...] Thus, only superficially do word choice and theme win out over the claims of arrangement, for what, at one level speaks in defense of anticompositional theory, at another level proves its own ineptitude; the claims of arrangement are, in the end, ironically vindicated.

Horace probably knew his Aristotle well enough and “Horace, time and again in his works, proves himself a consummate stylist, trained in the technical refinements of arrangement so important to ancient theory” (Freudenburg, 1993, 149).¹⁵³

Summarizing the first sixty two lines of S.1.4, we note that those exhibit again Horace’s faithfulness to the Epicurean maxims for poetry as put into words by Philodemus of Gadara, who had assembled in his Neapolitan circle amongst others Virgil, Plotius Tucca, Varius Rufus and Quintilius Varus, to whom Horace refers as a group in S.1.5 and S.1.10. The Epicurean maxims stem from their conviction that

¹⁵² The quote is from ENN.*Ann.*225-226 (Skutsch).

¹⁵³ Acc. to Freudenburg (1993, 150) “it was, in all likelihood, the *Satires* that earned Horace a place among the friends of Maecenas, marking him as one of the finest theorists and poets of his day.” See also Oliensis (1998, 23).

harmony, balance and unity are essential values.¹⁵⁴ The maxims are in short the unity of *ingenium* and *ars* as mentioned by Horace in lines 43-44, *res* and *verba* (the subject of lines 45-48), and the issue of the impossibility of metathesis in good poetry, as expressed in lines 53-62. The relationship of *ingenium* and *ars* had been a favourite subject of literary debate for a long time when Horace wrote the *Sermones*. However, from the doctrine of the Stoic paradox, that is that only the wise man (*sapiens*) was perfect and thus talented (see my discussion of S.1.3.124-133) followed that the Stoics saw *ingenium* (natural talent) as the main attribute for writing good poetry. During the first century B.C., this resulted that the Stoics favoured natural talent (*ingenium*) over skill (*ars*) contrary to the Epicureans who looked at the matter as a whole and stressed the unity of the two.¹⁵⁵ Concerning *res/verba* Oberhelman and Armstrong (1995, 249) state that

Res/verba as an organic whole was part of Horace's poetic creed throughout his career. [...] *Res/verba*, too, is at the root of Horace's attack on Lucilius. In Horace's opinion, *res* and *verba* are so linked to the creative and conscious artistic processes of the poet [...] as to render them inseparable from these processes and from each other. Poetry, in other words, is *ars* and *ingenium* and *res* and *verba* interwoven into a unity.

Horace will return to *res/verba* in S.1.10. Further, we saw earlier in the discussion of S.1.4.7-13, that the rugged word arrangement favoured by the Stoics was set against the compositional theory to which the Epicureans adhered, amongst them Horace and his associates in Maecenas' circle (see also note 135). Finally, the Epicureans and Stoics held very different views on metathesis. According to Oberhelman and Armstrong (1995, 244-245).

Horace's views on metathesis are directly related to Philodemus', which were set forth elsewhere [by Armstrong (1995)]. To restate in simple terms, Philodemus objected to the tactic of metathesis because any change in style, any change in expression, results in a change in thought: [...] Metathesis with its rearrangement, therefore, is impossible in the case of good poetry.

The Stoics, on the other hand, held, on grounds of their anticompositional sentiments and their dedication to the natural poetic talent, that metathesis with its rearrangement is a powerful and relevant tool. We saw above that Horace demonstrated in lines 53-62 the destruction of good poetry by applying metathesis.

Horace's criticism of the Stoic theories regarding poetry is visible not only through his poetic analyses in S.1.4.1-62, but also through the men he mentions in these lines, and indeed also in the section that follows, S.1.4.63-78. Referring to a number of

154 For the unity of *ingenium/ars* and *res/verba* in the Epicurean theory of Philodemus of Gadara and in Lucretius, see Oberhelman & Armstrong (1995, 249-252).

155 For the Stoic elevation of *ingenium* over *ars*, see Freudenburg (1993, 145-147). For the balance of *ingenium/ars* and *res/verba*, see Oberhelman & Armstrong (1995, 240; 247).

Stoics, Horace focuses Maecenas' attention not only on his technical understanding of poetic theory, but he also places himself clearly within Maecenas' Epicurean camp. In other words, his poetic principles form the literary part of his credentials. Who are those men? The first one is Crispinus of line 14 and we saw earlier that he was a writer on Stoic ethics (see notes 75, 141). Fannius of line 21 was most likely an adherent of Sextus Pompey, who also wrote on the themes of Stoic ethics (see also notes 75, 141). It is likely that Pomponius of line 52 was a victim of prosecutions and sympathizer with Sextus, although he is not positively identified. Further, I will suggest below that the satirists Sulcius and Caprius of lines 65-66 and 70 had Stoic leanings and I note that according to DuQuesnay it is possible indeed that the bandits Caelius and Birrus of line 69 were supporters of Sextus.¹⁵⁶ Albius of line 28, a man of expensive taste (see S.1.4.109), cannot be identified.

Line 63 contains an explicit message: *hactenus haec* (enough of this), no more writing about style. In what follows Horace will discuss matters of content, such as the moral objectives of his genre. S.1.4.64-65 reads *nunc illud tantum quaeram, meritone tibi sit/ suspectum genus hoc scribendi* (now I will ask nothing more than this: does this genre of writing deserve your suspicion?). His poems are not like those of Sulcius and Caprius. Radermacher (1935, 81) suggests that the two names taken together “may translate Greek *συκοφάντης* ‘informer’ lit. ‘fig-revealer’, since two types of figs were known as *ficus sulca* and *caprificus*.” Hence, Sulcius and Caprius should refer to informers. I concur with Rudd (2007, 144 note 31) that “it is ingenious but somewhat far-fetched. [...] on the whole it is probably best to take the names as referring to contemporary lampoonists.”¹⁵⁷ Ullman (1917, 117-119), who argues convincingly that Sulcius and Caprius refer to contemporary satirists, discusses the two names within the context of the whole passage S.1.4.65-78, in which Horace brings together several characteristics of how he sees his future work as a political commentator. The *libellis* in line 66 do not refer to writs, accusations or notebooks of informers, but look forward to the *libellos* of line 71. Lines 65-78 read:

Sulcius acer
ambulat et Caprius, rauci male cumque libellis,
magnus uterque timor latronibus; at bene si quis
et vivat puris manibus contemnat utrumque.
ut sis tu similis Caeli Birrique latronum,
non ego sim Capri neque Sulci; cur metuas me?
nulla taberna meos habeat neque pila libellos,

¹⁵⁶ For Pomponius, see DuQuesnay (1984, 53-54; 54 note 163), “it is natural to link them [a Pomponius and a Balbinus in 1.3.40] with their notorious homonyms [as described by Appian in App. BC.4.45, 50];” Freudenburg (1993, 124); Gowers (2012,166). For Caelius and Birrus, see also DuQuesnay (1984, 54, note 163).

¹⁵⁷ Conform Freudenburg (1993, 109; 118). See also Gowers (2012, 169).

*quis manus insudet vulgi Hermogenisque Tigelli.
nec recito cuiquam nisi amicis, idque coactus,
non ubivis coramve quibuslibet. in medio qui
scripta foro recitent sunt multi quique lavantes:
suave locus voci resonat conclusus. inanis
hoc iuvat, haud illud quaerentis, num sine sensu,
tempore num faciant alieno.*

(angry Sulcius and Caprius walk about [full of their own importance], horribly hoarse and armed with their little books, both [striking] great fear into bandits; but if someone is honest and keeps his hands clean in life, he could see both as unimportant. Even if you were like [= as bad as] the bandits Caelius and Birrus, I am not like Caprius or Sulcius; why should you fear me? I want no bookshop to have my little books or column to advertise them, for the hands of vulgar men and those of Tigellius Hermogenes would sweat over them. I do not recite to anybody save friends, unless I am forced, not anywhere or before whoever it may be. There are many who recite their writings in the middle of the Forum, or at the baths: an enclosed area echoes the voice pleasantly. This delights the worthless, who not at all ask themselves the question, whether they act without taste or whether the timing is wrong)

It should be noted that the whole passage concerns the activities of the satirists Sulcius and Caprius, with whom Horace compares himself. They are depicted as hoarse (*rauci male*) from reciting their works in public and trying to sell their books (line 71) in shops, where they are being soiled by the unreliable Hermogenes of S.1.3.129, whom he mentions in the same breath with the vulgar crowd. Horace does not want to see his writings in the bookshops, and he recites only within his circle of friends, and not in public places like the Forum and bathhouses. Worthless people without taste or tact give these kinds of performances.

In my view, Horace gives in S.1.4.65-78 another glimpse of his future programme, in addition to his short-term objective convincing Maecenas. His references to Sulcius and Caprius, and indeed to Caelius and Birrus, are written within the functional frame and show us not only his allegiance to Octavian's cause, but also reveal his intentions with respect to his style of writing poetry embodying political commentary. In lines 65-67 he portrays Sulcius and Caprius as "both striking great fear into bandits." I propose that *latronibus* in these lines is a functional reference to the criminal actions of the political elite and new rich.¹⁵⁸ We have seen above that Horace criticized *avaritia*, *ambitio* and *luxuria*, and the social and political risk of unrestrained greed and ambition of the elite in S.1.1. He continued this course in the second *sermo* criticizing the vulgar conduct and materialistic attitude of the elite and new rich alike, and the threat of their lack of restraint pursuing their own interests. In S.1.3, he referred also to Hermogenes, who exemplifies adaptability and unreliability,

158 I suggest that Horace refers to a specific sort of criminals; hence I do not translate *latro* as robber, but as bandit. This choice is also consistent with my interpretation of S.1.4.3-5, where the poet refers to ruffians, thief, adulterers, murderers, or otherwise notorious, not describing ordinary criminals or robbers in particular, but individuals in high office, political bandits.

and to Alfenus, who shows untrustworthiness and dishonesty symbolizing the many who try to force themselves into holding high office and are not deserving such. I mention above that he maintained this position in the opening of S.1.4. Speaking approvingly in S.1.4.3-5 of the poets of Old Comedy who censured “anyone deserving to be described as a ruffian and a thief, as an adulterer or murderer, or as otherwise notorious,” he was not thinking of ordinary criminals, but of individuals in high office who were profiteering by criminal action. Thus, it is likely that, although none of their work has come down to us, Sulcius and Caprius were indeed satirists, who in lines 65-67 are depicted censuring rightly the political elite and the new rich acting like criminals.¹⁵⁹ Horace’s next line is a matter of course: if one lives a honest life, there is no need fearing the poems of the two satirists.

In lines 69-70, Horace kills three birds with one stone. Firstly, it is feasible that the two satirists Sulcius and Caprius belonged to the Pompeian party, and also adhered to the Stoics. Ullman (1917, 119) observes already that “Horace turns in that passage [S.1.4.14-21] from Lucilius to two contemporary poets, Crispinus and Fannius, with their love for notoriety, so here he turns to the two poets, Sulcius and Caprius, who are addicted to the same weakness.” Thus, Horace connects the four men, and it is interesting to note that Crispinus was a Stoic and that, although Fannius’ identity in Horace’s work cannot be established, one of the two historical Fannii was a follower of Sextus Pompey, the other was of the anti-Caesarian party (see note 141). It is therefore feasible that Horace lumped together all Pompeian authors, who wrote against Octavian. With respect to the identities of Sulcius and Caprius, I recall the fact that in the treaty of Misenum of the summer of 39 B.C., Sextus Pompey retained control over Corsica, Sardinia and Sicily. My conjecture is that either Sulcius was a native of Sulci, a Sardinian harbour town, and Caprius of the island of Capreae, or that Horace used these two sobriquets to place the men in the Pompeian camp, as the islands between Sardinia and Sicily were well-known as recruiting areas for Sextus.¹⁶⁰ Further, I conjecture that Sulcius and Caprius were known for publicly lampooning the profiteering conduct of men in the Octavian camp, and keeping the followers of Sextus out of harm’s way. Secondly, by introducing the two criminals Caelius and Birrus Horace reinforced his view that some actions of some of the elite and new rich were very reprehensible indeed. Caelius and Birrus are not identified, but according to DuQuesnay (1984, 54 note 163) it is possible that they were also Pompeian supporters referring to Sextus’ policy to recruit many bandits and runaway slaves into his navy. According to Gowers (2012, 170) “Birrus is possibly from Birra, a gladiator employed

¹⁵⁹ For Sulcius and Caprius as satirists, see also Rudd (1956, 49, note 1).

¹⁶⁰ DuQuesnay (1984, 56) makes a similar point for Tigellius Hermogenes. He conjectures that the latter had defected to Sextus Pompey and says: “What makes this a possibility is that Tigellius was a Sardinian and in 39 Sardinia had been granted to Sex. Pompeius.” See also my discussion of S.1.3.124-133.

by Milo,” and about Caelius nothing can be found. However, from the context it is feasible that line 69 should be interpreted as “even if you were as bad as the bandits [*latronum*] Caelius and Birrus” meaning that these two names refer to notorious politicians or their accomplices in Octavian’s camp, who carried out the large scale murdering and stealing and consequently were targeted by Sulcius or Caprius.¹⁶¹ Thirdly, Horace lifts the veil of his *modus operandi* censoring political criminals. He says in line 70: when someone carries out those crimes, I will censure him, but not in the way of Caprius or Sulcius, satirists who seek publicity. Horace explains why his targets should not fear him. He asserts in lines 71-78 that, contrary to Caprius, Sulcius, and many other poets, he is not out to sell his poems through the booktrade, or to perform in public or at the baths. He says about his mode in lines 73-74 that he does not recite to anybody save friends, unless he is forced, not anywhere or before whoever it may be. Leach (1971, 627), with feeling for Horace’s practical approach, notes with dry humour that the poet assures “those whose follies make them liable to satire may be grateful for a satirist of retiring ways who does not bellow his verses publicly (75-6), but saves them for the company of his friends.” He will indeed criticize those criminals in a *sermo* to his friends, men with influence like Maecenas, as he needs to get their approval. But his poems for his friends will be written with the right taste and when the timing is right (line 78).¹⁶²

In the mock conversation of the next passage (lines 78-103), Horace is more specific about the mode of delivering critical poetry, firstly to his friends (lines 78-85), secondly to a group of men who are within the retinue of a patron (lines 86-93), and thirdly to some members of the political elite (lines 93-103).¹⁶³ At first, he recalls the blame which is often put on a censoring poet by quoting a mock person saying: *‘laedere gaudes’/ inquit, ‘et hoc studio pravus facis.’* (“you love to cause pain,” some person says, “and you do so on purpose, out of spite.”). Then, Horace puts two rhetorical questions in lines 79-80, which refer back to lines 73-74 about reciting his poetry only to friends. The questions are *unde petitum/ hoc in me iacis? est auctor quis denique eorum/ vixi cum quibus?* (where did you find this charge to fire at me? Finally, is the informant someone with whom I was close?). The answer is no, as Horace’s friends do not fire charges at each other, and is no again as Horace himself is concerned. He gives a catalogue of malice that in his view cannot be tolerated among friends (line 85). I will quote some examples from the catalogue. First, S.1.4.81-85 reads:

¹⁶¹ Contrary to Gowers (2012, 170), who identifies Caelius and Birrus as armed robbers.

¹⁶² For Horace’s preference of reading to his friends, see also S.1.6.122-123 and S.1.10.81-88.

¹⁶³ Leach (1971, 627-630) discusses S.1.4.81-103 from the point of view that the “three examples of injurious criticism by ordinary men show what malicious pleasure really is. The persons described might be called non-artistic satirists; although they have a superficial resemblance to Lucilius, they abuse *libertas*.” (Leach, 1971, 627).

*absentem qui rodit amicum,
qui non defendit alio culpante, solutos
qui captat risus hominum famamque dicacis,
fingere qui non visa potest, commissa tacere
qui nequit: hic niger est, hunc tu, Romane, caveto*

(he who slanders an absent friend, who doesn't defend him when someone else finds fault with him, who seeks to obtain the boisterous laughter of men and the fame of a man talking sharply, who can invent things he has not seen, who cannot keep a secret: he is the wicked, of him, true Roman, take heed)

This malicious backbiting is the opposite of what one expects from friends: the true Roman of line 85, Horace himself, does not work that way and keeps clear of such a man. Gowers (2012, 171-172) states about the first part of the catalogue of malicious behaviour in S.1.4.81-85

if the thoughts [in these lines] belong to H.[orace], which seems more likely [than belonging to his imaginary opponent], given the vehemence of the definition (Kiessling, A. rev. by R. Heinze 1957/1959; Brown 1993/2007), they represent a paranoid delusion that he has been betrayed by one of his own circle, as well as a vehement disavowal of genuine malice.

I agree with Gowers that lines 81-85 are Horace's own thoughts indeed and that the poet disavows genuine malice. In my opinion however, it is certainly not a "paranoid delusion that he has been betrayed by one of his own circle." In S.1.4.81-85, the poet states his views on the correct behaviour among friends in reply to the imaginary rhetorical questions of lines 79-80. Friends should certainly frankly criticize each other if necessary, but this should not be done in a malicious manner, but in a civilized style with concern for one's friends' feelings, as he already argued in S.1.3.25-75. Further, his friends do not tell tales out of school.¹⁶⁴ I have already mentioned at the end of the discussion of S.1.4.5 that in the case of S.1.4.81-85 Horace's belief in the old Roman values, *mos maiorum*, is the inspiration for his moral guidance. The passage concerned is about malicious behaviour among friends against which Horace makes his stand. I see the words "*hunc tu, Romane, caveto* (of him, true Roman, take heed)" in line 85 as a functional reference to the guidance by the old Roman values. Horace addresses all true Romans, including himself, and tells them that such conduct doesn't befit their values, and his. By alluding to the old values and including all true Romans in the group, he enlists them, as it were, as supporters of Octavian, who proclaimed himself as the defender of *mos maiorum*. This goes with *parrhesia* as a guide of frank criticism among real friends, who treat each other kindly and thoughtfully.

¹⁶⁴ Feeney (2009b, 20) suggests that part of a *sermo* has "been leaked to a larger public." It is likely that this happened occasionally, but the gist of the passage is the opposite: friends can be trusted.

Next, Horace describes events at a crowded dinner party. He replaces in lines 86-93 the friends in the previous passage with dinner guests, not necessarily friends. One of the guests is severely censured in lines 87-91:

*e quibus unus amet quavis aspergere cunctos
praeter eum qui praebet aquam; post hunc quoque potus,
condita cum verax aperit praecordia Liber.
hic tibi comis et urbanus liberque videtur,
infesto nigris.*

(among whom one likes to asperse everyone in every possible way except him who provides the water, the host; later when he is drunk, he bespatters him as well, when truthful *Liber* [=Bacchus] reveals the secrets of his heart. Such a man seems to you agreeable, witty and forthright, you enemy of the black-hearted)

Clearly *liber* in line 90 in conjunction with *Liber* (= Bacchus) in line 89 do not refer to *libertas*, freedom of speech, as in line 5. Here Horace describes the common behaviour of a dinner guest who had too much to drink and who blurts the most unbecoming rigmarole (see also note 131). Horace, who in line 85 condemned scandalmongering among friends saying that someone behaving like that is wicked (*niger est*), uses the same qualification for the wrong man within the retinue of a Roman patron present at the dinner party in lines 90-91. He asks ironically whether the latter should be considered agreeable, witty and forthright, when the malicious backbiting “friend” is seen as wicked. Freudenburg (1993, 95) shows that “the adjectives *dicax* (‘malicious,’ [perhaps better: ‘talking sharply’] 83), and *urbanus* (‘witty,’ 90) are terms commonly ascribed to the *scurra mimicus* [buffoon in the mimes]. Corbett [1986, 38], [...], concludes: ‘The professional *scurra*’s role in mime must then be that of a malicious, witty, gossiping, interfering, arrogant nuisance.’” We have seen in the discussion of S.1.3.29-34 that Horace rejects this role as his: he chooses that of the gentleman commentator/jester, who speaks freely. Horace underlines his choice in S.1.4.91-93 referring to his views of censurable behaviour when he quotes in line 92 exactly his words of S.1.2.27. Lines 91-93 read:

*ego si risi, quod ineptus
pastillos Rufillus olet, Gargonius hircum,
lividus et mordax videor tibi?*

(As far as I am concerned, if I laughed because absurd “Rufillus smells of lozenges, Gargonius stinks like a goat,” do you find me malicious and snarling?)

We saw when I discussed S.1.2 that the poet writes with disdain about the nouveau riche: Rufillus and Gargonius were ridiculed for their common behaviour in public. Horace’s commentary in S.1.2 concerns among other matters the common and unmannerly conduct of an increasing number of members of the elite, but particularly that of the urban upstarts with their materialistic attitude, their hunting for status, and lack of restraint. By quoting exactly the same line of S.1.2.27, the poet asserts in

S.1.4.91-93 that he will stand by his earlier statement (in S.1.2) about the way he will write his critical commentary: openly without malice. His style will be very different from that of the *scurrae* who belong to the retinue of the Roman patron, and who inveigh against their host.

The poet discusses the backbiting in the third group, that of the members of the elite, by a mock address in lines 93-103, in which Petillius Capitolinus has the major part. Lines 93-95 read:

mentio si quae
de Capitolini furtis iniecta Petilli
te coram fuerit, defendas ut tuus est mos
 (if some mention of the thefts of Petillius Capitolinus was made in your presence, you would defend him in the way you are used to)

Not much is known about Petillius Capitolinus, who returns in S.1.10.26. There is a story in Porphyrio that he stole the gold crown of Jupiter Capitolinus, when he was in charge of the temple, but was acquitted by Julius Caesar; the story is probably an invention. According to Brown (2007, 135) it is more likely that he was accused of embezzlement, as “the charge of stealing Jupiter’s crown was a proverbial one,” like the charge of stealing the Crown Jewels in England. However, Petillius was well-born, a family that supplied in the Republican era a quaestor and praetor; he himself was a mint-master from 37 B.C.¹⁶⁵ In short, although Petillius was not a member of the leading aristocracy, he belonged to the political elite.

Horace continues in lines 96-101 the mock example of extreme disloyalty by a member of the elite pretending to defend his mock life-long friend Petillius after the fashion of his class. His plea begins with pretend fine words about their friendship, which one often hears at their gatherings in Roman society salons, but ends with a vitriolic remark. S.1.4.96-103 reads:

‘me Capitolinus convictore usus amicoque
a puero est, causaque mea permulta rogatus
fecit, et incolumis laetor quod vivit in urbe;
sed tamen admiror quo pacto iudicium illud
fugerit.’ hic nigrae sucus lolliginis, haec est
aerugo mera: quod vitium procul afore chartis
atque animo, prius ut, si quid promittere de me
possum aliud vere, promitto.

¹⁶⁵ For Petillius Capitolinus, see also Gowers (2012, 174); Gundel (1972a). Porphyrio’s text (Meyer, 1874, 212) reads: *Petillius autem Capitolinus cum Capitolii curam ageret, coronae subreptae de Capitolio causam dixit absolutusque a Caesare est* (but Petillius Capitolinus, when in charge of the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol, is accused of stealing the crown of Jupiter and acquitted by Caesar).

(“Capitolinus has been my companion and friend from boyhood, and he has rendered me very many services when asked; I am glad that he is safe and sound and lives here in Rome, but still I am astonished as to how he escaped at that trial.” This is the ink of the black squid, this is pure verdigris. That this fault will be far from my pages and from my mind, as it has been in the past; if I can make any true promise about myself, this I promise)

Aerugo is literally verdigris or copper-rust; in a figurative sense it means: envy, ill-will.¹⁶⁶ Horace says in lines 101-103 about the sting, which is literally in the tail, that he does not intend to apply such malice. Inspired by his understanding of the moral principles embodied in the *mos maiorum*, he condemns the hypocritical malice of the would-be friend of Capitolinus in lines 96-97. Horace’s reaction in S.1.4.93-103 is similar to that in S.1.4.81-85, at the end of his comments on the wrong behaviour among friends, and the ironical questions he asked in S.1.4.90-93, at the end of the section about the objectionable scandalmongering by the wrong type at the dinner party of the Roman patron. The keywords chosen by Horace fit the parties which he speaks about very well. I mentioned above that in lines 81-84 he chose for the party of friends words which express malicious backbiting, the opposite of what one expects from friends. In line 85, he used *niger* (wicked) condemning this malice. In the case of the man at the dinner party, who asperses everyone in the most insulting manner possible, the poet characterized in line 90 the other guests’ reception of his words in typically nouveau riche fashion. They consider him (in line 90) agreeable (*comis*), witty (*urbanus*), and forthright (*liber*). In this way, Horace made a reference to the silly habit of parroting the social standards of the upper classes by the men at the dinner party. The mention of *liber* in line 90 may even have a double function. It can be interpreted that Horace alludes not only to frank criticism among friends (*parrhesia*), caricaturing their real relationship, but also to the opinion that freedom of speech was a prerogative earned by the elite in the Republican era. The new rich felt that they also deserved this privilege.

It is noteworthy that Horace uses the word *niger* (or word-forms) for wicked behaviour in censuring others at three places in S.1.4: S.1.4.85 (among friends, *niger*), S.1.4.91 (nouveau riche at patron’s dinner party, *nigris*), and in S.1.4.100 (elite dinner, *nigrae*).¹⁶⁷ In this passage, Horace has no good word to say for the stealthy manner in

¹⁶⁶ For *aerugo*, see Lewis & Short (1955, 60): “*Envy, jealousy, ill-will* (which seek to consume the possessions of a neighbor, as rust corrodes metals).”

¹⁶⁷ The word *nigro* is used in *Ep.2.2.60* with a similar meaning (see also my discussion in section 2.1). With the aid of Brepols’ Library of Latin Texts – Series A, 2016 (<http://www.brepolis.net>), I found that Horace used the word *niger* (or word-forms) fourteen times: in the *Sermones* (10), *Epodi* (2) and *Epistles* (2). In nine cases the word relates to matters which have no bearing on the present discussion, such as *nigra collyria* (black ointment) in S.1.5.30, *nigra palla* (black robe of Canidia) in S.1.8.23, *nigris oleis* (black olives) in S.2.2.46, or *nigris moris* (blackberries) in S.2.4.22. The word *nigrum* in *Huncine solem/ tam nigrum surrexe mihi!* (now, that such a black day occurred to me!) in S.1.9.72-73 is remotely relevant because of the context of the pest who attempts to force his way into the circle of Maecenas.

which the elite censures their people; on the surface it seems to be civilized, but in reality it is as malicious as it is often the case among friends (line 85) or among the new rich (line 91). He promises that such style will be far from him.

In lines 103-105, Horace apologizes in advance if he were to be seen as too outspoken (*liberius*) or too jesting (*iocosius*). Gowers (2012, 175) observes that in these two lines “black humour is presented [by the poet] as something on the margins of social acceptability, mildly risky, life-and-soul-of-the-party-ish. *Liberius* pleads for the same kind of indulgent interpretation as 90 *liber* did.” It should be noted, however, that the contexts of *liber* in line 90 and of *liberius* in line 103 differ significantly; “90 *liber*” describes the wrong kind of talk coming from a drunk (*Liber* in line 89, see above) who can not control himself, while *liberius* in line 103 is part of Horace’s *parrhesia*. The scene has changed. Horace observes and describes in lines 93-103 the ignominious behaviour of the elite, and he has thus come near to his own circle of elite friends. Therefore, I interpret lines 103-105 that Horace does not observe and describe others any longer, but has turned round and directly addresses himself to Maecenas and his friends, because he is worried that he overstepped the limits of frank speech. But, I should first explain the poet’s views on frank criticism among friends. Michels (1944, 173) states that one finds in much of Horace’s work a “concern for the welfare of his friends,” inspired by his “sympathy with Epicurean doctrine,” that is the teaching of Philodemus in his handbook *Περὶ παρρησίας* (On Frank Criticism). She (1944, 177) closes her paper with the words that Horace “saw how through the use of Epicurean *παρρησία* Lucilian satire could be used in Epicurean fashion for the instruction of a group of friends. This is the new idea which he is explaining in *Serm.*1.4, having already demonstrated it in the three preceding satires.” Konstan et al. (2007, 8) concentrate on the notion that Philodemus’ treatise “discloses a form of psychagogy that depends upon the active participation of all members of the community in the correction of one another.”¹⁶⁸ We saw above that Horace mentions *libertas* – the contemporary Roman interpretation of *parrhesia* by Philodemus – indeed as one of the sources in executing his concern for his friends and their moral development, the other being the *mos maiorum* like in S.1.4.81-85 and S.1.4.93-103. In my opinion, *mos maiorum* is not at issue in lines 103-105, but frank criticism among friends is (see also the introduction of the discussion on moral guidance at S.1.4.5). In lines 103-105, Horace is worried that he is seen as rising above his station, either as too outspoken and as gone too far in his frank criticism, or as frivolous, while the correction of friends is a serious business. In his apology in lines 103-105, Horace says *cum venia dabis* which I translate as “when you grant me a favour.” He presents himself as a modest and civilized man compared with the nouveau riche and the members of the elite dinner party.

¹⁶⁸ For Philodemus and criticism, see Hunter (1985); Konstan et al. (2007, 3-24); Michels (1944). For friendship in the classical world, see Konstan (1997).

From line 105, a passage follows in which Horace claims that his father taught him the moral lessons which laid the foundation of his outlook upon life. Before considering in more detail his father's role, I will briefly consider S.1.4.105-115, when he summarizes, as it were, the moral vices which he mentioned thus far in the previous *sermones*. One should note that he presents those in the same sequence as that of S.1.1-1.2. He says in lines 105-106 *insuevit pater optimus hoc me,/ ut fugerem exemplis vitiorum quaeque notando* (my father, the best of all fathers, accustomed me to that by censuring several vices by his examples, so that I should steer clear of them).¹⁶⁹

The first vices, which Horace addresses in lines (107-111) refer to those from the first *sermo*. His *pater optimus* taught him that he should not become discontented with his lot envying others and grow overambitious like the men of the opening lines of S.1.1: if I live thriftily and frugally, content with what he himself (his father) had provided for me (*parce, frugaliter, atque/ viverem uti contentus eo, quod mi ipse parasset*). The father recalls both how badly the son of extravagant Albius of S.1.4.28 fares (*Albi ut male vivat filius*; see also note 145), and the poverty of Baius (*Baius inops*). Horace claims in lines 110-111 that this story by his *pater optimus* about the lots of Albius' son and of Baius taught him an important lesson (*magnum documentum*), namely not to squander the patrimony (*ne patriam rem/ perdere*). Albius and Baius are unknown to us. Thus, it is not clear whether Albius or his prodigal son, or a Baius or his son lost the family fortune by their immoderation. But Horace makes it very clear what he thinks of the vulgar ways of the new rich. According to Gowers (2012, 177) Baius is "perhaps suggesting a connection with Baiae, sybaritic seaside town." Her proposal is feasible indeed, as we have noted earlier that Horace describes in *Carm.*2.18 the lavish building of *villae* in Baiae where the houses of the rich partly extend into the sea at the cost of confiscating farmland. In *Carm.*2.18.20-26, the poet paints a moving picture of the evictions of the poor.

In lines 111-115, Horace repeats the second group of vices, which he considered in the second *sermo*, that is a shameful love for a prostitute (*turpi meretricis amore*) or chasing adulterous married women (*sequerer moechas*). He introduces again two men who were possibly known to indulge in these passions, Scetanus who visits prostitutes and Trebonius who makes love to a married woman and is caught in the act (*deprensi*). Although Scetanus and Trebonius are also unknown, the latter may give a clue to the social class that Horace addresses in those lines. The family did not belong to the top of the Roman elite, but members of the family held political office. C. Trebonius was in Republican times a supporter of Pompey and a tribune of the plebs in 43 B.C., who wrote a letter to Cicero in 44 B.C. (see *CIC.Fam.*12.16.3). DuQuesnay (1984, 30) observes¹⁷⁰:

¹⁶⁹ For "Horace's father's" role, see Freudenburg (1993, 33-39); Leach (1971); Schlegel (2000, 93-107 = 2005, 38-51); Yona (2015). See also my discussion of S.1.6.71-82.

¹⁷⁰ For Trebonius, see DuQuesnay (1984, 29-31); Gowers (2012, 177). The Latin citations are from *CIC*.

Here we find Trebonius celebrating his first taste of that *libertas*, which he evidently hoped that the murder of Caesar had restored [*ut aliquando otiosa libertate fruamur*], by composing an invective in the manner of Lucilius [*deinde, qui magis hoc Lucilio licuerit adsumere libertatis quam nobis?*] as a concrete demonstration of his new-found *libertas*. The target of his invective was probably M. Antonius, his former friend and the future Triumvir.

It is feasible that Horace, who most likely knew of Trebonius' political activities at the time of Julius Caesar's murder or immediately after, also knew of Trebonius' opinion of Marc Antony when he wrote the fourth *sermo* between the years 38 and 35 B.C. Marc Antony broke with Octavia in 37 B.C., and he passed his time alternately between military campaigns in the East and Cleopatra's palace in Alexandria, culminating in the Donations of Alexandria in 34 B.C. At the time of writing S.1.4 the tensions between Octavian and Marc Antony were increasing. In addition, men writing in the manner of Lucilius, like Trebonius, were connected with the faction of the Pompeians and were seen as the defenders of traditional *libertas*. I concur with DuQuesnay (1984, 31), who argues that Horace, contrary to the general opinion, says that Octavian, Maecenas and "his friends [are] the true champions of *libertas*," that is they are traditional and responsible. They are opposed to "licence, the irresponsible, malicious and divisive exercise of freedom with which true *libertas* is wrongly confused" (DuQuesnay, 1984, 30). I propose that Horace by the functional reference to Trebonius in S.1.4.114 kills three birds with one stone. Firstly, by referring in line 114 to Trebonius, the man who wrote an invective against Marc Antony, Horace alludes to the latter reminding readers that Antony is overstepping the mark of true *libertas* again in his affair with Cleopatra. He also criticizes Antony's affair with Cleopatra sharply in S.1.8 in connection with the threat of Eastern magical practices, in which the Egyptian queen was involved. The allusion to Antony in line 114 is the second occasion that he criticizes Antony; the first time was in S.1.2.55-59, when he censured the sexual escapades of men like Marsaeus which, as I mentioned above, may allude to Antony's adventures with the actress Cytheris. Secondly, Horace makes a statement about his views on true responsible *libertas*, which is very different from licentious behaviour. Thirdly, the possible link of Trebonius with Marc Antony also substantiates that the poet's criticism of the sexual affairs in S.1.4.111-115 was directed at the political and social elite, the same targets as that of the second *sermo*.

After the poet's summary of the principal vices and examples of the perpetrators in lines 105-115, Horace quotes in lines 115-126 his mock father's words focusing on "the father's" role in the poet's upbringing. Lines 115-119 are crucial for understanding the role of "the father," or rather quasi-father. He mentions the role of "the father" not only in this passage, but also in the sixth *sermo*. S.1.4.115-119 reads:

*Fam.*12.16.3.

*'sapiens, vitatu quidque petitu
sit melius, causas reddet tibi: mi satis est si
traditum ab antiquis morem servare tuamque,
dum custodis eges, vitam famamque tueri
incolumem possum;'*

(“a philosopher will explain to you the dos and don’ts: I am satisfied, if I can preserve the way of life handed down by our ancestors, and can keep your life and reputation unimpaired, so long as you need a guardian”)

I will argue below that Horace’s quote of his “father’s” words does not necessarily mean that the father actually spoke those. It is also possible that the poet again makes here two points through the medium of “his father.” Even so, the first point is that he does not want to be guided in moral matters only by the teachings of philosophers, but also by following the traditional Roman moral teachings handed down to him. We saw already at several places in S.1.4 that the *mos maiorum* was of great importance to him. He was an adherent of Epicureanism, and he used Philodemus treatise “On Frank Criticism” as a guide. Yet, he also knew the Stoic dogmas, as he showed for example in S.1.3.99-124, when he used both Stoic and Epicurean tenets to deliver his commentary on social and political evil. He also demonstrated at many other occasions in S.1 that he knew Stoicism well enough to understand the thinking of the Stoic opponents. The second point is that “the father’s” words *traditum ab antiquis morem servare* (preserve the way of life handed down by our ancestors) can hardly be interpreted as referring to – paraphrasing Gowers (2012, 178) – “notable ancestors of H.[orace]’s father, an ex-slave.”

We saw that Horace writes in S.1.4.105-108 that his father taught him the moral lessons which laid the foundation of his outlook upon life. I do not interpret these lines as his father actually sitting with Horace teaching him moral philosophy, but that Horace says that the way of life is handed down to him by the Roman forefathers in general. The role of “the father” in the narrative is being a link between the generations symbolizing the continuity of the traditions. I do not interpret the passage S.1.4.103-133 as autobiographical, but as Horace expressing that he grew up in a milieu having respect for the old Roman values. He confirms this again in a later *sermo*, S.1.6.76-78, when he narrates that his father took him to Rome for his education. He writes: *sed puerum est ausus Romam portare, docendum/ artis, quas doceat quivis eques atque senator/ semet prognatos* (but he dared to take his boy off to Rome, to be taught those studies which any knight or senator would have his own children taught) (see also section 1.3.2, and discussion of S.1.6). Horace was to be educated within a milieu of the social elite (*eques atque senator*) in Rome, which likely meant that he would move within circles where the old values were still upheld.

When Horace says in lines 120-121 *sic me/ formabat puerum dictis*, I read this as: it formed my character as a boy with sayings like these.¹⁷¹ Thus, my interpretation of the passage differs much from that of Leach (1971). She (1971, 618) observes that “so specific and well drawn is Horace’s picture of his father and himself, that it has had unquestioning acceptance as pure autobiography.” Next she explores Horace’s account of “his father’s” teaching and proposes that it “is closely analogous to a scene in that play [i.e. Terence’s *Adelphi*].” Leach suggests that Horace’s father has been modelled after Terence’s Demea, as both share the same moral convictions and didactic methods, relying on traditional values.¹⁷² In addition, Freudenburg (1993, 37) points out that a literary resemblance exists between Terence’s and Horace’s texts as follows. In TER.*Ad.*417-419, Demea rehearses his teaching with the slave Syrus in “repeated short bursts of thought, each introduced by *hoc* [4 times].” This is mirrored by Horace in lines 134-137.¹⁷³

‘rectius hoc est:

*hoc faciens vivam melius: sic dulcis amicis
occurram: hoc quidam non belle; numquid ego illi
imprudens olim faciam simile?’*

(“this is better: doing this, I shall live more happily: this is how to make a good impression on my friends: that wasn’t nice of so and so: might I one day unintentionally do a similar thing?”)

While this literary resemblance looks very convincing indeed, some important differences in content exist between the two texts. Leach (1971, 619) identified already that the seeming obedient son of Demea who lived with his father on the farm “breaks free from the harsh discipline of his father and enlists his city brother’s aid in the abduction of a courtesan,” and Freudenburg (1993, 38) concludes that “as the plot unfolds, it becomes apparent that Demea’s methods have been entirely unsuccessful,” while Horace is portrayed as a perfect and obedient son.

Studying the fourth *sermo* for the political content from a functional point of view, I postulate that the significance of the poet’s many lines about the moral vices and their perpetrators is overlooked. The first four *sermones* are closely connected, and S.1.4 is, metaphorically speaking, the head on top of the body of S.1.1-1.3. The fourth *sermo* draws together the views which the poet expressed in the first three poems. In lines 107-115 he gives his final summaries of respectively S.1.1 and S.1.2. When, from line 115 until the end of the poem “the father’s” moral teaching is compared to that of philosophers, the tone becomes more personal and intimate. I propose that lines 115-143 pertain to S.1.3, which is – as we have seen above – the

¹⁷¹ I owe the rendering of *me* as “my character” to Brown (2007, 51).

¹⁷² For the supposed model of Terence’s *Adelphi*, and the autobiographical nature of S.1.4, see also Freudenburg (1993, 33-39); Leach (1971); Oliensis (1998, 18-26).

¹⁷³ For the translation of S.1.4.134-137, I have followed some of the suggestions by Gowers (2012,180).

sermo that concerns his position among friends. I suggest that S.1.4 does not only concern Horace's relationship with his supposed literary "father" Lucilius (I borrow this expression from Schlegel, 2000, 106), but also – and indeed primarily – shows Horace's conviction that his role as an author of poetry with political commentary is to expose the many social and political evils and shows his search for an effective way of expressing. This is what a critical poet is for, as he says in lines 120-122:

sic me

formabat puerum dictis; et sive iubebat

ut facerem quid, 'habes auctorem quo facias hoc' ;

(it formed my character as a boy with sayings like these, and if it [my character] was telling me to do something, it would say "you have one on whose authority you can do this")

I interpret the latter lines as saying that he learned how to follow his own counsel. The last bit of paternal advice is given in lines 124-129 beginning with the rhetorical question '*an hoc inhonestum et inutile factu/ necne sit addubites, flagret rumore malo cum/ hic atque ille?*' ("are you in doubt whether or not this is dishonourable and useless, when so and so is grilled by bad repute?"). The answer, given in lines 128-129, is that young people are often restrained from vice by the example of scandal experienced by someone (*sic teneros animos aliena opprobria saepe/ absterrent vitiis*). Next, Horace reflects on the moral lessons learned in his youth in lines 129-131:

ex hoc ego sanus ab illis,

perniciem quaecumque ferunt, mediocribus et quis

ignoscas vitiis teneor.

(Thanks to this method [of giving examples to the young], I am free from those faults, which bring ruin, although I am in the power of minor, innocent ones)

"Instilling morals by example to the young" (Gowers, 2012, 179) keeps young people from serious moral faults, as Horace, generously admitting his own minor defects, testifies in lines 129-131. He expects, however, that these minor failings will mend with time, a frank friend, or reflection (*abstulerit longa aetas, liber amicus,/ consilium proprium*, lines 132-133). *Liber* in line S.1.4.132 refers to the concept of *parrhesia* as meant by Philodemus in his treatise. At this stage, it is useful to briefly recapitulate Horace's use of the notion of *parrhesia* in S.1.4. The word *libertas* (*parrhesia*) appears for the first time in the poem at S.1.4.5 praising the poets of Old Comedy, who censured men holding high public office with great freedom of speech (*multa cum libertate notabant*). There is, however, an essential difference between S.1.4.1-5 and S.1.4.132. In the former passage, he describes censure of thirds which should be frank and free. In the latter, he is concerned with the issue of behaviour among friends, a discussion with equals. Horace touches in S.1.4.132 upon the true meaning of Philodemus' views in his treatise "On Frank Criticism." Konstan (2007, 5-6) puts this as follows: "It is abundantly clear in Philodemus' treatise *On Frank Criticism* that the topic of frank

criticism in moral reform is part of the topic of friendship. Members of the group admonish and censure each other in friendship.” Horace counts on his friends to correct his minor faults.

Thus, the passage of lines 103-143 concerns firstly his priorities for his programme of writing politically oriented commentary (to be content and avoid avarice in lines 107-111, and to shun vulgar passion in lines 111-115), and secondly his “father’s” education as the foundation for the position within his circle of friends (lines 115-143). That is what “his father” taught him in the first place. But why does Horace quote “his father” in such detail? Why does he not simply state that he is much in sympathy with the old Roman values, and why does he need “his father’s” authority? I intend to show that the passage about the role of “his father” relates directly to S.1.3, and particularly to the last but two lines 139-140. When I discussed S.1.3, I mentioned that Horace closes the poem with a few lines about his own fortunate circumstances. I concur with DuQuesnay (1984, 36), who also argues that Horace at the end of the third *sermo* (in S.1.3.139-140) refers to himself: *et mihi dulces/ ignoscent, si quid peccaro stultus, amici* (and my dear friends will forgive me if I – fool I am – make a mistake). He was accepted within a circle of men of great charisma and importance, real friends. The words *dulces amici* are repeated in S.1.4.134-136 when the son says: “*rectius hoc est;/ hoc faciens vivam melius; sic dulcis amicis/ occurram*” (“this is better: doing this, I shall live more happily: this is how to make a good impression on my friends”). Both at the end of S.1.3 and that of S.1.4, Horace expresses his contentment with the way his career advances. Oliensis (1998, 18-26) also recognizes that he wrote these lines with the progress of his position within the circle of Maecenas in mind. She (1998, 26) argues that S.1.4.133-137 means that the socially inferior self-made man Horace will enter a

self-improvement program. It is this self-improvement program, Horace claims, that makes him *dulcis amicis*, ‘dear to his friends’ – a fine candidate for the friendship of the judicious Maecenas, among others. Only in this indirect and laudable fashion can Horace’s satiric art be said to have won him his new position in society.

However, she and I differ on the points Horace makes concerning his programme of action. She (1998, 20) also maintains that “if Horace focuses attention on the proper selection of satiric targets, one reason is his desire to reassure Maecenas that he will not level his satire against him.” I propose a different interpretation to that of Oliensis, namely that Horace’s wish was to write critical commentary on contemporary political issues, and that he did not intend to exclude the political leadership, that is Octavian and Maecenas among others. The second book of *Sermones*, written between 33 B.C. and 30 B.C., contains two poems (out of eight) with critical commentary on contemporary social and political issues, S.2.2 and S.2.8. The book of *Epodi*, written

in the same period, has seven (out of seventeen) such poems.¹⁷⁴ Horace, an unknown man from provincial Venusia, must first demonstrate that he is a reliable member of the circle of Maecenas, but one with an independent mind who will speak freely. That is what he does at the closure of S.1.4, and indeed in S.1.3 and S.1.5, written between 38 B.C. and 36 or 35 B.C. DuQuesnay states that “among his [Horace’s] *amici* were Caesar (Octavian) and Maecenas; among the faults which they pardoned, the reader will recall, [was] Horace’s adherence to the Republican cause at Philippi.” Horace is stigmatized firstly by his Venusian origin: we have seen in section 1.3.2 that Venusia was punished, as the town had not remained loyal to Rome in the Social War, while the majority of Latin towns maintained their support for Rome. Thus, it is likely that Venusians were considered unreliable by leading Romans. He makes this point again in S.1.5. Secondly, Horace joined Brutus’ party and fought at the wrong side at Philippi. Thus, he has to demonstrate that he is of good political stock, who upholds the traditional Roman values, and that he shook off the last vestiges of Republican leanings.

Leach (1971) does not recognize that Horace’s representation of “his father” is not autobiographical, but I concur with Schlegel (2000, 93) that it is poetic fiction, who argues “that Horace tells us [in S.1.4] very little about his life.” However, I differ from Schlegel when she states “that furthermore the ‘information’ he supplies is motivated by its poetic context.” She continues with the words that Horace is not “confessing his life to his books. *Satires* 1.4 and 1.6 are the well-known *loci* of Horace’s upbringing by his father, told in the context of Horace’s relation to Lucilius, his satiric forebear, and to Maecenas, [...]. All four figures – father, son, satiric predecessor, and patron – are artifacts of the poet’s generic construction, *dramatis personae* structured to provide a definition to Horace’s satiric art.” I have explained above and I will explain in the discussion of S.1.6, that I agree with the opinion that Horace, among other matters, indeed writes in S.1.1 – 1.4 about his views on censure poetry. However, I do not support the view, that Horace explores and defines his satiric art by means of the figures of

174 For the date of writing of *Epod.*, see note 7. In S.2.2, Horace criticizes the social consequences of the land confiscations by, amongst others, Octavian (see Weeda, 2010, 141-142; 340). In S.2.8, where Maecenas is the guest of honour at a dinner party arranged by a nouveau riche, Horace shows that mixing the old elite and the new rich is a danger to a healthy society (see Weeda, 2010, 146-148; 340). In *Epod.*2, Horace condemns the cynical attitude of Rome’s leading circles towards the situation after the land expropriations (see Weeda, 2010, 153-154; 340). In *Epod.*4, the poet criticizes the rise to powerful positions of too many new men, who are incompetent and not to be trusted (see Weeda, 2010, 155; 340). In *Epodi* 5 and 17, Horace expresses his concern about the dangers of black magic, the growing Eastern influence, and the alliance of Marc Antony and Cleopatra (see my discussion of S.1.8). *Epodi* 7, 9 and 16 pertain to the civil war. In *Epod.*7, he censures Antony, Sextus Pompey and particularly Octavian for the ongoing war and power struggle (see Weeda, 2010, 157-159; 340). In *Epod.*9, Horace focuses on the battle at Actium; he is critical of Octavian’s military qualities (see Weeda, 2010, 160-163; 340). In *Epod.*16 he also criticizes the renewal of the war, but he expresses his expectation of better times (see Weeda, 2010, 166-169; 340).

“his father” and Maecenas. Firstly, I use the words “censure poetry” advisedly as he did not write much *satire*; the greater part of his social and political criticism can be found in other genres. Thus, Lucilius was not Horace’s satiric predecessor, although he learned from Lucilius that frank and free criticism had its place and deserved to be listened to (see also my observations on this subject in the discussion of S.1.10). Secondly, in my view, “his father” in this passage is not Horace’s biological father, but symbolizes the sound ethical and political priorities of his background, and Maecenas’ role is that of the man who needs to be convinced that Horace will be a worthwhile associate (see also the discussion of S.1.6.78-80, and note 223).

I mentioned above that the passage from line 115 concerns his position within his circle of friends. First, in lines 115-131 he explained that his political background was sound. Next, from line 131 he looks forward to the pleasure of the company of his friends: the word *amicus* appears twice, in lines 131 and 135. However, there are other pleasures. There will be time for reflection (*consilium proprium*), relaxing on a couch (*lectulus*) or strolling in the colonnade (*porticus*). He will take to self-examination, as he says in lines 134-140, which I partly quoted above. Some thoughts he will keep to himself, but others he will commit to paper. In S.1.4.137-140 he says:

haec ego mecum
compressis agito labris; ubi quid datur oti
illudo chartis. hoc est mediocribus illis
ex vitiis unum;
 (these [thoughts] I consider with myself, lips sealed; when I have some spare time, I waste paper.
 This is one of those minor failings)

Gowers (2012, 181) sees in lines 137-138 a reference to, “the *scurra* of [S.1.4.]86-89, who blabs about his friends behind their backs” at a dinner party. In my view, S.1.4.115-143 refers to his position within his circle of friends. Consequently, I read S.1.4.131-140 to echo S.1.4.17-18 and partly S.1.4.81-85. Horace is not going to give in to malicious backbiting like the untrustworthy friend in S.1.4.81-85, he keeps his lips shut tight. He will conduct himself in such a manner, that he can achieve what he intended and partly wrote down tongue-in-cheek in S.1.4.17-18 *di bene fecerunt inopis me quodque pusilli/ finxerunt animi, raro et perpauca loquentis* (the gods be praised for creating me with a weak intellect and petty spirit, one that speaks rarely and scantily). His programme is to write down for his friends his thoughts when he can, with restraint and in simple language, not hasty, but in a polished and attractive style considering his words carefully. In the words of Anderson (1982, 16) “In his [a Roman citizen’s] social intercourse he might be ‘free’ among friends of the same station. A true friend would express himself frankly and honestly, even when such freedom meant that he had to criticize a close companion.”

Finally, the sensible Horace surprises us in the last four lines of the poem. Any of his friends who refuse to listen to his poetry will face a group of his colleague poets coming to his aid (*multa poetarum veniat manus auxilio quae/ sit mihi*). Earlier in the

same poem, in lines 41-42, he wrote that one would not consider anyone like him, who writes something resembling the language of conversation, a poet (*neque si qui scribat uti nos/ sermoni propiora, putes hunc esse poetam*), but at this stage he considers himself a poet and implicitly elevates *sermo* to true poetry.¹⁷⁵ I suggest that Horace's statement in line 142 *nam multo plures sumus* (for we are much in the majority) is not a "comic hyperbole" (Brown, 2007, 138), but a confident statement that he and a number of his poet-friends within the circle of Maecenas have an important contribution to make to the debate about the major contemporary political and social issues. He warns his readers in the last line of the poem that they will do their utmost to convert them to their points of view, like the Jews do, known for their zeal and tenacity. The group of poets around Maecenas was clearly not the majority of the whole circle. As far as we know, nine other poets, apart from Horace, belonged to the group around Maecenas, of whom Horace mentions in S.1.5 Virgil, Varius Rufus, and Plotius Tucca as his intimates (see also note 45). In addition, he will also say in S.1.10.81-90 that he has a warm place in his heart for the elegist Valgius Rufus, the poet Octavius Musa, the tragedian Asinius Pollio, and the dramatic writer Aristius Fuscus, who was a special friend. White (1993, 40) states "that the people who gathered around men like Maecenas and Messalla did not form closely knit groups pursuing distinctive ideologies." I (2015, 54-84) argue that Virgil's Caesarean sympathies and distinct political views are already visible in the *Eclogae*, of which most (7 out of 10) – the politically most outspoken poems – were written between 42 B.C. and at the latest 40 B.C.¹⁷⁶ This was before Virgil's relationship with Maecenas. White (1993, 40) asserts that "Varius also was writing poetry with political overtones in the latter 40s. We do not know that it was pro-Caesarean, but we do know that it was anti-Antonian." Thus, when Horace was invited to join the circle, he came into the company of at least two poets – and perhaps more if some of the poets mentioned in S.1.10 belonged already to the circle – whose poetry also held political commentary, although we do not know the details of that in the case of Varius. This may have been the reason for Horace asserting in these last lines that they, although not great in number, but not the least of poets, would be a force to be reckoned with in the discussions of political issues: he would strengthen that force by the power of speech in his *sermones*.

175 For the question whether satire was seen as true poetry, see Freudenburg (1993, 119-128; 145-150) and Gowers (2012, ad loc.). I discuss these issues above w.r.t. S.1.4; detailed discussions of the general issues are given in Freudenburg (1993).

176 For the likely dating of *Ecl.1* in 41/40 B.C., see Weeda (2015, 59, 79); Weeda & van der Poel (2016, 196); of *Ecl.2* in 42 B.C., see Weeda (2015, 60, note 76); of *Ecl.3* in 42/41 B.C., see Weeda (2015, 61); of *Ecl.4* in most likely 40 B.C., see Weeda (2015, 61); of *Ecl.5* in about 40 B.C., see Weeda (2015, 65); of *Ecl.6* is not discussed explicitly, but most likely shortly after 40 B.C., see Weeda (2015, 65); of *Ecl.7* most likely after 40 B.C., see Weeda (2015, 69); of *Ecl.8* in likely 35 B.C., see Weeda (2015, 60 note 76; 70); Weeda & van der Poel (2016, 196); of *Ecl.9* in 40 B.C., see Weeda (2015, 74, 79); Weeda & van der Poel (2016, 196); of *Ecl.10* in 41/40 B.C., see Weeda (2015, 79); Weeda & van der Poel (2016, 196).

2.2.3 *Sermones* 1.5 and 1.6: Horace's Credentials for Maecenas Continued: A Journey to Brundisium; Youth and Education in Venusia and Rome

Sermones 1.5 and 1.6 are often read as autobiographical poetry. S.1.5 is supposed to record a historical journey from Rome to Brundisium that Horace made in the company of Maecenas, and S.1.6 is seen as a true report of the young poet's days in Venusia and his first experiences in the company of Maecenas. We have seen in section 2.2.2 that Horace narrated for the first time some "personal experience" in S.1.4, when he wrote about his own education by his "father." I suggest that he wanted to show that he was of good political stock, which upholds the traditional Roman values, and thus a worthy member of the circle of Maecenas. I intend to demonstrate that he continued to take this line in the fifth and sixth *sermones*.

In **Sermo 1.5**, Horace relates his (supposed) taking part in a journey from Rome to Brundisium. He describes travelling in the company of amongst others Maecenas, Virgil, Varius and Tucca.¹⁷⁷ It is generally held among scholars that Horace modelled S.1.5 on Lucilius' *Iter Siculum*.¹⁷⁸ I note that I do not interpret S.1.5 as a poem in which Horace intended to emulate Lucilius. I intend to demonstrate that the fifth *sermo* is the poet's next step in presenting himself as a worthy member of the group of men around Maecenas – a leading theme of the previous *sermones*. Further, I mentioned in section 1.4, that the historicity of the journey is very doubtful, and that the latter is most likely Horace's poetic fiction (see Musurillo, 1955). I concur with Musurillo (1955, 162), who argues that "in view of the meagerness of our historical sources, and considering what seem to be in Horace conflicting details, can we be sure that the satire is not simply a *poetic fiction*, a composite picture perhaps of journeys made at different times and bound together as a *jeu d'esprit* in imitation of Lucilius?" Contrary to this view, Campbell (1970, 82-83; 92-93; 166-167) firmly reads S.1.5 as an account of a real journey which Horace made in Maecenas' company. He (1970, 92-93) states that "between 40 B.C. and the spring of 37 inclusive, he [Maecenas] made no less than four separate journeys to Brundisium [...]. It is now generally agreed that the journey

177 For S.1.5, see Anderson (2010, 37-38); Brown (2007, 138-150); Connors (2005, 131-135); Cucchiarelli (2002); DuQuesnay (1984, 39-43); Freudenburg (1993, 201-205; 2001, 51-58); Gowers (2003, 76-78; 2005, 48-57; 1993/2009; 2012, xi, 182-214); Mayer (1989, 10-11); Meijer (2017); Musurillo (1955); Oliensis (1998, 26-30); Rudd (2007, 54-64); Sallmann (1974), who also gives a review of the scholarship. For the friendship of Horace and his companions of the trip, see Mayer (1989, 10-11).

178 Porphyrio (Meyer, 1874, 213) stated already that Lucilius' *Iter Siculum* was the model for S.1.5: *Lucilio hac satira aemulatur Horatii iter suum a Roma Brundesium usque describens, quod et ille in tertio libro fecit* (Horace, who describes his journey from Rome to Brundisium, emulates in this satire Lucilius what he also described in his third book). For a summary of Lucilius as a model for S.1.5, see DuQuesnay (1984, 40-43); Freudenburg (1993, 201 note 51; 2001, 51-52); Gowers (2012, 10; 184); Sallmann (1974, 182-184); Williams (1968, 569-570). A detailed discussion of the issue in Barchiesi & Cucchiarelli (2005, 213-215); Fiske (1966, 306-316); Fraenkel (2002, 105-112); Rudd (2007, 54-64).

described in *Satires*, I.V [...] took place in the Spring of 37.” DuQuesnay (1984, 40) agreeing that “of all the satires, this is the one most obviously modelled on a famous poem by Lucilius” takes the same stand when he states that “the journey, then, which Horace is describing certainly took place, as his contemporaries would be only too well aware.” According to Oliensis (1998, 27), Horace went on this journey as “the naming of so many potential witnesses suggests that he did.”¹⁷⁹ We saw in section 1.3.1 (Autobiography in Horace’s poetry) that Gowers (2003) offers a very useful model to understand the historicity of Horatian poetry. In addition, an anonymous reviewer pointed out that “Gowers’ very broad interpretation of the word ‘autobiographical’ clearly encompasses poetic fiction.” Yet, as I stated in my discussion in section 1.3.1, I will continue to apply both the concepts of poetic fiction and autobiography knowing that those two are interwoven and serve for depicting Horace’s life-story. In the case of S.1.5, Gowers (2009, 159) sees the “autobiographical” elements and the fictitious details of the journey as “a simulation of a real adventure.” Gowers (2009, 160) states that

it would be a mistake to read the poem in the context of works like the itineraries or Julius Caesar’s lost *Iter*, which sounds like a logbook of a Roman route. Horace has something else on his mind. This is in quite another sense a poetic fiction: not so much a conflation of journeys as an exercise in writing Horatian satire.

I concur with Gowers that S.1.5 “is in quite another sense poetic fiction,” and that Horace “had something else on his mind.” I suggest, however, that the poem is neither a description of a real journey nor “an exercise in writing satire.” In my view, Horace had something very different on his mind, that is a description of fictitious events because his objective for S.1.5 (and indeed the other poems in S.1) was to present to Maecenas his views on their relationship. We also saw in section 1.3.1 that it is likely that Horace considered that this was best done by using the form of the first-person *persona* (Horace) who presents himself as engaged in fictitious events. This enabled Horace to give his commentary on those events or on the individuals involved, while Maecenas received the poet’s opinion and could recognise those as fiction but still

179 For the historicity of S.1.5, see also Anderson (1955/1956); Barchiesi & Cucchiarelli (2005, 213-215), and Cucchiarelli (2001, 15-70), both authors are not explicit, but I understand them to say that the journey took place in reality; see also DuQuesnay (1984, 40); Gowers (2009, 157-160; 2012, 183-184); Fraenkel (2002, 105); Meijer (2017) in his engaging and instructive book about the *Via Appia* (published in Dutch) takes the historicity of S.1.5 for granted. He (2017, 14) states: “Only few wrote about their experience travelling the road. The poet Horace is the only one who gives a full account. He travelled in 37 B.C from Rome to Brundisium and described his experiences in a long satire [S.1.5].” (the translation from the Dutch is mine); Musurillo (1955); Rudd (2007, 54), who states: “We do not know for certain which [conference Maecenas’ party travelled to], but that does not oblige us to accept the view held by Musurillo and others;” Williams (1968, 569-570). For S.1.5 as a form of travel-writing, see Gowers (2012, 183-184).

consider the factual points that Horace made. This way Horace could arrange an informal setting for the interchange of views and Maecenas could choose whether to react or to listen.

I will commence by briefly recalling the narrative of S.1.5 including the different views on some aspects of the context of the poem, such as the purpose and the dating of the “journey.” Next, I will analyse the poem in detail. Then, I consider the authenticity of the “journey” and I will especially examine two aspects of the text, that is firstly the route of the journey, and secondly the differences in content and detail of Horace’s description of several parts of the voyage. Finally, I will present my view on the theme of the *sermo*.

At this stage, I will relate Horace’s narrative as given in S.1.5 irrespective of my views that the account is not grounded on a historic journey. I divide the “journey to Brundisium” into three parts: (1) Rome to Trivicum (some 30 miles Northwest of his hometown Venusia), (2) the route between Trivicum and Rubi, and (3) from Rubi to Brundisium.

After leaving Rome by the Via Appia, Horace spends the night at a modest inn at Aricia. It is not clear from the text whether he stayed there on his own, or with some fellow voyagers. Although he tells us in lines 2-3 that his companion is Heliodorus, by far the most learned of all Greeks (*rhetor comes Heliodorus,/ Graecorum longe doctissimus*), this Heliodorus cannot be identified. Gowers (2009, 166) suggests that the *comes* “might be the Heliodorus who wrote a poem called *Theamata Italica*, ‘Sights of Italy’ (or *Thaumata Italica*, ‘Miracles of Italy’) [of which 12 lines survive]. It is even more probable that Horace means that he did not take a man at all, but a book, a kind of ‘Companion Guide to Southern Italy’.”¹⁸⁰ If S.1.5 were a form of travel-writing, Horace would presumably have told us something about Aricia, the hometown of Octavian’s family the Atti, or about the villa which Julius Caesar built in the town. Perhaps Horace alluded to the *Theamata Italica* because Heliodorus’ book contained such information. In lines 3-23 the Forum Appi gets a brief mention, followed by an account of the boat trip through the canal in the Pomptine marshes. In the Forum Appi Horace experiences his first physical trouble of the journey, a stomach upset caused by the water, that was very bad (*hic ego propter aquam, quod erat deterrima, ventri/ indico bellum*) (lines 7-8). He watches his companions eat their dinner.

Some form of travel-writing starts in line 9. After dinner, at nightfall, they board a canal boat, which is packed full: lines 12-13 say: *‘trecentos inseris: ohe/ iam satis est!’* (“you packed in three hundred [passengers]: ho there, that’s quite enough!”). In the boat, Horace experiences the second trouble within a day. Lines 14-18 say:

¹⁸⁰ See also Kiessling (1959, 91); Gowers (2012, 187-188).

*mali culices ranaeque palustres
 avertunt somnos, absentem ut cantat amicum
 multa prolutus vappa nauta atque viator
 certatim: tandem fessus dormire viator
 incipit*

(bad midges and frogs from the marshes drive the sleep away, while the boatman, sozzled with much vapid wine, sings of the girl he misses and a passenger vies with him. At last, the tired passenger falls asleep)

After describing a night without sleep, caused by midges, frogs and a drunken boatman, Horace touches in lines 18-22 upon a further frustration created by personal discomfort: the delay of the barge caused by the lazy boatman who lets the mule graze on the bank and snores away lying on his back (*stertitque supinus*) (line 19).¹⁸¹ The boat has come to a standstill, until a hot-headed (*cerebrosus*) passenger gives boatman and mule a thrashing and gets the barge going again. Line 23 says that eventually, at ten o'clock in the morning they disembark (*quarta vix demum exponimur hora*) and in lines 25-26 Horace reports that they had a late breakfast and crept for three miles going uphill to Anxur (modern Terracina), laying upon her dazzling white rocks, which can be seen from afar (*milia tum pransi tria repimus atque subimus/ impositum saxis late candentibus Anxur*). Here in Anxur, where the Via Appia hits the sea, Maecenas and Cocceius, who had obviously travelled by sea, were to meet the party. Lines 27-29 say:

*huc venturus erat Maecenas optimus atque
 Cocceius, missi magnis de rebus uterque
 legati, aversos soliti componere amicos.*

(here noble Maecenas and Cocceius were to arrive, both sent as ambassadors on important business and experienced in bringing together friends who were opposed)

Before reporting their arrival, Horace informed us of another of his physical troubles in lines 30-31, that is the necessity to treat his inflamed eyes (conjunctivitis?) with a black ointment (*hic oculis ego nigra meis collyria lippus/ illinere*). The manner in which Horace narrates the discomforts of the first two days, such as his stomach troubles and the boat journey with the crowded conditions, a sleepless night, the delay of the boat and his sore eyes are not only well-known elements of travel-writing, but serve also a very different purpose. Horace mentions the contrast of the comfortable arrival of Maecenas and company in Anxur in order to show that travellers like himself are willing to suffer hardship and discomfort in the service of Maecenas.

181 A side effect of the mention of frogs in line 14 is that the season in which the journey took place can be determined. The season is in turn significant for the dating of the poem. This has been studied by Gow (1901), who, after consulting some eminent authorities on frogs, concluded that Horace travelled in the spring. See also Campbell (1970, 93); Musurillo (1955, 161).

He reports their arrival in lines 31-33:

*interea Maecenas advenit atque
Cocceius Capitoque simul Fonteius, ad unguem
factus homo, Antoni non ut magis alter amicus.*

(Meanwhile Maecenas arrives and Cocceius and with them Fonteius Capito, a gentleman to his fingertips, so much so that no one is a better friend of Antony)¹⁸²

The passage of lines 27-33 tell us that two experienced (*soliti*) diplomats, Maecenas and Cocceius, joined the party in order to settle the problems between two friends, which is generally interpreted as a mission to repair the Triumvirate. Maecenas and Cocceius are *soliti* as they were both involved in the negotiations which resulted in the Treaty of Brundisium in 40 B.C., and the marriage of Antony to Octavia.¹⁸³ Thus, the poem may refer to a diplomatic mission of Maecenas, but we cannot know which one. In the secondary literature, three possible reasons for Horace's journey in Maecenas' company to Brundisium are considered. These are either the diplomatic mission by Maecenas to Brundisium in 40 B.C., where Octavian and Antony signed the treaty, or Maecenas' journey to the town for a crossing to Athens where he was to meet Antony in 38 B.C., or the signing of what became the Treaty of Tarentum, when Antony could not enter Brundisium in 37 B.C.¹⁸⁴ Musurillo (1955, 162) argues "that it is a useless task to attempt to assign any specific date to the events of the *Journey to Brundisium*, or to try to sort out details that might be (a) historically true, (b) pure fiction, (c) imitations of Lucilius, (d) plausible 'poetic coloring' (as, e.g., perhaps the gnats, the frogs, and the rain-washed roads)." The uncertainties about the actual journey causes Musurillo to propose that the journey is not historical but poetic fiction.¹⁸⁵ Gowers (2009, 159) writes that "none of them (Treaty of Brundisium of 40 BCE; the Treaty of Tarentum

¹⁸² I owe the rendering of lines 32-33 to Gowers (2012, 194-195).

¹⁸³ For the involvement of Maecenas and Cocceius in 40 B.C. in Brundisium, see Gowers (2012, 193); Pelling (1996, 17-19).

¹⁸⁴ Anderson (2010, 36-38) states that the poem refers to a journey to Brundisium in 40 B.C. According to Bowditch (2010, 59) the poem refers to the trip to Brundisium in 38 B.C. Campbell (1970, 93) is certain that "it took place in the Spring of 37." Gowers (2012, 183) states that 37 B.C. is the most likely option. See also DuQuesnay (1984, 39-41); Gowers (2012, 212-214). According to Rudd (2007, 54) "we do not know for certain which conference."

¹⁸⁵ For the uncertainties about the progress of the supposed journey, see Gowers (2012, 204; 205) re. line 71 and lines 77-93; Musurillo (1955, 159) writes: "there is the problem – admittedly not an important one – of determining the exact number of days Horace's party required for the journey." He found in the scholarly literature a range of twelve to seventeen days. Sallmann (1974, 187), referring to Musurillo, states: "daß die Zahl der Übernachtungen und damit die Gesamtzahl der Stationen durchaus nicht klar ist: die Gelehrten zählen zwischen elf und siebzehn Tagen" (that the number of overnight stays and thus the total number of stages is absolutely unclear: scholars count between eleven and seventeen days).

of spring 37; and a meeting in Athens between Octavian and Antony in 38 BCE) is quite consistent with Horace's account." I discussed above in the opening passage of the examination of the present poem her (1993/2009, 160) argumentation that it would be wrong to read S.1.5 as an itinerary, and that Horace had something else on his mind, namely an exercise in writing satire. In her paper she develops further the literary reading of S.1.5. She (1993/2009, 160) argues that the poem reflects "all the tangled ramblings, the stops and starts, asides, resumptions and suspended endings that make up Horatian satire." In addition, she (1993/2009, 164-165) interprets the fifth *sermo* as a prolongation of Horace's criticism of Lucilius. I read the poem with a different objective, that is not the literary one. I search for references that support the view that Horace had a functional objective in the first book of *Sermones*, namely to prove that he was a valuable and trustworthy member of the circle of Maecenas. Thus, I will propose below that the "uncertainties" of the journey presented by him are only one of the indications that the journey in the poem is fictitious. This poetic fiction caused his audience to focus on the hidden meaning of the poem, as they knew very well that Horace never took part in such a voyage. I will discuss all the evidence of the fictional nature of S.1.5 later after completing my review of the narrative of the whole poem.

The next station of the journey, Fundi, gets only a short mention in lines 34-36. In these lines, we come across the first instance in this *sermo* of Horace's attempts of showing that he has left behind the habits and politics of small provincial towns. We will see this again in lines 51-69 by his treatment of Sarmentus, and in lines 97-103 by ridiculing the superstition of the inhabitants of Gnatia.¹⁸⁶ He writes in lines 35-36 in a rather condescending manner about Aufidius Luscus, the chief official of the town: *insani ridentes praemia scribae, / praetextam et latum clavum prunaeque vatillum* (laughing at the knick-knack of the deranged clerk, the bordered robe, the broad purple stripe and bucket of burning coal). Horace depicts Aufidius as a pompous local dignitary, who put on airs of a senator by wearing the regalia of the senatorial rank. Horace, who had been a *scriba* himself, reached a much grander position and wants to distance himself from these small-town men. It is quite feasible that Horace chose Aufidius as the name reminds us of the river Aufidus near his home town Venusia. Thus, he does not only distance himself from insignificant Fundi and his chief, but he refers also to his own past in Venusia.¹⁸⁷

186 Conform Kemp (2010, 73 note 28): "Horace still wants to be seen to be above petty superstition in *Satires* 1.5, just as he still wants to oppose Stoic extremism with humane Epicurean anthropology in 1.3."

187 Horace's reference to the river Aufidus resembles Virgil's reference to the river Rhenus in *Ecl.* 10, which does not represent the Rhine, but the river Reno in Northern Italy. In both cases, the poet focuses the thoughts of the reader on the home region of the author. The poet transfers, as it were, some of the argument. For Virgil's use of this functional reference, see Weeda (2015, 79-82) and Weeda & van der Poel (2016).

After Fundi the party arrives at Formiae, the town of the Mamurra family (*Mamurrarum urbe*). One Mamurra, a well-known nouveau riche, was from 58 B.C. Julius Caesar's *praefectus fabrum* (chief engineer) in Gallia, and returned in 55 B.C. to Rome, where he built himself an expensive house on the Caelian Hill. He was notorious for his extravagance, ostentation and his sexual affairs.¹⁸⁸ Horace returns in line 37 to one of his earlier subjects, that is his loathing of the new rich, presenting Mamurra in a similar way as he did Aufidius in line 34. In both cases, he connects the man with the town – *Fundos Aufidio Lusco* (line 34) and *Mamurrarum urbe* (line 37) – suggesting that the parvenus and pretentious dignitaries were not only to be found in Rome, but also in small towns. Fortunately, Horace does not have to suffer their company, as he enjoys the hospitality of people whom he considers his equals, L. Licinius Varro Murena and C. Fonteius Capito; the first a member of a family that brought forth many of the political and social elite, the second a consul in 33 B.C. and ambassador of Marc Antony. Line 38 reads: *Murena praebente domum, Capitone culinam* (Murena providing shelter and [Fonteius] Capito the catering).

A peak in the journey is the putative meeting with M. Plotius Tucca, L. Varius Rufus and Virgil the next day in Sinuessa, a place on the coast near Naples. Horace says in lines 39-44:

namque

*Plotius et Varius Sinuessae Vergiliusque
occurrunt, animae qualis neque candidiores
terra tulit neque quis me sit devinctior alter.
o qui complexus et gaudia quanta fuerunt!
nil ego contulerim iucundo sanus amico.*

(for at Sinuessa Plotius, Varius and Virgil come to meet us, no brighter spirits earth bore and nobody is more attached to them than I. O the embracing and how great was our joy! So long as I am in my right mind, there is nothing I would compare with a pleasant friend).

According to Gowers (2012, 197), Horace chose cleverly for the Naples region for the supposed meeting with his three poet-friends in order to present his own associations with Philodemus, with whom according to Gowers (2012, 20) “Virgil, Varius and Maecenas were certainly associated.”¹⁸⁹ I argue below that the journey, and

188 Catullus writes about Mamurra in CATUL.29.6-9: *et ille nunc superbus et superfluens/perambulabit omnium cubilia/ ut albulus columbus aut Adoneus?* (and shall he now, arrogant and with money plentiful, make the rounds of everyone's marriage-bed, like a white cock-pigeon or an Adonis?).

189 Gowers (2012, 197): “they [Plotius, Varius and Virgil] cross his [Horace's] path later than his patron [Maecenas] does, aptly near Naples, centre of the Epicurean sect led by Philodemus (c.110 – c. 35 BC) and Siro with which Varius, Virgil and H.[orace] were associated.” For Horace and Philodemus, see Oberhelman & Armstrong (1995, 235-236). For the association of Maecenas and Philodemus, see Gowers (2012, 20-21); Kemp (2010, 72-73); Moles (2007, 168). For the allusion to Epicurus in this passage, see Gowers (2012, 197-198).

consequently the meeting, never took place. Yet, this allusion to his philosophical preference fits in with the general theme of this *sermo* (and others), that is an account of his views and his person, which demonstrate that he is an acceptable member of the circle of Maecenas, of which Varius and Virgil form also part; they introduced him to Maecenas in 38 B.C. Horace says in line 44 that the three poets are kindred spirits and very special friends.

After an overnight stop in a modest guest house close to Pons Campanus in the Capuan hinterland, the travellers head for Capua where they arrive in good time. Maecenas has the opportunity for a relaxing game, but both Horace and Virgil take to their beds: Horace still suffers from his conjunctivitis (*lippis*) and Virgil is suffering from indigestion (*crudis*) (lines 48-49). The next stage takes them not to common inns (*cauponas*), but to the well furnished villa of L. Cocceius Nerva in Caudium. Here, Horace imagines that a battle of wits (*pugnam*) between Sarmentus and Messius Cicirrus is staged, which he narrates in lines 51-70. He refers explicitly in lines 53-55 to both men's stock (*et quo patre natus uterque*). Sarmentus was most likely an Etruscan ex-slave of M. Flavonius, who in 42 B.C. was freed by Maecenas, and promoted to *scriba quaestorius*. Treggiari (1969, 272) mentions the option "that he was a Tuscan, [and that] it is possible that Sarmentus was freeborn and had been wrongfully enslaved. Maecenas may have established his client's right." He was a comic *scurra* favoured by Marc Antony, Livia and Augustus, became an *eques* by purchase, but finished as a typical parasite.¹⁹⁰ Sarmentus' lineage was similar to that of Horace. Horace will claim in S.1.6.45-46, either autobiographically correct or fabricated, that he was a son of a freedman from provincial Apulia, later a *scriba* – characteristics which Gowers (2012, 201) calls "H.[orace]'s Achilles' heels." Sarmentus was most likely a freedman himself, became *scriba quaestorius*, and originated also from a provincial town. A point of particular interest is the difference between the two in the manner of practising their profession: Sarmentus is a *scurra*, whereas Horace rejects this role emphatically. He does not wish to present himself as a buffoon, as he sees such a character as uneducated and vulgar, not the sort of man he wants to be. Horace wants to position himself as a gentleman commentator.¹⁹¹ Thus, Horace, who had a similar social background as Sarmentus, had developed very differently being associated with Maecenas. Messius is unknown and was presumably a local of Oscan stock. The battle of words between Sarmentus and Messius is in keeping with the worst traditions of the comic stage. It does not rise above coarse remarks

190 JUV.5.3 refers to Sarmentus as a despicable parasite. For the passage S.1.5.51-70 and Sarmentus, see Corbett (1986, 66-68); Freudenburg (1993, 203-204; 2001, 55-56); Gowers (2012, 199-200); Oliensis (1998, 28-30). For Sarmentus, see also Gundel (1972b); Treggiari (1969, 271-272). Acc. to Gowers (2012, 200) M. Flavonius, a supporter of Pompey, was killed in the proscriptions after Philippi.

191 For Horace positioning as a gentleman commentator and his rejection of the role as a comic *scurra*, see my discussion of S.1.3.29-34.

about physical disfigurements and comparisons to animals intended to insult. In the episode described in lines 51-70, Horace wants to show how well at ease he is within Maecenas' party. According to Oliensis (1998, 29) "Horace takes care to locate himself very definitely in the audience, far above the satiric boxing ring." Horace writes in lines 56-57 *ridemus* (we laugh) when Sarmentus compares Messius to a wild horse (*equi te/ esse feri similem dico*). This is not an audience's laugh at a funny joke, but a laugh of contempt at such baseness. He preferred to keep himself at a distance of this base humour of the common show demonstrating to Maecenas that such milieu was not his. Horace's final assessment of the evening is also somewhat reserved. He says with an ironical bias in S.1.5.70 *prorsus iucunde cenam producimus illam* (all in all, we prolonged that dinner pleasantly).

Next day, they travel straight to Beneventum, where the party has a very different experience: a kitchen fire caused by the nervous innkeeper preparing dinner for his distinguished guests. Horace describes in S.1.5.75-76 the confusion when greedy guests (*convivas avidos*) and frightened slaves (*servos timentis*) together try to snatch from the dinner what is left and extinguish the fire. The past potential subjunctive of *videres* in Horace's description suggests that he "again watches the chaos with detachment" (see Gowers, 2012, 205). The route of the party after Beneventum is not clear. Horace tells us that he approaches the Apulian border with relief and gratitude for seeing again his familiar hills and it is the first time in the poem that an appreciation of the landscape shows through his words. S.1.5.77-80 reads:

*incipit ex illo montis Apulia notos
ostentare mihi, quos torret Atabulus et quos
numquam erepsemus, nisi nos vicina Trivici
villa recepisset,*

(from that point Apulia begins to display to me her familiar hills, which are scorched by the sirocco, and which we would have never climbed had not a villa near Trivicum taken us in)¹⁹²

Horace's extra enjoyment that the villa near to his home region was expected to bring him, the assignation with a local girl, turned out to be a disappointment; the girl did not show up. It may have helped that the next twenty-four miles were done by coach.

It is likely that the party remained on the *Via Appia* at least as far as Trivicum, if the latter town corresponds correctly to modern Treviso.¹⁹³ If Horace's cryptic mention in lines 86-87 of a small town (*oppidulo*) where the party was delivered by carriages is taken to refer to Venusia, one last day of travelling by the route of the *Via Appia*

¹⁹² The *Atabulus* is a burning wind in Apulia, a sirocco.

¹⁹³ For a detailed discussion of the route at this stage, see Gowers (2003, 76-78; 2012, 205-207), who (Gowers, 2012, 205) states that "it becomes half-clear (at 79 *Trivici uilla*) that H.[orace] and his companions have continued on the *Via Appia* at least to that point (if the villa at Trivicum is correctly placed by the *Barrington Atlas* (p. 45), a few miles off the *Via Appia*)." For the *Barrington Atlas*, see Talbert (2000).

followed. S.1.5.86-87 reads *quattuor hinc rapimur viginti et milia raedis, / mansuri oppidulo quod versu dicere non est* (from here, we are hurried away in carriages for twenty-four miles, to stay in a little town which cannot be named in verse). I agree with Gowers (2012, 209), who states that “*oppidulo* is an underestimate if the town is Venusia,” but the latter cannot be fitted into the metre indeed. It could be a bit of Horace’s poetic teasing, at which Gowers (2012, 209) presumably hints when she says “if H.[orace] is indeed hinting at the prospect of a return to his birthplace, the equally unmetrical *Vēnūsīa* (see 77-8 nn), a special kind of mock-modesty is in play.” Gowers (2012, 208), however, offers also a perhaps rather far-fetched, but still very attractive conjecture that Venusia is meant indeed. In line 84, when Horace falls asleep still longing for the girl who never turned up, he says that he (in the rendering of Gowers) is “keyed up for Venus, bent on sex” (*intentum Veneri*). This may be an allusion to “heading for Venusia” through what Gowers calls “the provocative echoing of ‘Venus’/ ‘Venusia’ in *uestem, uentrem* [in 85]; cf. 84 *uisu*, 86 *uiginti*, 87 *uersu*, 88 *uenit uilissima*, 90 *uiator*.” Gowers’ suggestion supports my view that S.1.5 is very well constructed poetic fiction with not only functional references, but also very imaginative literary references. Arguments that Horace praises specifically Venusia may be found in a functional reference in S.1.5.89-91, where he commends the little town for the quality of the bread. Arguments that he also praises the Apulian region in general may be furnished by S.1.9.29-34; the latter passage can be read that Horace was not from Venusia itself, but from somewhere in the region (see the discussion of S.1.9.29-34 in section 2.2.5). S.1.5.89-91 reads:

*sed panis longe pulcherrimus, ultra
callidus ut soleat umeris portare viator;
nam Canusi lapidosus,*

(but the bread [in the little town] is by far the best, so that an experienced traveller is wont to take a load on his shoulders for later; because at Canusium the bread is as hard as stone)

If it is accepted that Venusia and the region distinguished themselves selling “by far the best bread,” the lines may suggest that he recalls a fond memory from his youth; remembering food that tasted good when young later evokes often warm feelings. But, the mention of *panis* (bread) can also indicate a functional reference. Horace uses in the whole of his work six times (apart from this one in S.1.5) word-forms of *panis*, typically in the *Sermones* and in the *Epistulae*. In addition to S.1.5.89-91, in five out of the six cases the context, within which he uses the word, is either a description of the bare necessities of food and drink as in S.1.1.47 (see also Gowers, 2012, 73, who refers to S.1.5.90) and in S.1.1.74, or a description of simple living as in S.2.2.17, and in *Ep*.1.10.11 and *Ep*.2.1.123.¹⁹⁴ Thus, I propose that Horace refers in lines 86-90 to

194 For the search of the total number of places where Horace used word-forms of *panis*, I used Brepols’ Library of Latin Texts – Series A, 2016 (<http://www.brepolis.net>). S.2.8.68 is the only place

Venusia and the region, and that he particularly calls attention to his uncomplicated milieu and the naturalness of his upbringing, although he also relates in S.1.6.71-78 that Venusia and environs was totally controlled after the Social War by veterans, whose views and lifestyle were very much in contrast with those of his family (see also section 1.3.2 on Horace's "biography"). This was also the cause of his leaving the town for Rome. Thus, he did not emerge a provincial bumpkin, and he does his utmost to convince Maecenas and his friends that this Venesian background taught him the traditional Roman values

Horace imagines that the supposed party does not continue on the Via Appia arriving the following day in Canusium (modern Canosa) on the Via Minucia. The latter road branched away from the Via Appia at Beneventum and ended by way of Barium (modern Bari) in Brundisium hugging the Adriatic coast. We saw that the text is not clear about the route between Beneventum and Canusium; either via Trivicum-Aquilonia-Herdoniae, or via Trivicum-Venusia. I prefer to think that Horace described the fictitious latter route, as this gave him the opportunity in his story to dwell on the significance of his Venusia for his education. He may have been deliberately vague about the putative route through his native area. Thus, Venusia was not meant specifically but rather the Apulian region (see above) in order to make the point about the values in the region: in that case S.1.5.77-90 can be paraphrased as that in the Apulian/Lucanian region the traditional Roman values can still be found and that he respects those. But, we will also see that he shows at different places in S.1.5 (in lines 34-36, 51-70, and 97-103) that he has left behind the little-minded habits and politics of small provincial towns.

Horace pictures with regret in line 93 that L.Varius Rufus leaves the putative party in Canusium (*flentibus hinc Varius discedit maestus amicis*) without telling us the reason of his (unexpected?) departure. In my opinion, both the arrival and the departure of Varius are obviously part of the fictitious nature of the poem. Line 93 should be read in conjunction with lines 39-44 symbolizing the cohesion and devotion to each other of the friends/poets: excessive joy in S.1.5.39-44, when the friends arrived, and deep distress when Varius leaves in S.1.5. 93.

Next, the group travels in poor weather by way of Rubi, and the following day to Barium in good weather. Horace has nothing else to report about the two days than the condition of the road, the weather and that Barium is a fishing town (*piscosi*). He gives Gnatia (modern Torre Egnázia) more lines, S.1.5.97-103, as the town and her inhabitants present him a good opportunity to show his well-considered philosophical views, which he expects Maecenas may value. Lines 97-103 read:

where the context is not about either basic necessities or simple living, but about the concerns of a host at his dinner party.

dein Gnatia Lymphis
iratis exstructa dedit risusque iocosque,
dum flamma sine tura liquescere limine sacro
persuadere cupit. credat Iudaeus Apella,
non ego: namque deos didici securum agere aevum,
nec si quid miri faciat natura, deos id
tristis ex alto caeli demittere tecto.

(then Gnatia, which was built when the water-nymphs were angry, made us laugh and gave us merriment when it would have us believe that incense melts on the threshold of the temple without fire. Apella, the Jew, may believe it, not I: for I learned that the gods have a carefree life, and that, if nature accomplishes any marvel, the gods do not send it down from their heavenly home because they are miserable)

This story relates to the miracle of Gnatia, the spontaneous blazing of wood on a sacred stone, which causes amusement and hilarity for the sophisticated members of the party. It is the third example in this poem where people in provincial towns are being ridiculed. Horace offers his credentials showing his own “erudition” in lines 101-103 by quoting from *de Rerum Natura* (LUCR. 5. 82-83). A superstitious Jew and the people of Gnatia may believe in marvels, but Horace “interprets natural phenomena like thunder and lightning in terms of scientific law rather than divine vengeance” (Gowers, 2012, 212). Horace shows again that he does not want to be associated with provincial superstition.

The final line 104 *Brundisium longae finis chartaeque viaeque est* (Brundisium is both the end of a long story and a long journey) is an abrupt end to the poem. Horace tells us that they arrived in Brundisium indeed, but still does not give us any information about the purpose of the journey. We must do with the cryptic reference in lines 27-33 when Maecenas, Cocceius and Fonteius Capito joined the party in Anxur on the third day. I discussed above the scholarly interpretations of the putative mission of S.1.5, that is that the aim was to repair the Triumvirate. The poem may refer to a diplomatic mission of Maecenas, but we cannot know which one. Horace also studiously avoids to broach the political context of the mission. Nisbet (2007, 10) states that “Horace artfully conceals any political involvement.”¹⁹⁵ If he were in the company of Maecenas, Cocceius and Capito on a major diplomatic mission, he could well have picked up some of its political background, which would have been valuable material for alluding to the importance of his journey, and hence enhance

195 Contrary to DuQuesnay (1984, 40), who writes that “Horace is notoriously reticent about the political context and his account is noticeably free of all tensions. That is surely deliberate. [...] The journey, then, which Horace is describing certainly took place, as his contemporaries would be only too well aware.” For Horace’s political involvement, see also Lyne (1995, 12-20). I would propose a nuance to Lyne’s (1995, 18) point, who argues that S.1.5 (and S.2.6) “have a common emphasis, astutely contrived, and they have, I [Lyne] think, a common aim: to advertise a non-politically-involved Horace.” I argue that Horace in S.1.5 is not yet politically involved, but is preparing himself actively for such involvement as a political commentator.

his own prestige. It is obviously possible that he avoided the subject for reasons of confidentiality, but he could have alluded in covert terms to the political importance of this specific mission, that is to say if he had ever been a member of such a mission in reality.

I will now present my suggestions with respect to the historicity of the journey and the function of S.1.5, which I will ground on firstly Horace's description of the route, secondly on the absence of any information about the purpose of the mission, thirdly on the function that he gives to Venusia and the Apulian region, and fourthly on the manner in which he presents himself in the text.

Concerning his description of the route, I divide the route to three parts. I define as the first part the stretch from Rome to Trivicum (approximately 186 miles), reported in lines 1-85. The second part is the voyage of approximately 89 miles in Apulia from Trivicum to Rubi, described in lines 86-95. The third part, the 104-mile stretch from Rubi to Brundisium, is covered in lines 96-104.¹⁹⁶ Horace takes eighty-five lines recording the first part of the journey, only ten lines on the second part, and nine lines on the third part. We saw that Horace records in the first part of the route in all but one cases (Beneventum) the six stations of an overnight stay and the overnight boat trip through the Pomptine marshes. In addition, he reports episodes of a personal character and provides – in some cases – detailed descriptions of events during the day and evening. For example, he sketches personal experiences such as his stomach trouble due to the poor water quality in lines 7-9, the arrival of Plotius, Varius and Virgil in lines 39-44, the fiasco of his rendezvous with a girl in Trivicum in lines 82-85. Instances of general impressions during the journey are presented, that is the boat journey through the Pomptine marshes in lines 9-23, the arrival of Maecenas, Cocceius and Fonteius Capito in lines 31-32, the battle of words between Sarmentus and Messius Cicirrus in lines 51-70, and the kitchen fire in Beneventum in lines 71-76. In the account of the second part of the journey in Apulia from Trivicum to Rubi, Horace's recording of the overnight stays is scarce. In line 87 he mentions only that the party stayed in a small town (*mansuri oppidulo*), which he does not identify. I proposed above that it is feasible that the unknown *oppidulum* is Venusia if they are supposed to have stayed on the Via Appia and turned north beyond Venusia to Canusium. If the town described is indeed Venusia, Horace gives in lines 89-90 the only, though important, personal impression in his report of the second part: his functional reference to the quality of the bread, an allusion to his cultural and social background. There are two more descriptions of interesting personal experiences, that is that apart from the metaphor of the good quality of the bread in Venusia the poet only mentions Varius leaving the party in Canusium, and the problem of the availability of water in Canusium. Although he tells us in line 91 that the party came to Canusium, we are not told whether they spend the night there; however, it is likely they did as they were

¹⁹⁶ For a schematic summary of the journey, see Appendix I.

supposed to have travelled that day some 35 miles. Then, they “travelled to Rubi” (line 94) where they spent the night which can be gathered from line 96: *postera tempestas melior* (next day’s weather was better). The coverage of the last part of the journey, the 104-mile stretch from Rubi to Brundisium is incredibly short. The overnight stays in Barium and Gnatia are not mentioned. The most memorable matters seem to be the weather, the road, and the lack of water from springs in Gnatia in lines 95-98. Horace narrates in lines 98-103 the miracle of the spontaneous blazing of wood on a sacred stone in Gnatia, which prompts a Lucretian reflection. In S.1.5.104, he mentions the supposed arrival at Brundisium in one line.

I conclude that the composition of the narrative shows a remarkable difference in detail and in extent of information about the places visited between on the one hand the first part of the journey and on the other the second and the third. If one were to use S.1.5 as travel-writing, one should not have to travel beyond Trivicum, and even then the information is minimal. For example, one would have expected some information about Aricia in the first part. The description of Apulia in part two is with respect to both the route and the places visited unclear; one town is even indicated only as *oppidulum*. The report of the third part is a brief list of four towns on the Via Minucia, of which one, Gnatia, attracts a few lines for a derision of her provincialism. I conclude from Horace’s description of the journey that the *Iter Brundisium* in Maecenas’ company never took place. Maecenas travelled indeed at several occasions together with other political leaders to Brundisium, but the journey described in S.1.5 is Horace’s poetic fiction. Horace obviously knew of previous trips by Maecenas and he used this knowledge as a framework for the present *sermo*. Further, he knew most likely the part of the Via Appia between Rome and Beneventum reasonably well from his own experience travelling between his home region and Rome. This explains the comparative detail of the description in S.1.5.1-85. The special attention for Venusia in his description of the second part I will discuss below. Further, I suggest that, when he wrote the poem, he had never travelled the stretch from Rubi to Brundisium.

With reference to the second point, that is the absence of any information about the goal of the mission, I argued above that if he had been in the company of Maecenas on a major diplomatic mission, he could well have taken advantage of alluding in covert terms to the political importance of this specific mission, enhancing his own prestige. I conclude from the lack of any information about the context of the mission – apart from the reference to Maecenas and Cocceius in S.1.5.27-29, who were both sent as ambassadors on important business and experienced in bringing together friends who were opposed (*missi magnis de rebus uterque/ legati, aversos soliti componere amicos*) – that Horace was never a member of such a mission in reality.

Thirdly, Horace pays special attention to Venusia and the Apulian region, although briefly. I also propose that he kept his description of the route of the Apulian part of the “journey” in S.1.5.86-95 deliberately unclear, as he wanted to focus on the quality of his upbringing in Venusia through his metaphor of the quality of the bread. He refers to his milieu in the present *sermo* as he did in S.1.4 and will do so again in S.1.6, 1.7, 1.9

and 1.10. The milieu to which he referred in the fourth *sermo* is his own ancestry: “the father” represents the link between the generations symbolizing the continuity of the traditions. Horace expressed in S.1.4 that he grew up in a family having respect for the old Roman values. In S.1.5, he testifies that he – notwithstanding his allusion to his own estrangement from his past in Venusia in S.1.5.34-36 – recognizes that his family was not the only Venusian or Apulian one holding this respect, the veterans excluded.

The fourth subject, that emerges in the present *sermo* is the manner in which he presents himself. His aversion of new rich and other upstarts is very evident in lines 34-36 (Fundi, Aufidius Luscus), line 37 (Formiae, Mamurra) and lines 51-70 (Caudium, Sarmentus). This is in great contrast with the appreciation he has of the leaders of the supposed party (lines 27-33) Maecenas, Cocceius and Capito, whom he considers his equals, and the joy of being with his friends (lines 39-44, 93), Plotius, Varius and Virgil. At three occasions, he distances himself from provincial attitudes, in lines 34-36 (Fundi, Aufidius the “praetor”), lines 51-70 (Caudium, base humour of the show of Sarmentus and Cicirrus), and lines 97-103 (Gnatia, the miracle). He intends to be a worthy member of the circle of Maecenas assuring him that he does not want to associate with the nouveau riche and that he also left the provincial milieu behind. He upholds the traditional Roman values handed down to him. Like the closure of S.1.3, this poem also illustrates his contentment with the reception by Maecenas and the members of his circle. This theme returns in S.1.10 and in S.1.9, and I intend to demonstrate in my analysis of the latter poem in section 2.2.5 that S.1.5 and S.1.9 have much in common in structure and theme.

In summary, I interpret S.1.5 as a poem about a fictitious journey. Horace’s objective in producing this *sermo* was, like S.1.1-1.4, to let Maecenas know that he, on grounds of his descent, education and personal development, was well qualified to become a worthwhile and reliable member of Maecenas’ circle. In other words, another of his credentials.

Horace continues in ***Sermo 1.6*** his credentials for Maecenas with a presentation of his views on the significance of one’s social background for a political career: low birth should not be an obstacle, and high birth no guarantee, although being well-born is a recommendation for high office. He also relates more details of his personal background and history and his views about his own future, which he does not envisage as one in politics. S.1.6 contains several themes that are also present in previous *sermones*, for example his disapproval of the new rich in S.1.1, S.1.2, and S.1.5, the role of Horace’s “father” in his education in S.1.4, and his youth in Venusia, his disengagement from provincialism, and the journey from Rome to Venusia in S.1.5, although in the present poem the journey is in the reverse direction. I agree with DuQuesnay’s (1984) division of S.1.6 into three main sections: the first section S.1.6.1-44 on the issue of social mobility and eligibility for high office, the second S.1.6.45-84 (contrary to DuQuesnay’s S.1.6.45-88) on his moral credentials and the teaching by

his milieu and his father, and the third section S.1.6.85-131 with his views on his own future.

Horace raises in S.1.6.1-44 the subject of mobility between social classes, or as Gowers (2012, 215) formulates it “he contributes to an age-old debate over the merits of individual worth as opposed to noble pedigree.” He broaches in the first forty-five lines of the poem the subject as this issue was particularly pointed in the Late Republic when new classes, who aspired to political influence, came up.¹⁹⁷ Horace mentions in the opening lines, S.1.6.1-6, Maecenas’ ancestry. We saw that he in previous poems, for example in S.1.1 and S.1.5, pointed at the risks of the unbridled ambitions of the new classes, and he will examine in the first section of the sixth *sermo* Maecenas’ views on social mobility against the latter’s social background. In S.1.6.1-6 Horace writes:

*NON quia, Maecenas, Lydorum quidquid Etruscos
incoluit finis nemo generosior est te,
nec quod avus tibi maternus fuit atque paternus
olim qui magnis legionibus imperitarent,
ut plerique solent, naso suspendis adunco
ignotos, ut me libertino patre natum.*

(Although, Maecenas, no one of all the Lydians that have settled in Etruscan lands is of nobler birth than you, and though you had ancestors on your mother’s and father’s side who once commanded mighty legions, you do not look down your hooked nose, like most men do, at those born of an unknown father, or at me born of a freedman)

The three opening words of S.1.6 *non quia, Maecenas* recall the first three words of S.1.1 *qui fit, Maecenas*. The poet refers in the present *sermo* in a special, almost disrespectful way to Maecenas’ ancestry. Although the word *generosior* in line 2 indicates that Maecenas was of noble birth, the qualification *Lydorum quidquid Etruscos/incoluit finis* (of all the Lydians that have settled in Etruscan lands) suggests that the present-day “Etruscan prince” Maecenas originated from a Lydian family that once was new to Italy. I note Gowers’ suggestion that Horace did this perhaps tongue-in-cheek: she (2012, 219) states that he “between the lines pokes fun at Maecenas’ pet hobby, genealogy, and his pretensions to royal ancestry, pointing out that his patron, like himself, is technically an outsider in Rome.” The fact that Asian immigrants were often seen as equivalent to imported slaves and that Maecenas himself came from provincial Italy implied that his background was not very distinguished. DuQuesnay (1984, 44) observes “that he was not a Roman *nobilis*. In view both of this and of the current political climate it is worth stressing that his ancestors are for once not called

¹⁹⁷ For general commentary on S.1.6, see Anderson (1982, 120-123); Brown (2007, 150-165); DuQuesnay (1984, 43-52); Gowers (2012, 214-250); Rudd (2007, 36-53); Shackleton Bailey (1982, 14-20). For Horace and social mobility, see Armstrong (1986); Gowers (2012, 215); Lefèvre (1993, 98-99). For the position of freedmen and their sons in general, see Treggiari (1969); Wiseman (1971, 110-116). For Horace and the role of his father in S.1.6, see Harrison (1965); Lefèvre (1993, 98-100); Schlegel (2000, 108-117).

reges [kings] but *olim qui magnis legionibus imperitarent* (who once commanded mighty legions) ([line] 4). This description matches the claims of the Roman *nobilitas* precisely in the terms of their own aristocratic code of values.” Thus, Maecenas fitted well in the top of Roman society.¹⁹⁸ MacKay (1942, 80) was unable to find in ancient testimonies any conclusive evidence about Maecenas’ distinguished descent. He concluded “that Maecenas’ family was socially little if at all above the families of other upstarts who, as Syme [2002, 129] points out in his *Roman Revolution*, formed the bulk of Octavian’s supporters.” Wiseman (1971, 52) observes that the contemporary leaders of Roman society grew up in the provinces, and that Roman society was dominated by “Maecenas of Arretium, the obscurely born Vipsanius Agrippa, and the *princeps* himself from a small town in Latium.” Although Horace mentions in lines 3-4 that Maecenas’ ancestors on his mother’s and father’s side once commanded mighty legions, this may refer to nothing more elevated than their equestrian status. Syme (2002, 129) states as a fact that Maecenas “was of regal stock, deriving his descent on the maternal side from the Cilnii, a house that held dynastic power in the city of Arretium from the beginning.” Simpson (1996), however, concludes that the contemporary sources do not confirm that Maecenas’ mother was a member of the Cilnius family. Maecenas’ claim to regal descent remains a matter of speculation: it is presumably the result of his father’s marriage above his station to a Cilnius girl.¹⁹⁹ Maecenas may have overstated his social position by posing of nobler birth than he was. This was perhaps the real cause of his genealogical interest. Although there is a difference in the social background of Maecenas’ family and that of Horace’s family, the first being of equestrian status and the second the son of a freedman, the latter saw his own social position as equivalent to that of Maecenas.²⁰⁰ Horace claims in S.1.6.48 that he also commanded a Roman legion (*quod mihi pareret legio Romana tribuno*). Further, it is held that Brutus elevated Horace to the rank of *equus*.²⁰¹ I suggest that what Horace says in lines 5-6 to Maecenas is a compliment, when he declares that the latter does not look down upon him, the son of a freedman. Horace sees himself indeed socially equal to Maecenas, but he also recognizes that Maecenas has an advantage over him. It is likely that the man from Arretium was born into a family that one or two generations before Horace’s attained some form of elevated social standing. Yet, Maecenas did not forget his roots and reveals an enlightened view on social mobility. It is likely that Horace would not have made the point that Maecenas and he are both upstarts if he did not have irrefutable evidence concerning

¹⁹⁸ For Maecenas’ supposed Lydian origin and descent from Etruscan kings, see Gowers (2003, 79-80; 2012, 216; 219-220); MacKay (1942, 80); Shackleton Bailey (1982, 17); Simpson (1996). For Lydian immigration to Etruria, see Scullard (1967, 34-57).

¹⁹⁹ For the Cilnii, see Scullard (1967, 167).

²⁰⁰ Conform Shackleton Bailey (1982, 17). See also Gowers (2012, 219). For Horace the son of a freedman, see my discussion of S.1.6.71-75 in section 1.3.2; Gowers (2012, 222; 236-237).

²⁰¹ Armstrong (2010, 17-18); Gowers (2012, 219; 232); Ross Taylor (1925).

Maecenas' past. He makes his point in the style of a gentleman jester, the man who knows when to make a sensitive point. He returns to this style later in the poem in lines 97-111 when he compares in a critical tone his own ambition and his preferred future lifestyle with the present one of Maecenas.

S.1.6 is the next instalment in Horace's series of credentials, in which he presents himself as a reliable member of Maecenas circle sharing the latter's political convictions. Having concluded that Maecenas and he are social equals, Horace recognizes that Maecenas shoulders greater political responsibility than he. In lines 7-8 Horace observes approvingly that Maecenas is generous in his judgement of peoples' worth. S.1.6.7-8 reads: *cum referre negas quali sit quisque parente/ natus, dum ingenuus, persuades hoc tibi vere* (when you [Maecenas] say it does not matter what sort of parent everyone has, as long as he is free-born, you'd be right in this conviction). The poet repeats the compliment in S.1.6.51-52 and S.1.6.63-64. I propose that these two lines ought to be read in conjunction with the previous two, particularly with the words *ut plerique solent* in line 5. If these words are also seen as relevant to S.1.6.7-8, Horace states that most members of Maecenas' social rank have a prejudiced, if not hostile, view of social mobility. Many members of the elite saw the new men as a threat to their own traditional place in society arguing that for example freedmen's sons were not capable of holding high office because they lacked either the proper education, or didn't have the right experience or financial means. Horace resented indeed the new rich who exhibited an unrelenting ambition for office with the rewards belonging to it, but he accepted that men who aspired for office should be judged on their individual merits.²⁰² Social mobility and its pros and cons is the theme of the next section.

Horace is in the first main section, S.1.6.7-44, concerned with social mobility, both in the distant past and in his own days. In S.1.6.9-17, he presents instances of social mobility going back to the days of Servius Tullius, king of Rome from 578-535 B.C., who is "said to have been born of a slave mother and an unknown father" (see Gowers, 2012, 223). Lines 9-11 describe that before Servius became king many men with insignificant ancestry lived often honourable lives and were enriched with high office (*ante potestatem Tulli atque ignobile regnum/ multos saepe viros nullis maioribus ortos/ et vixisse probos, amplis et honoribus auctos*). But after times of opportunities for many, Servius is known to have curtailed voting rights by granting those according to wealth. Next, Horace describes "the black sheep" Laevinus, a member of the old aristocratic *gens Valeria*, of whom we only know from S.1.6.12-13 that he descended from that Valerius *unde superbus/ Tarquinius regno pulsus fugit* (through whom Tarquin the Proud was driven from his tyranny and went into exile) in

²⁰² Contra the Loeb edition, where lines 1-6 are separated from lines 7-44 by a new paragraph. For *persuades hoc tibi vere* I follow the rendering of Gowers (2012, 223). For the criteria for eligibility, see DuQuesnay (1984, 45-49), and my discussion of S.1.6.41-42.

509 B.C.²⁰³ Contrary to Servius Tullius, Laevinus “is of high birth failing to guarantee merit” (Brown, 2007, 153), who would still turn out to be a loser, if he were to be judged by people known for their regard for aristocracy. In lines 12-17, Horace records the miserable quality of the process of determining the eligibility for political functions.

*contra Laevinum, Valeri genus, unde superbus
Tarquinius regno pulsus fugit, unius assis
non umquam pretio pluris licuisse, notante
iudice quo nosti populo, qui stultus honores
saepe dat indignis et famae servit ineptus,
qui stupet in titulis et imaginibus.*

(that Laevinus, on the other hand, who descended from that Valerius through whom Tarquin the Proud was driven from his tyranny and went into exile, was never thought worth tuppence, given a black mark by the judge you know: by the people, which often as a fool give office to the undeserving and are stupidly enslaved to fame and dazzled by titles of honor and ancestral images)²⁰⁴

Horace had no good word to say for the process, which he described as fickle and unreliable. His final conclusion will be that the process is so poor that he does not want to be part of it.

The climax of this short historical excursion is in lines 17-18, when he poses the rhetoric question *quid oportet/ nos facere a vulgo longe longeque remotos?* (what ought we to do, we who are far, far disconnected from the crowd?). I interpret these words as Horace saying: we, Maecenas and I, intelligent and reasonable men, should certainly continue judging people on their own merits. In addition, S.1.6.17-18 looks forward to S.1.6.19-22, and the six lines should be read as one statement by Horace, that is that Horace wants to stay out of practical politics. Gowers (2012, 225) states that lines 17-18 can also be interpreted as “what am I H.[orace] to do, who am so far removed from the common people?” a rare use of the “royal we” by Horace.²⁰⁵ She (2012, 225-226) argues that

203 For Laevinus, see Deißmann – Merten (1975): “P.V.[alerius] Laevinus, bei Hor.s.1,6,12 erwähnter Senator, der es auf grund der Abneigung des Volkes gegen ihn trotz vornehmer Herkunft und wiederholter Bewerbung nur bis zur Quaestur brachte” (P. Valerius Laevinus, mentioned as senator at HOR.S.1.6.12, who, because of the aversion to him by the people, only succeeded in becoming quaestor, in spite of his distinguished descent and repeatedly standing for a [more prestigious] office). Brown (2007, 153): “about the degenerate descendant [Laevinus] nothing else is known; Porphyrio’s allusion to a P. Valerius Laevinus who failed because of his dissolute character to rise above the quaestorship may be sheer guess-work.” Gowers (2012, 224-225); Rudd (2007, 49; 138). All that Rudd (2007, 138) says about Laevinus in the category *Dead people* to whom Horace refers is: “passing quickly over [...] the black sheep Laevinus (1.6.12).”

204 The rendering of *unius assis non umquam pretio pluris licuisse* is by Brown (2007, 63).

205 For the discussion of lines 17-18, see Gowers (2012, 225-227).

the implied answer [to the question] ‘Stay out of politics altogether’, now leads easily to the next section, but the link with the opening passage on Maecenas’ liberality is consequently weaker (H.[orace]’s response would now arise solely from the attitude of the people). In either interpretation, the logic is stained.

When we read lines 17-18 in context with lines 20-22, Horace’s intention becomes clear. S.1.6.20-22 reads:

ensorque moveret
Appius, ingenuo si non essem patre natus:
vel merito, quoniam in propria non pelle quiessem
 (and an Appius as a censor would strike me off the senatorial roll, unless I were the son of a free-born father: deservedly indeed, as it would not make me feel good)²⁰⁶

Firstly, he would not qualify to become a senator anyway on grounds of Appius’ action as recorded in S.1.6.20-21. The censor Appius Claudius Pulcher removed all sons of freedmen from the Senate in 50 B.C., after many of them had been admitted to the Senate in the previous decenniads.²⁰⁷ Horace, the son of a freedman, refers in these lines to the impossibility of him being a member of the Senate, as the rule was still put into practice when he wrote S.1.6, ten to fifteen years later on. Secondly, he makes in line 22 a personal point, that is that he would not wish to aspire to a political career, as he would not feel good being a politician. He would not want to be involved in a selection process that befell Laevinus as recorded in S.1.6.12-17.²⁰⁸

Thus, S.1.6.20-22 contains a very significant message from Horace to Maecenas, namely that his interest in political issues is not caused by political ambition. My interpretation differs essentially from that of Gowers (2012, 227). She argues that S.1.6.22 “produces a sudden and unexpected twist. H.[orace] concludes that he would be deservedly punished for political ambition, *since Epicurean quietism is the best policy for those, like himself, of humble birth.*”²⁰⁹ Quietism may play a part, but I do not see “the sudden and unexpected twist.” Horace has no ambition to become a politician, but he prepares himself in the first book of *Sermones* for his future role of

206 Acc. to Lewis & Short (1955, 1326) *in propria pelle quiescere* is a phrase meaning “to be content with one’s own state or condition.” Thus, I translate here the rather pompous “I would not be content with my own state” as “it would not make me feel good.” The expression is an allusion to a well-known fable by Aesop of the ass in a lion’s skin. See also Gowers (2012, 227).

207 For the history of selection for the Senate, see Armstrong (1986, 267-277); Gowers (2012, 215; 224); Rudd (2007, 36-40); Treggiari (1969, 229-236); Wiseman (1971). For the action of Appius, see Gowers (2012, 215; 226); Treggiari (1969, 60-61); Williams (1995, 310; 2009, 152-153).

208 Contrary to Treggiari (1969, 61), who states that Horace did not want to go into politics because “he would be going out of his proper metier. The feeling that politics were the rightful business of the rich and leisured *nobiles* was as strong in Rome as most of the laws.”

209 *Italics* in the quote are mine.

political commentator: the statement in line 22 is in entire agreement with the attitude he reveals already in for example S.1.3.29-34 and in the final lines of S.1.6.

Next, Horace pays in S.1.6.23-44 attention to the endeavours of men of his own days to gain office. We saw above in the case of Laevinus (lines 12-14) that both Maecenas and Horace endorsed the view that the *nobiles* on grounds of inherited worth (*virtus*) through birth have a valid claim to be selected for high public office, provided that they are not disqualified by lack of individual worth. If this were the case, it would be preferable to elect worthy free-born *homines novi* (new men) instead of unworthy aristocrats.²¹⁰ In lines 23-24, he gives his view on what often motivates both the unknown (*ignotos*) and the well-born (*generosis*), namely not the desire to serve the welfare of the state but to serve *Gloria*: passion for glory, ambition. He imagines ambition on her chariot dragging her victims. S.1.6.23-24 reads: *sed fulgente trahit constrictos Gloria curru/ non minus ignotos generosis* (but *Gloria* drags along chained to her glittering chariot the unknown no less than the well-born). Horace rejects emphatically in lines 23-24 the pursuit of ambition often seen with men who strive to gain high office and who seek to further their own, financial, interests.

Horace then gives some examples as to how people can go wrong when they yield to the temptations of ambition introducing in the same line (24) his first example of the *ignotos*, a man called Tillius, whom he condemns in lines 24-25 for his political ambition: *quo tibi, Tilli,/ sumere depositum clavum fierique tribuno?* (what good would it bring you, Tillius, to assume the broad stripe that you had to give up and become a tribune?). I interpret *depositum clavum* as meaning that the unknown Tillius was one of the freedmen's sons who were admitted to the senate. These men, however, were for reasons of political expediency expelled again, either by Appius or later in the early 30s B.C. Gowers (2012, 228) offers the same interpretation of line 25 when she says "next to *sumere*, *depositum* suggests disquieting flux in the senate's constitution." Gowers' and my reading of *depositum clavum* are important for establishing the likely identity of Tillius. For example, according to Toher (2005, 186-189) Tillius is modelled after L. Tillius Cimber, who in his view put aside as a young man voluntarily the senatorial tunic.

Horace mentions in S.1.6.26 the result of Tillius' ambition: *invidia* (envy), which he would not have suffered if he had stayed *privato* (without office). The poet depicts in the following lines 27-29 the resentment that freedmen's sons have to suffer when they are successful in public office. He puts his condemnation quite plainly in those lines when he qualifies as crazy someone, who attires himself as a senator, but shows also his annoyance at the antagonistic approach towards low-born men who succeed in political office. S.1.6.27-29 reads:

210 For a comprehensive exposé of the socio-political context of the eligibility for high political office in the Late Republic/Early Empire, see DuQuesnay (1984, 44-48).

*nam ut quisque insanus nigris medium impediit crus
pellibus et latum demisit pectore clavum,
audit continuo 'quis homo hic est? quo patre natus?'*

(for as soon as one is crazy enough to encircle his legs up to the middle with the black leather strings and let the broad stripe hang down his chest, he immediately hears “Who is this man? Who was his father?”)

It should be noted that Horace makes *pellibus* in line 28 echo *pelle* in line 22: in both cases the high office causes an impediment for his preferred way of life.

Tillius' identity has given rise to much discussion in the scholarly literature. Firstly, some see the figure as poetic fiction, representing Horace himself. Secondly, others identify him either as Horace's contemporary L. Tillius Cimber, Julius Caesar's assassin, or (for example Porphyrio) as the latter's brother. A third option is, in the words of Gowers (2012, 228), that “Tillius might have been a freedman's son who incurred hostility when he attained senatorial rank.”²¹¹

The poet gives some powerful clues for the identity of Tillius in the first main section (S.1.6.7-44), such as his functional reference in line 6 to his own background as a freedman's son, in lines 9-11 to men of humble origin who attained high office, and in lines 23-24 to *Gloria* who also has the unknown chained to her evil chariot. Within a context of the opportunities and risks for freedmen's sons, one would expect Tillius to be one. That is not to say that I read Tillius representing Horace, although S.1.6 is indeed also a poem in which Horace writes about himself denying any personal ambition for a political career. However, an interpretation of Tillius' identity as that of Horace does not agree with the broad context of the poem as a whole. He describes in S.1.6 the positions of several social classes in the political spectrum in general, and he presents the process of gaining political office by unknown men and the dangers of unfettered ambition, of whom Tillius is just one example of many. Concerning his own position, Horace gives in this section his arguments to stay away from the political business, as it would not make him feel good, as he said in line 22: *quoniam in propria non pelle quiessem*.

I also suggest that Horace did not intend to use the name of Tillius in order to refer to the hated L. Tillius Cimber or his brother. Toher (2005) argues that Julius Caesar's assassin is the Tillius of S.1.6. One of Toher's (2005, 186-187) main arguments is that “the phrase *depositum clavum* in Horace [S.1.6.25] could simply mean that at some

211 For Tillius, see Münzer (1942). For an overview of the different options of the identity of Tillius, see Toher (2005) and Gowers (2012, 227-228). For Tillius as a hypothetical version of Horace, see Armstrong (1986, 271-273): “Tillius is Horace” (Armstrong, 1986, 272). For the choice of L. Tillius Cimber, the assassin, see Toher (2005). For Tillius as the latter's brother, see Armstrong (1986, 271-272), DuQuesnay (1984, 47), Ross Taylor (1925, 169), and Wiseman (1971, 266) who reject this option; Wiseman states “the scholiast's note looks like guesswork, and is rightly rejected by Kiessling-Heinze [1959, 112-113] (on 6.25) and Fraenkel (*Horace* [2002,] 102 n.6).” For the third option of Tillius as an unidentified freedman's son who became a senator, see Armstrong (1986, 272); DuQuesnay (1984, 47).

point early on Tillius, like Ovid, had lost interest in a senatorial career and so as a young man put aside the tunic with the *latus clavus*.” This habit was not uncommon among the sons of the senatorial class. He (2005, 188-189) also states that Tillius Cimber may have survived Philippi, was pardoned and “chose to take up again the *latus clavus* and the path of *ambitio*, gained high office, but found only defeat and infamy as the reward for his *cupiditas gloriae*.” In my view, it is significant that no independent contemporary testimony of the assassin Tillius’ second career as *tribunus plebis* and *praetor* exists (see also Toher, 2005, notes 17 and 19). The reference of Horace in line 25 to the *clavus* does not infer that he modelled the Tillius of S.1.6 after Tillius Cimber. Overt allusion to Julius Caesar’s assassin does not fit comfortably in a *sermo* that is addressed to Maecenas, confidant of Octavian, Julius Caesar’s adopted son.

The third option comes close to my view on the identity of Tillius. My reading of lines 24-25 fits much better within the context of the poem and of S.1, in which Horace offers his political credentials to Maecenas claiming that he will be a worthwhile member of Maecenas’ circle. I concur with much of what DuQuesnay (1984, 47) writes:

The rest of this first main section [S.1.6.7-44] focuses on Tillius. His identity is unfortunately not certain. He is accused [by Horace] of being the son of a freedman (1.6.38-41). He had been expelled from the senate (1.6.25 with Porphyrio’s comment: *nam pulsus ante senatu fuerat* [because he was previously expelled from the senate]). The context would naturally suggest that he had been expelled by Appius Claudius. He later re-entered the senate and became a tribune. It is subsequently revealed that he also became a praetor (1.6.108). Porphyrio says simply that he was readmitted to the senate *post Caesarem occisum* [after Julius Caesar’s murder]).

I see Tillius in S.1.6.24 indeed as an ambitious freedman’s son, who had an erratic political career, but remains otherwise unidentified. In other words, the Tillius of S.1.6 may well be Horace’s fiction, who was not modelled after a historical person. Horace made him an embodiment of political ambition leading to his senatorial rank followed by his removal, with other attributes added, namely a man of humble descent or a freedman’s son symbolizing in S.1.6.107 the bad habits of the ambitious new men. These characteristics match precisely the subjects on which Horace focuses in S.1.6.7-44.

One unidentified Barrus is introduced in lines 30-33, whom Horace describes as a vain man, perhaps a well-known society figure, a handsome boy type, who shows off his attractiveness to the girls in the hope that he can win them over. Horace describes this folly as an embarrassing form of exhibitionism. He calls it an illness (*morbo*), and regards it presumably as a disorder of the mind. He makes in lines 34-37 the point that he who puts himself up for a public function is prone to lose his dignity and privacy just like Barrus who throws away his honour. S.1.6.34-37 reads:

*sic qui promittit civis, urbem sibi curae,
imperium fore et Italiam, delubra deorum,*

*quo patre sit natus, num ignota matre inhonestus,
omnis mortalis curare et quaerere cogit.*

(so he who assures to look after the citizens, the city, the empire, Italy and the sanctuaries of the gods forces the whole world to trouble themselves to ask who his father is or whether he is unrespectable through an unknown mother)

Horace declares again, this time implicitly, that he does not want to be part of the group of men holding public office losing his privacy and independence.

In the lines that follow, Horace stages a mock conversation about the political careers of three freedmen's sons. A free-born points out to them the grave responsibilities of Roman magistrates.²¹² The poet voices the prejudice of the established political elite that the new men are not qualified to carry out their duties properly. The free-born says in S.1.6.38-39 *'tunc, Syri, Damae, aut Dionysi filius, audes/deicere de saxo civis aut tradere Cadmo?'* ("Do you have the nerve, you the son of Syrus, Dama or Dionysius to throw citizens from the rock or to hand them over to Cadmus?"). Although the three names are common slave-names, I concur with Gowers (2012, 229) that freedmen's sons are meant.²¹³ The poet describes the right to inflict the death-penalty by public execution, that was reserved to the magistrate, in a very imaginative way: to have criminals flung off the Tarpeian rock or strangled in jail by Cadmus, the public executioner. Gowers (2012, 230) makes an interesting point on line 39, when she observes that

The two punishments are described in language that connects them with the ups and downs of the socio-political situation in general: *deicere de saxo* suggests the physical equivalent of political humiliation (cf. 18 *remotos*, 25 *depositum*, 28 *demisit*); *tradere Cadmo* (Cadmus, judging by his pretentious mythological name, is an ex-slave himself) offers a cruel parody of patronage and recommendation, *tradere* supplying the crudely operative verb missing from the account of Varius and Virgil's introduction of H.[orace] to Maecenas at 54-5 but uttered by the pest at 9.47 *hunc hominem uelles si tradere*.

The scene expresses the resentment of free-born men at the promotion of ex-slaves or of freedmen's sons to high public offices. This feeling is also apparent from the use of the word *civis* in S.1.6.39. In the words of Gowers (2012, 230): "civies [= *civis*] expresses outrage; genuine citizens are in the power of upstarts."

Two upstarts, the son of a freedman and the freedman Novius, enter in S.1.6.40-41. Horace makes clear that the son of a freedman speaks disdainfully about the freedman Novius, as the former says about the latter in line 41: *'namque est ille, pater quod erat meus.'* (for he [Novius] is only what my father was [freedman]). The social distinction between a freedman and the son of a freedman is obviously that the former was

²¹² For the opportunities of the sons of freedmen and of their fathers, see Treggiari (1969, 229-236).

²¹³ Contrary to Brown (2007, 155), and Rudd (2007, 146; 191; 229; 234). Apart from this line, Rudd discusses the slave Dama in S.2.5.18, 101 and S.2.7.54, where he is depicted in very different contexts.

once a slave and the latter is possibly “free-born.” Treggiari (1969, 62-63) concludes that there is much evidence that sons of freedmen were admitted to the Senate or held magistracies: “Moreover, there is no conclusive proof that *libertini* [freedmen] themselves were debarred by law from holding office, but we find no mention of any certain freedmen holding office: the lowest legitimate magistrates mentioned are their sons. *Mos* [custom], which was strong against the sons of freedmen, was stronger still against freedmen themselves.” The obstacles to freedmen, and to a lesser degree their sons, were social, cultural, educational and a lack of financial means. Horace’s son of a freedman achieved the desired public position, and readily assumed the airs of the free-born showing his resentment of Novius’ position, one of the freedmen who were promoted to the Senate by Julius Caesar in 45 B.C. and by the Triumvirs in 39 B.C.²¹⁴ He begrudges in line 40 his colleague Novius’ seat in the theatre sitting only one row behind him: ‘*at Novius collega gradu post me sedet uno.*’ The new generation of freedmen has come too near to “the old,” the sons of freedmen of the previous generation. Horace shows the relativity of this form of new class-consciousness through what the big-headed son adds to his outburst against the pretensions of the freedmen in S.1.6.41-44:

*‘hoc tibi Paulus
et Messalla videris? at hic, si plaustra ducenta
concurrentque foro tria funera, magna sonabit
cornua quod vincatque tubas: saltem tenet hoc nos.’*

(“do you therefore think that you are a Paullus or a Messalla? And he [Novius], if two hundred wagons and three great funerals clashed in the Forum, will make a noise enough to drown out the horns and trumpets: by this means at least he will have a hold on us”)²¹⁵

The poet states in S.1.6.41-42 that the freedman Novius will never match the social standing of the aristocracy. Paulus refers to Aemilius Paullus Lepidus and Messalla to Valerius Messalla Corvinus. I agree with DuQuesnay’s (1984, 45-46) point that the mention of the latter two aristocrats has a special significance. At the time, those men were two of the few supporters of Octavian to be found within the old aristocracy. Most of them supported Marc Antony, or even worse, Sextus Pompey. Octavian needed the support of the Senate which traditionally was dominated by the *nobiles*. Hence, Maecenas, and with him Horace, supported the claims of the old aristocracy that birth was an important qualification for high office, though the most important criterion for eligibility is that the men who aspired for office should be judged on

²¹⁴ For the position of freedmen at the Late Republic/Early Empire, see Gowers (2012, 230); DuQuesnay (1984, 44); Treggiari (1969).

²¹⁵ Although the OCT gives *funera, magna sonabit*, I follow Gowers (2012, 231) that *magna* agrees with *funera*. I have also followed her rendering of *saltem tenet hoc nos*.

their individual worth, or lack of it, as we saw in S.1.6.7-8 and S.1.6.12-18 (the Laevinus story). DuQuesnay (1984, 46) summarizes Maecenas' views as follows:

The promotion to high office of *noui homines* [new men] is entirely justified by their *uirtus* [worth]. Yet birth also is important: to hold public office, a man should be at least *ingenuus ingenuo patre natus* [free-born with a free-born father], while the Laevinus story suggests that a *nobilis* [aristocrat] may be disqualified from taking up his birthright by lack of *uirtus* [worth]. This attitude must have given hope and encouragement to both *noui* and to those *nobiles* wanting to return to Italy after the war with Sextus or those who had returned after the treaty of Misenum in 39.

It seems to me, however, that DuQuesnay undervalues the qualification on grounds of high birth as the reference to Paulus and Messalla in lines 41-42 suggests. A member of the aristocracy with the right *virtus* had a better chance of becoming a senator than a free-born son of a freedman. An ambitious freedman like Novius will never make it, and Horace demonstrates what remains for men like Novius by means of the comic scene of a traffic jam at the Forum. Novius' loud voice alludes to the likely occupation that is available for freedmen: a *praeco*, an auctioneer or a public crier. The latter occupation returns in S.1.6.86-87 as a possible career for Horace in his father's opinion.

In summary, Horace presents in the section S.1.6.1-44 his views on social mobility and eligibility for high office: give talent a fair chance, but the real work will go to the traditional upper class, as birth remains the determining factor. These views are according to DuQuesnay (1984, 44) "as least as much those of Maecenas as of Horace." I interpret the section as another part of his efforts to demonstrate to Maecenas that they think alike in political issues. Further, he gives in this section his arguments to stay away from the political business, as a career in politics would not make him feel good.

The next section, S.1.6.45-84, starts with the words *nunc at me redeo* (now to return to myself). S.1.6.45-52 reads:

*nunc at me redeo libertino patre natum,
quem rodunt omnes libertino patre natum,
nunc quia sim tibi, Maecenas, convictor; at olim
quod mihi pareret legio Romana tribuno.
dissimile hoc illi est; quia non, ut forsit honorem
iure mihi inuideat quivis, ita te quoque amicum,
praesertim cautum dignos adsumere, prava
ambitione procul.*

(now to return to myself, son of a freedman father, whom all backbite as son of a freedman father, nowadays because I am your companion, Maecenas; but in the past because as a tribune a Roman legion obeyed me. The two are different; because it would not be right that anyone envies

me also your friendship, as it perhaps might be right to envy me the post [of tribune], especially when you are careful to adopt deserving men who shun improper ambition)²¹⁶

Some of the important themes of the previous section S.1.6.1-44 come to light in a nutshell in these eight lines. In lines 45 and 46, he mentions his status of son of a freedman. The first point that he raises is perhaps the one that troubles him most, that is his own status as son of a freedman (*libertino patre natus*). The second point is his own social mobility which he describes in lines 47 and 50, his friendship with Maecenas. In lines 48 and 49 he mentions his serious miscalculation when he was a tribune in Brutus' army and fighting at the wrong side at Philippi. He also admits in lines 49 and 50 that people, who resent his post of tribune in the past in Brutus' army and who see the advancement of his career and social status after that, may have a point. Those people may not ignore his former choice for the anti-Caesarian party and may not accept Maecenas' generosity, although he was most likely elevated to the status of *eques* in 43 or 42 B.C., and he bought the position of *scriba quaestorius* probably in 41 B.C., both many years before he met Maecenas.²¹⁷ Finally, Horace recounts in lines 51 and 52 Maecenas' good judgement accepting within the circle around him men who shun improper ambition, those who do not pursue high political office and are motivated by *avaritia*, *ambitio* and *luxuria* (greediness, ambition and extravagance), as he saw with many of the new rich. Many new men also succeeded to become new rich, of whom many used their wealth attempting to buy political office. This was a major issue for Horace, and he condemned in every *sermo* of the first book (except in S.1.8) those vices, which he observes in all layers of the population. He saw those vices as a threat to the traditional structure of Roman society. The number of new rich grew particularly amongst the bankers, moneylenders, merchants and manufacturers in the provinces and in Italy, and amongst the military and the freedmen. Military men made their fortune in the areas where they settled after completing their time of service, or enriched themselves by the sale of booty they stole in the wars overseas or confiscated in the proscriptions (S.1.2). Others extracted as tax officials large amounts of money from local businessmen in the provinces (S.1.7). Horace condemned the lifestyle of the nouveau riche, who showed his wealth in extravagant (particularly luxurious building) enterprises. For example, he relates the building of luxurious villas not only at the end of S.1.2 (section 2.2.1), but also in *Carm.*2.15 and *Carm.*2.18.

Next, Horace narrates his introduction to Maecenas stating in lines 54-55 *nulla etenim mihi te fors obtulit: optimus olim/ Vergilius, post hunc Varius, dixere quid essem*. (since it was not chance that brought you [Maecenas] in my path; some time ago

²¹⁶ The rendering of *praesertim cautum dignos adsumere, prava/ ambitione procul* is close to that of Gowers (2012, 232).

²¹⁷ For Horace's social status in S.1.6, see Armstrong (1986, 267-277), and sections 1.1 and 1.3. For his equestrian career, see Armstrong (1986, 255-263); Ross Taylor (1925). For his career as *scriba*, see Armstrong (1986, 263-267).

the excellent Virgil and after him Varius told you what I was). It is notable that in Horace's view of the meeting, Maecenas came in his path and not the reverse: another indication that he sees himself as socially equal to Maecenas. After the preparatory work by his two friends Horace was introduced to Maecenas in line 56. Horace depicts both Maecenas and himself as two reserved and uncommunicative men at their first meeting. Horace writes about himself in lines 56-57 that *ut veni coram, singultim pauca locutus, / infans namque pudor prohibebat plura profari* (when I came face to face with you, I sobbingly spoke a few words, because speechless embarrassment prevented me saying more). After Horace has told Maecenas in lines 58-61 that he was not the son of a famous father (*non ego me claro natum patre*) and that he did not own country estates that needed a horse to get round (*non ego circum / me Satureiano vectari rura caballo*), Maecenas reply was brief, as was his way (*respondes, ut tuus est mos, / pauca*). Whether this scene represents what actually happened at their first meeting is not particularly relevant. I do not interpret these lines – and indeed the whole of S.1 – as simply autobiographical, but as a combination of autobiography and poetic fiction. The point is that Horace does not present himself as one of the new rich aspiring for the friendship of Maecenas. Both are depicted as recognizing the cultivated manners of the other, and they would not need many words to understand each other. Contrary to the new rich, Horace is embarrassed: presumably not by his social status, but by his association with Brutus' party in the past. I differ from Armstrong (1986, 267), who argues “that the occasion of the poem is Maecenas' asking Horace whether he would like to leave his scribeship and be supported for the first rank of the senate, the quaestorship.”²¹⁸ I suggest that he wrote S.1.6 as one of his credentials in order to be accepted as an associate who is socially and politically acceptable for Maecenas.

In the poem we find three times the words *libertino patre natum* (a freedman's son): in the opening address to Maecenas (line 6), and in the passage about his first meeting with Maecenas (lines 45 and 46). Later in the same passage there is a slight modification of these words when he says in line 58: *non ego me claro natum patre* (that he was not the son of a famous father). I interpret the emphatic reiteration of this point that the poet tells us that he, a son of a freedman himself, endeavours to advance and to be found acceptable to Maecenas and the circle around him. That is the poet's way of social mobility. He exaggerates the point by making it three times, and in so doing hopes to give it more impact. I argued before in section 1.1 that my interpretation differs substantially from that of Freudenburg, who states that Horace's words about his putative humble origins mean that the poet tells Maecenas that the latter needed “a truth-telling philosopher” and that he, Horace, was such a man. Although Horace's occasional references to philosophical dogmas were basic

218 For Horace's first meeting with Maecenas, see Armstrong (1986, 259-262); Gowers (2003, 78), who sees S.1.6. as “the most obviously autobiographical poem in the book.”

to his ethical socio-political views, he did not promote himself as an adviser on philosophical doctrines. Freudenburg (2010, 281) holds the view

that Horace patterns his introduction to Maecenas after that of Bion of Borysthenes to Antigonus Gonatas. As Bion himself tells it in his famous letter to Antigonus, the first words out of his mouth when he came into the king's presence were "I am the son of a freed slave" [as described in Diogenes Laertius 4, 46 (Hicks (Loeb), 1959, 424-425)] [...], and that phrase is repeated as the mantra of his letter to Antigonus, just as it is for Horace in his address to Maecenas in *Satires* 1.6.

Thus, Freudenburg (2010, 281-282) sees the literary allusion to Bion as an expression

that helps us structure the speaker's [Horace's] relationship to Maecenas in a certain, known way: Horace speaks truth to power the way Bion the cynic spoke to Antigonus. And thus an entire, pre-existing theoretical apparatus that lionized such relationships between truth-telling philosophers and kings as both helpful and necessary (the "king's confidant") comes into play to help imagine the poet's outspokenness in the same terms: Maecenas needs a man of that *kind* in his house, and that's the *kind* of (royal) house he runs.²¹⁹

It takes nine months before Maecenas makes contact again asking Horace to join his circle of friends. It is held that the invitation came at the end of 38 B.C. or early 37 B.C. The poet writes in lines 61-64:

*abeo; et revocas nono post mense iubesque
esse in amicorum numero. magnum hoc ego duco
quod placui tibi, qui turpi secernis honestum,
non patre praeclaro sed vita et pectore puro.*

(I withdrew; and nine months later you called me back and asked me to join your circle of friends. I consider it a great honour that I found favour with you, who distinguishes between the unworthy and the worthy not because of a famous father but because of an undefiled life and integrity).

Horace recalls in S.1.6.63-64 Maecenas' powers of discernment, which he praised before in S.1.6.5-8 and S.1.6.51-52. The poet obviously sees himself as one worthy of Maecenas' friendship on grounds of his way of life and his integrity. He will continue offering the evidence of his worthiness in S.1.6, as he did in the previous poems of the first book of *Sermones* and will do in the following. A reference to Maecenas powers of discernment returns in S.1.9.44-45, where Horace replying to the pushy fellow says:

219 For my view on Bion as a model for Horace, see also my discussion of Horace as a political commentator in section 1.1. For Horace's style as to how to deliver critical commentary, see my discussion of S.1.3.29-37 and the opening of S.1.4. For Bion, see Kindstrand (1976, 14-17). Bion of Borysthenes (ab. 325 – ab. 250 B.C.) originated from Olbia a town by the mouth of the river Borysthenes (modern Dnieper). Bion describes his parentage to king Antigonus II Gonatas of Macedonia. His father was a freedman. In addition to the putative reference to Bion in S.1.6 suggested by Freudenburg, Horace once actually refers to Bion in *Ep.*2.2.60.

Maecenas has few friends, but he is a man of good judgment and uses this most skillfully to choose those friends.

But, before presenting a brief account of his youth in Venusia and his years in Rome where he received his education, Horace humbly admits in lines 65-66 a few minor faults (*vitiis mediocribus ac mea paucis*), that spoil his otherwise sound nature (*mendosa est natura, alioquin recta*). These are presumably the same unspecified innocent ones he mentioned in S.1.3.19-20 (“what about you? You have no faults?” Yes indeed, but different and perhaps lesser ones) and in S.1.4.130-131 (although I am in the power of minor, innocent ones). In line 68, he calls himself a happy man that he is free from those faults that bring ruin, such as *avaritia* (greed) and *sordes* (meanness), the faults of S.1.1, or *mala lustra* (visiting brothels), the faults of S.1.2. For the good cause of his credentials, Horace adds in lines 69-71 to his self-praise:

purus et insons
(ut me collaudem) si et vivo carus amicis;
causa fuit pater his
 (if, to blow my own trumpet, I live a pure and innocent life and if I am cherished by my friends,
 this is because of my father)²²⁰

He claimed already in S.1.4.129 that his father taught him the moral lessons (described in S.1.4.103-128) that kept him free from those vices. He emphasises in line 71 his father’s work, who took him to Rome for his education. I have discussed S.1.6.71-78 in detail in section 1.3.2. Horace mentions in line 71 that his father was poor owning a lean small piece of land (*macro pauper agello*) in or near Venusia. Gowers (2012, 237) observes that “H.[orace] presumably exaggerates the poverty of a father who could evidently afford Roman schooling and, later, student life in Athens; the tiny plot contrasts with both Maecenas’ and Lucilius’ extensive estates.” However, I suggest that Horace makes not only the point that his father was not rich, but also that he did not belong to the emerging class of provincial nouveau riche. His father did not squander his money on fancy projects or extravagant displays of wealth, but used the necessary funds for a good education of his son. Thus, he enabled young Horace to move in the best milieu in Rome, that of an *equus atque senator* (knight and senator). Horace makes in S.1.6.71-78, as part of his credentials, functional references to several aspects of his social and cultural background which should build up Maecenas’ regard for him. He refers in this short section to his father’s parsimony, to his departure from provincial Venusia, to his good education in Rome living in a milieu where he encountered the old Roman values and the traditional way of life and probably picked up the right political ideas.

²²⁰ I owe the rendering of *ut me collaudem* to Gowers (2012, 236)/Palmer (1885, 199).

Lines 71-82 add to my reading of the role of Horace's father which I discussed at S.1.4.103-133²²¹. Horace writes in S.1.4.105-108 that his father taught him the moral lessons which laid the foundation of his outlook upon life. I do not read these lines to mean that his father actually sat with Horace teaching him moral philosophy. The latter point is reinforced by what he writes in S.1.6.81-82, namely that in Rome his father himself, a most uncorrupted guardian, was present with his support as I went round all my teachers (*ipse mihi custos incorruptissimus omnis/ circum doctors aderat*). The father was involved as he felt responsible for a good education, but did not want to be his son's one and only moral guardian.²²²

We saw in S.1.4 that Horace says that the traditional way of life is handed down to him by his Roman forefathers in general. Thus, the role of "the father" in the narrative is that of a link between the generations symbolizing the continuity of the traditions. I do not interpret the passage S.1.4.103-133 as autobiographical, but as Horace expressing that he grew up in a milieu having respect for the old Roman values. He confirms this in S.1.6.76-78, when he narrates that his father took him to Rome for his education (see also section 1.3.2). He writes: *sed puerum est ausus Romam portare, docendum/ artis, quas doceat quivis eques atque senator/ semet prognatos* (but he dared to take his boy off to Rome, to be taught those studies which any knight or senator would have his own children taught). Oliensis (1998, 34) observes at S.1.6.76 (*est ausus*) that "this is, moreover, an admirable audacity, exercised not on his own but on his son's behalf, and for the most moral of reasons: the father takes his son to Rome because he believes in the intrinsic moral value of a good education – a belief confirmed by his son, who attributes to his education the good character he claimed in the immediately preceding lines." This should convince Maecenas. Horace was to be educated within a milieu of the social elite (*eques atque senator*) in Rome, in which it was likely that he would move within circles where the old values were still upheld. The role of "the father" in the narrative is that of an enabler. Horace says both in S.1.4 and in the present lines of S.1.6 that the right way of life was handed down to him

²²¹ For Horace's father's role in S.1.6, see Oliensis (1998, 33-34); Schlegel (2000, 108-119).

²²² Contrary to Harrison (1965, 111-112): "that to do this [acquiring this basic decency through moral lessons] adequately being beyond his [father's] slender resources, kept me at home, and instructed me himself by dint of simple precept and example." See also Brown (2007, 159). Also contrary to Gowers (2012, 238), who states with reference to *doceat* (S.1.6.77): "doceat: generic subj. H.[orace] perpetuates the myth that aristocratic Roman fathers taught their own sons" and to Gowers (2012, 239), who with reference to S.1.6.81-82 gives Horace's father the role of *paidagōgos*: "H.[orace]'s father himself acted as his *paidagōgos* as he visited his teachers." I read the lines as a description of the father feeling responsible for a good education of his son, and not as "another case of displaced abjection: the freedman [the father], despising slaves' morals, refuses to trust one as his child's moral guardian" (Gowers, 2012, 239). I concur with Oliensis (1998, 33) at S.1.6.76-78: "In *Satires* 1.6, the educational mantle passes from the father to the schoolmaster. Horace's father's contribution was to ensure that his son got a proper schooling, not in backwoods Venusia but at Rome."

by good Romans in general, by his milieu in Venusia and that in Rome during his time with Orbilius, fond of flogging, who dictated to him as a boy the poems of Livius Andronicus, as he writes in *Ep.*2.1.69-71: *carmina Livi/ [...], memini quae plagosum mihi parvo/ Orbilium dictare* (the poems of Livius [Andronicus] [...], which I remember that Orbilius, who was fond of flogging, dictated to me as a boy). Contrary to the sons of the centurions whom he left behind in provincial Venusia, Horace claims that he belonged truly to the elite, when he was a schoolboy in Rome. He describes in lines 72-75 that the sons of important centurions in Venusia went to the local school (*Flavi ludum*), with their casket and writing tablet hanging from their left shoulder, bringing their eightpence school-fee on the Ides (*laevo suspensi loculos tabulamque lacerto,/ ibant octonos referentes Idibus aeris*). Their circumstances were much inferior to his in Rome amongst the sons of aristocrats. He relates in lines 78-80 his life in Rome as very much part of the aristocratic class with attending slaves, where money was no object: S.1.6.78-80 reads:

*vestem servosque sequentis,
in magno ut populo, si qui vidisset, avita
ex re praeberi sumptus mihi crederet illos.*

(if anyone had seen my clothes and the slaves who attended me – as is usual [for the rich] in a great city – he would have thought that those expenses were paid for me from an ancestral estate).

His life in Rome was so comfortable that one would have thought that he came from an old family with all the trappings that go with such a background.

Like in S.1.4, the father-son relationship in S.1.6 is a much debated issue. I read Horace's account of the relationship within the context of his presenting his credentials to Maecenas. That is to say that I consider parts of Horace's narrative about his father poetic fiction. I argue this at the appropriate places in S.1.4, where his "father" symbolizes the continuity of the good Roman traditions and the poet tells us how these were transferred to him, and in S.1.5 with respect to the passage that refers to Venusia and the naturalness of his upbringing.²²³ Schlegel gives a literary interpretation to the father-son relationship in S.1.6 stating at several places in Schlegel (2000, 93; 105-106; 114; 116) that

this father [in S.1.6] is also the cause of Horace's friendship with Maecenas. Just as the character that the father formed in Horace [by his education] makes the son's satire harmless (not deservingly *suspectum*) and adequate to the condition and status of poetry, so Horace's character allows for the relationship with Maecenas. The father is explicitly seen as the cause of the primary element in Horace's poetic life, his character. [...] In 1.4 and 1.6, then, his [Horace's] focus on his

223 For the "father"- role in S.1.4, see my discussion of S.1.4.115-143; for the "father"- role in S.1.5, see my discussion of S.1.5.86-90.

father serves his poetic program and contributes importantly to the task of identifying his genre with this persona.

Schlegel recognizes that the “father’s” role enables Horace to further his poetic programme, but she does not identify any other purpose, such as for example making clear to Maecenas that he is a worthy member of the latter’s circle of friends. I have doubts about her linking up Horace’s character exclusively with him writing satire. First, there is not much satire in S.1, which, in my opinion, was not written with the intention of producing censure poetry. Second, Horace stopped writing his *Sermones* after a few years and changed to a genre, that is very different, the *Carmina*, while the relationship with Maecenas remained. Did his “satire”- character fit the *Carmina* as well? He wrote most likely eleven *carmina* of the first book between 35 and 30 B.C. (see note 326). Thus, it is feasible that at the time when he still wrote S.1 he developed a “lyric programme,” which he effectuated when he wrote S.2.

Horace continues his praise of his background and the values which he had been taught. He arrives in S.1.6.82-84 at the conclusion that so far he has managed to remain uncorrupted, which is virtue’s first credential, as his father kept him free not only from shameful action but also from scandal (*pudicum,/ qui primus virtutis honos, servavit ab omni/ non solum facto, verum opprobrio quoque turpi*). Although Gowers (2012, 239) does not suggest that S.1.6.82-84 is part of Horace’s expounding his credentials to Maecenas, she recognizes two aspects of the passage which indeed may hint at this conclusion. Firstly, she renders *pudicum,/ qui primus virtutis honos, servavit* in lines 82-83 as “he kept me uncorrupted, which is virtue’s top credential,” using the very word. Secondly, she states about this passage that “H.[orace] tends to stress his unblemished morals rather than his literary gifts.” I note that “stressing his unblemished morals” agrees well with my interpretation of the context of the passage, that is that S.1 is a book with Horace’s credentials for Maecenas. It should also be noted that Horace uses the word *honos* in line 83 meaning “repute/esteem,” whereas the meaning of *honor* (= *honos*), used three times in the first main section S.1.6.7-44, is that of “high office.” It is probable that *honos* in line 83 refers back to *honor* (high office) in the first section, which is concerned with social mobility and gaining office.²²⁴ Thus, Horace connects in this *sermo* on the one hand his moral credentials and the teaching by his milieu and his father, described by him in S.1.6.45-84, with on the other hand the issue of social mobility, described in the first section S.1.6.7-44. In the third section S.1.6.85-131, he will offer his views on his own future.

From line 85, Horace starts to think aloud about his own prospects; he involves both his father and Maecenas. It is about time that he lets Maecenas know what his

²²⁴ I owe the rendering of “credential” for *honos* to Gowers (2012, 239). Horace uses both the word (and word-forms of) *honor* and *honos*. In S.1 he uses these six times, of which five times in S.1.6 (S.1.6.11, 15, 19, 49, 83).

own image of his future is. He does this in a rather indirect manner focusing on his “father.” He says in lines 85-88:

*nec timuit sibi ne vitio quis verteret olim
si praeco parvas aut, ut fuit ipse, coactor
mercedes sequer; neque ego essem questus: ad hoc nunc
laus illi debetur et a me gratia maior.*

(and he was not afraid that someone might one day reckon it his fault, if I were to go after small rewards as an auctioneer or, like himself, as a collector of money; nor would I have complained: but, as things are, I owe him all the more praise and thanks)

I interpret these lines not only as words of gratitude to his father, who is not to blame if Horace does not make a career, but also as indicating to Maecenas that his political ambitions may be limited. He expounds his feelings of gratitude for his education in the following lines: he says in line 89 that as long as he is in his right mind he would not regret having him as his father (*nil me paeniteat sanum patris huius*). And, he writes in lines 90-92 that – if he cannot achieve his ambitions – he will not blame his parents, as many others do: *non, ut magna dolo factum negat esse suo pars, / quod non ingenuos habeat clarosque parentis, / sic me defendam* (I would not defend myself, as the majority does, who say it is no fault of theirs that they do not have free-born or distinguished parents). We read in lines 93-97 that Horace thinks differently:

*nam si natura iuberet
a certis annis aevum remeare peractum
atque alios legere ad fastum quoscumque parentis,
optaret sibi quisque, meis contentus honestos
fascibus et sellis nollem mihi sumere,*

(for if nature ordered us to repeat our past life, beginning at a certain age, and to choose any other parents each of us wished for himself to match his pride, I would be content with my own and I would not want to take those who were distinguished by the rods and chairs [marks of high office])

Horace would not want to replace the naturalness and cultivation of his milieu by the insincere distinctions of high office. He addresses in lines 98-99 directly Maecenas, when he says that he is certain that Maecenas, who was according to Gowers (2012, 241), quoting ps.-Acro, known for his “disdain for senatorial office,” will understand that he declines the troublesome burden to which he was never accustomed: *sanus fortasse tuo, quod / nollem onus haud umquam solitus portare molestum* (but perhaps sound to you, that I would not want to bear a troublesome burden to which I was never accustomed). He will make the same point in the last lines of the poem, S.1.6.128-131. In lines 100-110, he describes what he dislikes in the way of life of those who hold high office recalling Tillius of S.1.6.24, the ambitious freedman’s son, who had an erratic political career, but remains otherwise unidentified. He was probably Horace’s fiction, who was not modelled after a historical person. Horace made him an

embodiment of political ambition leading to his ruination. The message to Maecenas is clear: it is the same as that in S.1.6.17-18 and S.1.6.20-22, when he decided that he wants to stay out of practical politics.

He gives his arguments for his rejection of high office from line 100, and he sounds determined not to seek the obligations which go with high office and a political career. He spells those out in lines 100-104:

*nam mihi continuo maior quaerenda foret res,
atque salutandi plures, ducendus et unus
et comes alter uti ne solus rusve peregreve
exirem; plures calones atque caballi
pascendi, ducenda petorrita.*

(for immediately I should have to seek extra financial resources and there would be more calls to exchange, to take one or two companions so as not to go alone either into the countryside or abroad; I should have to maintain more servants and feed more horses, and to have more carriages)

Horace does not specify in line 101 whether he imagines receiving callers or paying visits, but he most likely expects that he in the course of a political career must fulfil both disagreeable duties.²²⁵ His objections to being involved in the political business come down to losing control of his way of life and being forced to take account of the opinions and actions of other people: he is rather on his own, as we will read in the lines that follow. In S.1.6.100-104, he also exaggerates a little, which we see again in the following passage. Horace gives the passage from line 100 to the end a satiric trait, one of the few in S.1, depicting in lines 104-128 the attractions of simple life. I suggest that he writes tongue-in-cheek in the latter passage being his way of telling Maecenas that he is not aspiring to a traditional career in political business. Nisbet (2007, 10) recognizes the irony, and states: “In [S.]1.6, [...] he gives an attractive and no doubt exaggerated picture of his simple life (104-31) [...]; he thus tries to avert the malice that attended his new success.” The whole picture of his youth, his education and his simple life is indeed rather exaggerated. I interpret this as a support of my view that much of S.1 is fiction, in which exaggeration has the function of illustrating that he is not connected in any way with the world of the *nouveau riche* and other upstarts. Horace will remain his simple self, who is not in competition with Maecenas or other politicians. I concur with Nisbet that he tries to avert the malice, but not that of “new success,” as it still has to materialise. He tries to avert future involvement in politics.

Horace refers overtly to his personal freedom in lines 104-106:

*nunc mihi curto
ire licet mulo vel si libet usque Tarentum,
mantica cui lumbos onere ulceret atque eques armos:*

²²⁵ The rendering of *salutandi plures* in line 101 is conform Gowers (2012, 241-242).

(as it is, I am free, if it pleases me, to go all the way to Tarentum on a gelded mule; the rider and his bag make the mule's loins and flanks sore from the weight).

He also informs Maecenas in line 106, that although being free to choose, this does not mean that he gives way to the despicable manners of the new rich. Travelling cheaply on a long journey all the way to Tarentum by riding a mule is not comfortable; certainly not for the animal, which may imply that the rider has to travel slowly. However, the *equus* Horace travels in accordance with his simple, but civilized style, and thus according to Gowers (2012, 243) “has been more successful in renouncing the signs of his humble origins” than Tillius, who enters on the scene again after we last heard from him in lines 24-26. He is Horace's fiction impersonating an ambitious freedman's son or a man of humble descent, who had an erratic political career. Horace made him an embodiment of political ambition, who is depicted as one who managed to become *praetor*, “an increasingly un-exclusive office in the unsettled years of the triumvirate: in 38 B.C. there had been no fewer than sixty-seven praetors (Dio 48.43)” (see Gowers, 2012, 244).

Horace constructs in lines 107-111 a contrast between two freedman's sons: himself, the civilized and unassuming one, and fictitious Tillius, the nouveau riche who liked to show his advance in society and to display his wealth. The poet says to him in line 107 that no one will reproach me (Horace) with meanness, as one does you (*obiciet nemo sordis mihi quas tibi*). He imagines Tillius as one who feared to be considered mean if he were to make his journeys without a “proper” escort of servants: the reproach of meanness was for many of the new rich a serious lack of appreciation, as they wanted to be seen to belong to the class of people for whom money is no object, that can be showered over their clients. Thus, Horace gives a humorous description of Tillius on his short fictitious journey of only sixteen miles from Rome to Tibur (modern Tivoli), which he makes with a retinue of five servants, rather different from the way in which Horace imagined that he travelled on his mule to Tarentum. Horace mocks Tillius' pretensions in lines 108-109 *cum Tiburte via praetorem quinque sequuntur/ te pueri lasanum portantes oenophorumque* (when on the road to Tibur five slaves follow you, praetor, carrying your chamber-pot and wine-holder). In lines 110-111 Tillius is called ironically *praeclare senator* (great senator), which is perhaps too much honour, although he seems to do very well. However, Horace does not aspire after his rank, because he lives more comfortably than Tillius would, in this and a thousand other ways (*hoc ego commodius quam tu, praeclare senator,/ milibus atque aliis vivo*). He will narrate his putative day in the city in the final part of the third section.

Horace extols his ideas of a free and simple life in the city in S.1.6.111-128.²²⁶ When he wrote S.1, he had not yet received the free use of his Sabine estate from Maecenas (see section 1.4). He testifies to enjoying the peace and quietude of this estate in many

²²⁶ For Horace's typical day in the city, see also Coffey (1976, 77).

of his poems, amongst other S.2.6, *Carm.*1.20, 2.18, 3.8, and *Ep.*1.14. However, for the time being, he has to relax in Rome itself, which he imagines to be perfectly possible. In S.1.6.111-118, he tells us that wherever he wants to go, he goes on his own (*quacumque libido est,/ incedo solus*). He is prudent spending his money when he buys his simple food: *percontor quanti holus ac far* (I ask the price of greens and flour). At the end of the afternoon he wanders through (*pererro*) the Circus Maximus and the Forum where he listens to the fortune-tellers (*adsisto divinis*), which presumably keeps him in touch with common people. It sounds all very prosaic and not so pretentious as the entertainments of the parvenus. Then, homewards for a simple meal of leeks, peas and pasta (*inde domum me/ ad porri et ciceris refero laganique catinum*) served by only three slaves (*ministratur pueris tribus*). His table of cheap marble (*lapis albus*) holds a simple dinner set with among other things cups (*pocula duo*), a cheap rinsing-bowl (*echinus/ vilis*) and utensils of cheap Campanian earthenware (*Campana supellex*). No silver to be seen.

In the three lines that follow, S.1.6.119-121, Horace illustrates his objections to being deeply involved in political life and vindicates his freedom in an original scene, in which the statue of Marsyas plays the leading part. This statue, a satyr with right hand raised, was placed in the Forum, and was according to Gowers (2012, 247) “traditionally regarded as a Roman ‘Statue of Liberty’ (Serv. *Ad Aen.*3.20, 4.58 *in foro positus libertatis indicium est, qui erecta manu testator nihil urbi deesse* [placed in the Forum as a sign of freedom bearing witness by the raised hand that the city lacks for nothing]) or plebeian symbol (Wiseman 2004:68-70).” Lines 119-121 read:

*deinde eo dormitum, non sollicitus mihi quod cras
surgendum sit mane, obeundus Marsya, qui se
vultum ferre negat Noviorum posse minoris.*

(then, I go off to sleep, not troubled that I must get up early tomorrow, and must go to Marsyas, who says that he cannot bear to see the face of the younger Novius)

Horace acknowledges gratefully that he is not obliged to participate in the “tedious urban duty” of paying morning calls to Marsyas as his patron. He constructs on the one hand a very original congruence between Marsyas the popular defender of freedom and his own free choice of not having to make morning calls to his patron, and on the other a paradox between Marsyas as his imagined patron and Maecenas as his *amicus*. The raised arm of Marsyas can be interpreted as a gesture of abhorrence, which Horace explicates in line 121 as being directed against younger Novius, presumably the son of the freedman of line 40.²²⁷ The latter symbolizes the upstarts,

²²⁷ See for the raised arm, Porphyrio (ad S.1.6.121): “*duo Nouii fratres illo tempore fuerunt, quorum minor tumultuosus fenerator fuisse traditur* (at that time there were two brothers Novii, of whom is said that the younger was a noisy money-lender) in Meyer (1874, 225); see also Gowers (2012, 247).

who meet every morning their patron and of whom even Marsyas would abhor. This is not the kind of company that Horace would wish to choose.

Next, in S.1.6.122-128 he tells us about his favourite quiet day on his own. He either stays in bed till ten o'clock (*ad quartam iaceo*) and then takes a stroll (*post hanc vagor*), or he reads or writes something for his enjoyment on his own (*aut ego lecto/ aut scripto quod me tacitum iuuet*) (lines 122-123). Gowers (2012, 248) interprets *tacitum* as “H.[orace] pleases himself, rather than a patron.” I concur with her that Horace does not appreciate the status of client paying morning calls with many others to his patron.²²⁸ He has made this abundantly clear by his description of such an imaginary call to Marsyas. Horace expresses in S.1.6.122-123 the enjoyment he finds in his intellectual pursuits of reading and writing and discussing the output with his friends and associates of the circle of Maecenas, as he said in S.1.4.73-74 and will say again in S.1.10.81-88. Next, he is anointed with a good oil (*unguor olivo*), unlike the miser Natta who uses oil taken from his lamps (*fraudatis lucernis*). Horace says in S.1.6.125-126 that the warmer sun (at the end of the morning) persuades him, getting tired, to go to the baths, and avoid the Campus Martius and the ball-game (*ast ubi me fessum sol acrior ire lavatum/ admonuit, fugio Campum lusumque trigonem*), or alternatively avoid crowds and midday heat when the text of the majority of manuscripts is used: *rabiosi tempora signi* (the season/hour of the mad sign in the heavens) instead of *Campum lusumque trigonem*.²²⁹ Brown (2007, 164) suggests that the former phrase alludes “to the sun’s midday heat,” although he also states that it is “the most implausible periphrasis for an idea already expressed by *sol acrior*.” Horace argues in the passage that he wants to be on his own with his reading and writing. He wants to avoid crowds and midday heat: *rabiosi tempora signi* can be read either as a repeat of the warmer sun (*sol acrior*) as such, or as the effects of the warm sun, thus accentuating his aversion to crowds and heat. In view of the context, I favour the latter interpretation. Abstemious Horace having taken breakfast is not hungry (*pransus non avide*), but has just enough for lunch not to starve all-day (*quantum interpellat inani/ ventre diem durare*) and spends the afternoon idling at home (*domesticus otior*).

In her (1998, 34-35) description “of a typical day in the poet’s life” Oliensis considers Horace’s ambition and raises again the issue of Horace as a social climber. I read her present statement that she is not saying that Horace was a social climber, but

²²⁸ Conform Gowers (2003, 80): “Horace is no scurrying client with urgent duties, but a solitary being who sleeps late and dictates his own timetable.”

²²⁹ For the textual problem of the ending of S.1.6.126, see Brink (1987, 30-31); Brown (2007, 164); Gowers (2012, 248-249). Brink states that the problem is not satisfactorily resolved. Brown mentions two options: “the phrase can scarcely mean ‘the season of the rabid dog-star’ (conform 7.25-6), which, even if the allusion to the time of year had point, Horace had no power to avoid, or ‘the hour of the rabid sign’ alluding to the sun’s midday heat, the most implausible periphrasis for an idea already expressed by *sol acrior*.”

that on the contrary he needs to be “distinguished from the parasitic social climber.” She says:

It is a remarkable feat that the poem commemorating the beginnings of Horace’s friendship with Caesar’s right-hand man leaves us feeling that Horace is one of the most unassuming men in the world. The effect is enhanced by the beguiling description of a typical day in the poet’s life with which the poem concludes. The description is framed as if it were proof positive of the advantages attending a life free from political ambitions: “In this way my life is more agreeable than yours, eminent senator” (*hoc ego commodius quam tu, praeclare senator, /...vivo*, S.1.6.110-11); “This is the way men live who are free of the wretched weight of ambition” (*haec est/ vita solutorum misera ambitione gravique*, 128-9). But the real burden of the intervening description is to distinguish Horace not from the political aspirant but from the parasitic social climber.

Contrary to Oliensis’ view of Horace’s routine, Gowers (2012, 244) interprets S.1.6.111-128 as that “indeed, many of the activities described shadow the routines of *clientela*.” Below, one will find my view on the issue, that is that Horace reveals by his story of his daily routine that he is not a social climber.

I suggest that, just like a number of other narratives in S.1.6, the account in lines 111-128 is not autobiographical, but again fiction. Contrary to both Oliensis and Gowers, I interpret this passage as Horace’s answer to the short passage about Tillius that precedes this one, and indeed to many other passages in this and previous *sermones* about the ostentation of wealth by many of the new men in politics and by the new rich. Further, this passage is consistent with the context of the book as a whole in which the poet tells Maecenas that he prefers the life outside the limelight of the political business and a continuation of his comparative freedom. Freudenburg (2010, 282) states about this passage (lines 111-128) that

as the philosopher gifted with leisure in *Satires* 1.6, Horace has time to stroll through the forum at dusk, to read and write and think great thoughts. [...] But the poet’s daily routine undergoes a drastic shift in *Satires* 2.6 to become the exact opposite of that earlier picture. [...] He [Horace] spends the day chasing about the city, frantically pursuing errands first for Maecenas, then for the scribes, and so on, but never having any time for himself.

Freudenburg then poses the question: “where, then, is the ‘true’ Horace in all of this, and what can we really know of his real life, his opinions, and his routines?” My interpretation of both S.1.6 and S.2.6 and the putative contrast in Horace’s attitude in the two poems differs significantly from that of Freudenburg. Firstly, Horace does not present himself in S.1.6 as “the philosopher gifted with leisure,” but as the man who wants to remain independent and does not wish to exist like the majority of the upstarts. However, his Epicureanism ought to be considered here indeed. I noted in my discussion of S.1.3.78 that Horace’s choice of words *ponderibus modulisque* (weights and measures) demonstrates his Epicurean disposition (see also note 113). According to Hanchey (2013), Cicero criticized the Epicureans severely for their selfishness and consequent tendency to avoid political life. He saw this as a serious

threat to the survival of the state.²³⁰ One might therefore conclude that Horace's description of his typical day proves Cicero's point. My conclusion differs essentially. Horace does not aspire to be an outsider in Roman politics, but seeks to participate in his own way as a commentator and not as a politician. His Epicurean views make him aware that he needs the freedom to organize his life in his own way to be able to reflect and study. Secondly, S.2.6 contrasts the displeasure, hassle and irritation of city life with the peace and bliss on his Sabine estate, which is what he prayed for (S.2.6.1: *Hoc erat in votis*). On his farm he is free, he can enjoy the conversations with friends: in other words he takes as much pleasure in the kind of existence on his farm in S.2.6 as he described eight years before as his liking in S.1.6.122-124. Thus, S.2.6 conveys the same message about Horace's preference as S.1.6. If his goal is to become involved in politics from the sidelines, he needs his independence in order to be free to say what he must. Concerning the point made by Gowers that Horace shows himself a parasitic social climber, I offer three arguments against this view. First, if he were a social climber, he probably would have given a very different description of a typical day in his life; one in which he imagines himself not visiting fortune-tellers but theatres, sitting in same row as Novius in line 40 and hoping for the front row, or attending great dinners with Maecenas rather than a simple meal of leeks and peas at home. Second, Horace's appreciation of being admitted to the circle of Maecenas is not only his social elevation, but as much his association with his friends and colleagues, Virgil, Varius and Plotius. He writes, for example, among others about them in S.1.5.42: *neque quis me sit devinctior alter* (and nobody is more attached to them than I), and in S.1.6.54-55 about Virgil and Varius *optimus olim/ Vergilius, post hunc Varius, dixere quid essem* (some time ago the excellent Virgil and after him Varius told you what I was). In *Carm.*1.3., he professes his feelings of friendship in a moving *propempticon* for Virgil, who sails for Greece, while Horace prays for a safe journey.²³¹ Third, in S.1.9, he shows what he thinks of social climbers, when he is confronted with the pest, a prototype of the ambitious and crude men who emerged in Roman society.

The finale of S.1.6 consists of only three lines and two words. He says in lines 128-129 that such a life is only for those who are released from the burdensome and pitiable ambition (*haec est/ vita solutorum misera ambitione gravique*). Thus, he restates in different words what he said before in the poem: in line 22 *quoniam in propria non pelle quiessem* (as it would not make me feel good), which I read as that he does not aspire to a political career, as he would not feel good being a politician, and in lines 98-99 that he would not want to bear a troublesome burden to which he was never accustomed (*quod/ nollem onus haud umquam solitus portare molestum*). In his final lines, he voices his gratitude that he is not the son of one of the established families, that would have deemed him to pursue a career in politics and probably finish as a

²³⁰ For a bibliography of Cicero's anti-Epicureanism, see Hanchey (2013, 119, note 2).

²³¹ For Horace's friendship with Varius, Virgil and other poets see section 1.3.2. and note 31.

senatorial candidate. In lines 130-131 he says: *his me consolor victurum suavius ac si/ quaestor avus pater atque meus patruusque fuissent* (I find comfort in these [his way of life] as I shall live more pleasantly than [I would have lived] if my grandfather, my father and my uncle each had been a *quaestor*). In addition to his aversion to the political business, Horace probably also hints again at the same point mentioned earlier in my discussion of Horace in the role as gentleman jester (at S.1.3.31-32, section 2.2.2). At the time of writing S.1.3, and indeed also S.1.6, (early 30s B.C.), Horace does not want to be involved politically. He needs to guard his independence to keep the opportunity to vent controversial political opinion, without taking sides. However, I noted already at the discussion of S.1.3.31-32, that he did not keep silence in the case of major contemporary political issues. Griffin (1993, 8) observes that Horace did not take sides until the Battle of Actium. He says of the *Epodi* that those “contain two rousing poems on Actium, [...] probably composed shortly before the publication of the book [...]: vigorous statements of partisanship, devotion to Caesar’s heir and loathing of his enemies, waited until after the Battle of Actium. Much prudence, perhaps, but little political passion.” I differ from Griffin’s view; I recognize already in S.1 both a number of political statements and Horace taking sides with respect to the outcome of one crucial issue, that is the power struggle between Octavian and Marc Antony.

In summary, I identify three sections in S.1.6. In the first, S.1.6.1-44, Horace presents his views on social mobility and eligibility for public office recognising the significance of one’s social background for a political career: low birth should not be an obstacle, and high birth no guarantee, although being well-born is a recommendation for high public office. In the second section, S.1.6.45-84, he records his first meeting with Maecenas in lines 45-61, and he presents his moral credentials and more details of his personal background and history, such as the teaching by his milieu and his father in lines 61-84. The third section, S.1.6.85-131, contains his views on his own future, which he doesn’t envisage as one in the political business, as a career in politics would not make him feel good. S.1.6 is the next *sermo* in Horace’s series of credentials, in which he presents himself as a reliable member of Maecenas circle sharing the latter’s political convictions.

2.2.4 *Sermones* 1.7 and 1.8: Threats from the East: Parthia and Egypt

Horace changes the emphasis slightly in S.1.7 and S.1.8 (and indeed in S.1.9) compared to the previous six *sermones*. The focus is still on proving his worth to Maecenas, but his approach differs from the one he used so far. Before, he raised for discussion subject matters of social and political ethics stressing the common ground with Maecenas, which were designed so that the latter would recognize readily Horace’s suitability for association. From S.1.7, Horace sounds confident that he will succeed – or already has succeeded – in his efforts to find a place within the circle of Maecenas and he chooses as his subjects for discussion strategic issues of military and foreign policy. He does

this presumably in order to demonstrate that he also has a contribution to make in those fields and again to show that he also supports the policies of Octavian and Maecenas. The subjects he raises are both the contemporary issues of the unresolved threat by the Parthians in the East and the alliance of Cleopatra and Marc Antony. Before I analyse the poems to see whether and how he informs us of those points, it is useful to first briefly chart the historic context of the poems. Thus, after a few words about Crassus' defeat in the battle of Carrhae in 53 B.C., I focus in the description of the historic context on the period between 44 and 31 B.C., in particular the conflict between Octavian and Marc Antony, and the disastrous failures of Marc Antony's leadership, that became apparent from the Parthian campaign and in his association with Cleopatra. The continuation of the civil war caused by these events was a major political issue at the time when Horace wrote S.1.7 and S.1.8.²³²

Carrhae in Parthia is where Crassus was defeated by the Parthians in 53 B.C. with the loss of 20,000 men killed and 10,000 taken prisoner and the loss of the legionary standards. In the thirties and twenties B.C. this was still felt as an affront to Rome that required the restoration of Roman honour, one way or another. Efforts to resolve the issue by military means, such as the Parthian campaign of Marc Antony in 36 B.C., when he crossed the river Araxes but was chased out of Armenia, had been a failure.²³³ When Augustus' power looked secure in 27 B.C., resolving the Parthian problem was a matter of high priority for the *princeps*. He succeeded not by military means, but by concluding a treaty; the standards returned to Rome in 20 B.C.

The murder of Julius Caesar on 15th of March 44 B.C. marked the beginning of the end of the civil wars, which had ravaged Italy and Rome for many decades. Immediately after the murder, Marc Antony, at that time consul with Caesar, took charge, convened the Senate and reached a compromise which meant that the murderers of Julius Caesar would not be charged, but that Caesar's measures were to be maintained.²³⁴ Octavian hastened to Rome. As a result of the opposition of the people against the clemency shown to the murderers, Brutus and Cassius were forced to leave Rome. Brutus went by way of Macedonia and Illyricum to Greece and was granted by the Senate *maius imperium* in Greece in 43 B.C. When Octavian insisted on punitive measures against the conspirators, Antony resisted, but he eventually had to yield to the greater military power and the popularity of Octavian among the people. Octavian pressed on and in 43 B.C. at the age of only nineteen he gained his first major political victory when the senate appointed him consul. Furthermore, he

232 For the historical context of the Late Republic and the Early Empire, see Boatwright et al. (2004, 267-316); Brunt (2004a); Galinsky (1996, 80-140; 2005); Naerebout & Singor (2004, 253-276; 302-307); Raaflaub & Toher (1993); Wallace-Hadrill (2005); Zanker (2010). This summary of the historical context of the conflict between Octavian and Marc Antony is an adaptation of parts in Weeda (2010, 24-26).

233 For Virgil's reference to Marc Antony's campaign in A.8.728, see Weeda & van der Poel (2014, 595). See also Lemaire (1819, 472) and Page (1962, 250).

234 Yavetz (1993, 29-30) offers an interesting analysis of the different options which Antony faced.

convinced the senate to condemn the murderers. Brutus and Cassius were proscribed and banished. Brutus, however, had in the meantime taken control of Asia illegally. Octavian and Antony were reconciled and together with Marcus Lepidus they formed the Second Triumvirate to restore order.²³⁵ In the year 44/43 B.C., Horace joined Brutus.

The civil war entered a new phase when in 42 B.C. Antony and Octavian advanced eastwards against Brutus and Cassius. In October of the same year both rebels were defeated in the battle of Philippi after which they committed suicide. Antony stayed in the East to direct the war against the Parthians and in 41 B.C. he met Cleopatra; not for the first time, but this time their encounter had important consequences.

In the meantime, Octavian had to deal with other adversaries such as Fulvia and Lucius, the wife and brother of Antony. In 40 B.C. both escaped after being besieged in Perusia (modern Perugia) and died soon after. A more dangerous enemy was Sextus Pompey, who blockaded the coast of Italy at different places with his fleet from a base on Sicily, thus threatening the Roman grain supplies. With the aid of Antony from Egypt and of Lepidus from Africa, Agrippa, the faithful general and friend of Octavian, engaged Sextus. In 36 B.C. Agrippa defeated the navy of Sextus in a number of naval battles (the last was the battle near Naulochus) around Sicily. Sextus could escape to Asia Minor, where he hoped to join forces with Antony. Not much later Sextus was captured and killed. Horace wrote S.1. between 38 and 35 B.C.

In the struggle for power Lepidus saw his chance to push aside Octavian and he claimed command of the legions of Sextus Pompey. Octavian solved this in his own characteristic way by entering the camp of Lepidus' army and inviting the troops of both Lepidus and Sextus to accept him as their commander. He was successful and Lepidus was removed from the Triumvirate and exiled to a small provincial town. From then Antony was for Octavian the last obstacle on the road to absolute power.

From 40 B.C. until 33 B.C. Antony joined Octavian in a continuation of the Second Triumvirate, in which the former kept control of the eastern part of the empire. At the insistence of Octavian, he married Octavia in 40 B.C. Three years later Antony sent Octavia back home to Rome and he passed his time alternately between military campaigns in the East and the palace in Alexandria. Subjugating the territories in the East served not only the imperialistic aim of Rome, but also the political and territorial aspirations of Cleopatra. These aspirations were a strong empire led by her and Antony with Alexandria as capital, where the Greek intellectual power was to be paired with the political and military might of Rome and which would certainly not be subordinate to Rome. During those years she took Antony along in this ambition, which eventually culminated in the so-called Donations of Alexandria in 34 B.C., when Antony presented Cleopatra's children with some of the recently won lands.²³⁶

²³⁵ For five years they formed a *Triumviri rei publicae constituendae* (Triumvirate for the Restoration of the Republic).

²³⁶ Cassius Dio, 49.40.2–41.4.

It would not take long before the struggle between Cleopatra and Antony on the one hand and Octavian on the other would be decided in arms. In 32 B.C. civil war flared up again and Octavian declared war on Cleopatra and Antony.²³⁷ As time passed Octavian provoked Antony more and more, among other matters by publishing the content of the latter's testament. In his public utterances Octavian made it appear that Cleopatra wished to destroy Rome and that Antony was wholly enslaved to her. Most probably this was not far from the truth. On 2nd of September 31 B.C. the sea battle near Actium was fought and resulted in a deciding victory for Octavian and Agrippa. Antony and Cleopatra fled to Egypt and in 30 B.C. Alexandria was taken. Thus the succession of civil wars which had started in 88 B.C. with Sulla's march on Rome finished in 30 B.C. And although Octavian made it appear that the war against Cleopatra and Antony was a war against a foreign enemy, this conflict also has to be viewed as a continuation of the internal power struggles in Rome, which had dominated the best part of the first century B.C. The consequences of these wars had been terrible for Italy and Rome. Modern scholars estimate that during the civil wars 14 to 17 % of the total number of adult male citizens had been enlisted in the army.²³⁸ It is impossible to determine the total number of victims among the civilian population in Italy and the total number of military losses, but over a period of nearly sixty years it must have been very substantial. In many parts of the country the administration had ground to a halt, public order was seriously affected and massacres and looting by groups of roaming soldiers and slaves were the order of the day. This contributed to the collapse of the economy and food supplies were seriously endangered by the reduced production in Italy and by the disturbance of grain imports.

Studying **S.1.7**, one notes that this *sermo* has not received as much attention of modern commentators of S.1 as many other poems in the book.²³⁹ Scholars considered the poem "a make-weight" (Brown, 2007, 165), or "think it is a failure" (Rudd, 2007, 66).²⁴⁰ This is presumably because the poem seems to have characteristics very different from

237 Cassius Dio, 50.24-28; the formal declaration of war was on Cleopatra only, as Octavian did not want the war to be seen as a civil war. It is likely that Octavian also had another motive as by leaving Marc Antony out he made it easier for the many Romans who had joined Antony's cause to change sides.

238 Conform Boatwright et al. (2004, 301). Estimates by Brunt (1971) and Hopkins (1987) (summarized in De Blois & van der Spek, 2001, 209) present the following figures: in 83 B.C. 143.000 soldiers = 14% of the total number of adult male citizens, in 63 B.C. 120.000 soldiers = 12%, in 43 B.C. 240.000 soldiers = 16%, and in 33 B.C. 250.000 soldiers = 16%. After Actium this reduces to: in 23 B.C. 156.000 soldiers = 9%.

239 For S.1.7, see Anderson (1982, 79-83); Brown (2007, 165-169); Buchheit (1968); DuQuesnay (1984, 36-38); Gowers (2003, 82; 2012, 250-263); Henderson (1994); Rooy, van (1971); Rudd (2007, 64-67).

240 For an analysis of, among other matters, the last lines of S.1.7, see Henderson's (1994, 157) conclusion: "The poem does not even warrant the understanding of Persius' [final] 'exclamation' as a 'pun', of whatever quality to whoever's ears, nor even as a 'joke'."

the rest of the book, almost as if it does not form part of it. On the face of it, the subject-matter of S.1.7 seems to differ from that of the other poems, namely that it seems to be concerned with events from the past that have no bearing on contemporary political issues, let alone that the poem can be read as one of his credentials. I intend to show that this poem can be properly interpreted as one of those. Hence, it follows that S.1.7 was most likely written between 38 – 36/35 B.C.

In S.1.7 Horace goes some five to seven years back when he narrates an event that presumably took place after he had joined Brutus in 44 or 43 B.C., and before Philippi and the death of Brutus in 43 – 42 B.C. That does not mean that the story is an account of a real historic event; it may be one of Horace's fictitious narratives. Horace referred only once before openly in S.1.6.48 that he once was a tribune in a Roman legion, although he does not say that this was in Brutus' army and that he fought at the wrong side at Philippi. It was not before *Carm.*2.7, written after 30 B.C., that he mentioned explicitly his experience in the battle of Philippi. He touched in S.1.3.139-140 on his own fortunate circumstances that he was accepted nevertheless within the circle of Maecenas by men of great charisma and importance, real friends.²⁴¹ We also saw that Horace was very much aware of the potential burden of his wrong choice in the past for his position within the Roman elite in the future. This caused him to write his first book of *Sermones* in which he endeavoured to convince Maecenas and others of his worth. I will argue that Horace juxtaposes in S.1.7 the cultured milieu that he experiences after being admitted to Maecenas' circle and the crude and aggressive one of his past with Brutus, thus admitting in the present *sermo* openly his previous association with the republican cause. This makes S.1.7 a poem with a special meaning.

Horace depicts a real or fictitious incident at a session of Brutus' circuit court as follows. He starts by introducing the two antagonists in the well-known case, according to Horace, in S.1.7.1-8.

*PROSCRIPTI Regis Rupili pus atque venenum
hybrida quo pacto sit Persius ultus, opinor
omnibus et lippis notum et tonsoribus esse.
Persius hic permagna negotia dives habebat
Clazomenis, etiam litis cum Rege molestas,
durus homo atque odio qui posset vincere Regem,
confidens, tumidus, adeo sermonis amari,
Sisennas, Barros ut equis praecurreret albis.*

241 Conform DuQuesnay (1984, 37): "This creates the overwhelming impression that the friendship of Maecenas has imposed no inhibitions on Horace about freely recalling his earlier allegiance. The implicit message must have been reassuring to other former Republicans who had either just returned to Italy or who were still hoping to return after the defeat of Sex. Pompeius. If Horace, the freedman's son, could find such complete acceptance, there was hope for the others."

(How the malicious and virulent Rupilius Rex, that outlaw, was repaid by the half-breed Persius is well-known, I think, to all blear-eyed men and barbers. This Persius was a rich man and had a very large business at Clazomenae and also an intractable lawsuit with Rex. Persius was a hard man, who could outdo Rex in offensive conduct, overconfident, arrogant, and so sharp-tongued that he would beat by a long shot the Sisennas or Barruses)²⁴²

The ex-praetor Rupilius Rex came from Praeneste (see line 28) and joined Brutus in Asia after he was proscribed in the triumviral proscriptions of 43 B.C. by Octavian to raise the necessary cash for recruiting the legions against Brutus.²⁴³ Cicero in *Fam.* 13.9.2 refers positively to a *P. Rupilius P.f. Men., qui est magister in ea societate* (P. Rupilius, son of P. from the tribe Menenia, who is the leader of this association [of tax-gatherers in Bithynia]). It is not certain whether this is the same man as the Rupilius in the present poem. Persius is not known, except that he owned a large business in the town of Clazomenae (modern Uria, region of Ionia, near Izmir, West Turkey). His name Persius suggests that his father was Roman and *hybrida* may mean that his mother was from Asia Minor, perhaps from Clazomenae. However, if the two men were fictitious the names may well have a different function. Indeed, it is likely that lines 2-3 *opinor/ omnibus et lippis notum et tonsoribus esse* (is well-known, I think, to all blear-eyed men and barbers) indicate that the story of the court case is Horace's fiction. Blear-eyed men are unreliable witnesses and during their visits to the "chemists" and those to the barber's shop they pick up much local gossip. Rex may be chosen in order to give Persius the opportunity to make his arrogant attack at the end, and the name of Persius, that also means "Persian" (see Gowers, 2012, 253), may well be a functional reference by Horace to the continuing Parthian influence in Asia Minor and the failure of Marc Antony to resolve the Parthian issue. I intend to demonstrate that Horace at several places indicates that this is the underlying meaning of this *sermo*. For example, I concur with van Rooy (1971, 74), who makes a case that *hybrida* in line 2 "*alludes* to high-minded and insulting *hybris* in the conduct of the half-Greek. That Horace attached a special meaning to 'hybrida' is suggested not only by the hyperbaton 'hybrida Persius', but by the emphatic position of the word at the beginning of the second verse. Moreover, 'hybrida' used adjectivally does not merely balance 'proscripti' at the beginning of vs.1." The reading that Persius conducts himself with arrogance accords with mine, particularly with his charge at Brutus at the end of the *sermo*. Persius is a hard (*durus*) and sharp-tongued (*sermonis amari*) man who could not care less.²⁴⁴ The problem with Brutus is obviously that he does not possess sufficient moral authority to prevent those humiliating charges.

²⁴² I owe several of the translations to Gowers (2012, 252-255).

²⁴³ For Rupilius Rex, see Gowers (2012, 252-253); Henderson (1994); Rooy, van (1971, 68); Rudd (2007, 64). For the proscriptions of 43 B.C., see Boatwright et al. (2004, 272).

²⁴⁴ Sisenna and Barrus are unknown, probably types; see Gowers (2012, 255).

Next, Horace focuses in lines 9-21 on the dispute between Rex and Persius, without telling us what they differ about, comparing their conflict with the Trojan War, that was according to Herodotus book 1 the first armed conflict between East and West. I interpret this allusion to the Trojan War as another indication that Horace invokes the contemporary situation in 38 – 36/35 B.C. in the province of Asia. He gives the main line of his story in S.1.79-10 and S.1.7.18-21: I will discuss those lines first.²⁴⁵

*ad Regem redeo. postquam nihil inter utrumque
convenit [...],*

*Bruto praetore tenente
ditem Asiam, Rupili et Persi par pugnat, uti non
compositum melius cum Bitho Bacchius. in ius
acres procurrunt, magnum spectaculum uterque.*

(I return to Rex. When nothing could be agreed out of court between the two [...], and when Brutus was in charge of rich Asia as praetor, the pair of duellists Rupilius and Persius came to blows, equally well matched as Bacchius and Bithus. They sally forth fiercely into court, each a great show)

Horace calls Brutus somewhat inaccurately “*praetor*” in line 18, and I indicated above already that Brutus had assumed wider illegal powers of *propraetor* in *ditem Asiam* (rich Asia). The latter office gave him the opportunity to extract the money in the rich province that he required for raising an army. This is yet another parallel with Marc Antony’s conduct in Egypt and Asia seven years later.²⁴⁶

Turning to the allusion to the Trojan War, the poet describes no mean quarrel between the two litigators. In line 11, they happen to be involved in head-on war (*adversum bellum incidit*) because they are brave fighters (*fortes*), who, like Hector and Achilles, could only fight it out till death would divide them (*ut ultima divideret mors*) (line 13). However, in lines 15-18 Horace describes the opposite when the Lycian ally of Troy, Glaucus of *Iliad*.6, gave the Greek hero Diomedes his golden armour for his bronze (*muneribus missis*), instead of fighting him. The poet alters the original story (*IL*.6.119-236) significantly, as Diomedes refused to fight Glaucus as their families were guest-friends. According to Gowers (2012, 257) Horace describes both as “cowards (cf. *pigrrior* in line 18 and *inertis* in line 15) who resorted to bribery to avoid fighting. Nonetheless, Glaucus is something of a role model for H.[orace], conciliatory rather than antagonistic.” In addition to the interpretation of Gowers, I suggest that lines 15-18 contain also two characteristics by which Horace may refer to the contemporary situation. The first one is the contrast between East (Glaucus) and West (Diomedes). The second may reflect a Roman prejudice, that is that it is easy to strike a bargain with

²⁴⁵ OCT gives in line 9 *regem* instead of *Regem*. I follow a.o. Gowers (2012, 256), as Horace refers here of course to Rupilius.

²⁴⁶ Acc. to Gowers (2012, 258) Bacchius and Bithus are most likely a well-known pair of gladiators.

the Asians. This could infer that Horace suggests that negotiations with the Parthians should start in order to solve the Parthian problem: a course that was followed by Octavian after 27 B.C.

The actual court case and Persius' final outburst is the last part of the poem in lines 22-35. It begins with: *Persius exponit causam* (Persius sets out his case). Then, the remainder of line 22-23 reads: *ridetur ab omni/ conventu* ("there's laughter throughout the assize") (translation by Brown, 2007, 71). Although Horace does not tell us why the audience laughs, I presume that there is some hilarity as listeners recognize Persius' servile grovelling for Brutus. I do not agree with Anderson's (1982, 80) explanation that the laughter shows "how Horace has employed the comic dispute between Rupilius Rex and Persius in order to present, among other things, some of his [Horace's] own literary ideas in polemic." Anderson argues that Persius' pun "as a last resort [in lines 33-35, see below] achieves more than he anticipated: the audience laughs at his enemy [Rex]. No doubt, the audience was laughing at both foes." Anderson concludes from the laughter that Horace dramatizes a basic theme of his satiric disagreement with Lucilius, that is "that simple laughter achieves more than spiteful invective." Although I agree with the latter statement, I do not see that Horace intended to make this point in S.1.7.²⁴⁷ Firstly, the audience doesn't laugh when Persius makes his final impertinent remark, but laughs much earlier in the battle of words between the two foes. Secondly, Anderson's interpretation doesn't take into account both the context of lines 22-26, where Persius exhibits his flatteries, and the context of the poem as a whole, in which Horace shows the dismal state of Brutus' propraetorship. S.1.7.23-26 reads:

*laudat Brutum laudatque cohortem:
solem Asiae Brutum appellat, stellasque salubris
appellat comites, excepto Rege; canem illum
invisum agricolis sidus venisse.*

(he [Persius] praises Brutus and he praises his staff. He calls Brutus the "sun of Asia," and his aides "auspicious stars," with the exception of Rex; he said that he had come like the Dog-star, hostile to farmers)

These lines by Persius are a fine example of flattery appropriate to a king. He cannot stop as we read in lines 26-27: *ruebat/ flumen ut hibernum fertur quo rara securis* (he rushed on like a river in winter, to which an axe is seldom brought). The simile refers to the wild torrent uprooting trees and thus making an axe superfluous; in other words, Persius went on and on paying his "respect" to Brutus, whose co-operation in settling the case in his favour he badly needed.

²⁴⁷ Anderson (1982, 80-81) makes the same point w. r. t. the last line of S.1.8. I will present my view that I also do not concur with his point w.r.t. S.1.8.50 when I discuss the latter line below.

Then, it is the turn of the man of Praeneste, Rupilius Rex, to set forth his case in lines 28-31:

*tum Praenestinus salso multoque fluenti
expressa arbusto regerit convicia, durus
vindemiator et invictus, cui saepe viator
cessisset magna compellans voce cuculum.*

(Then, in answer to his [Persius'] outpouring of wit, the man of Praeneste hurls back violent abuse pressed from the vineyard, like a vinedresser, tough and invincible, to whom the passer-by would often have yielded when he loudly called "cuckoo.")

Although Rupilius' identity cannot be established with certainty, lines 24-26 and 28-31 may provide some clues. Horace writes in lines 24-25 that Persius calls Brutus' aides "auspicious stars," with the exception of Rex (*stellasque salubris/ appellat comites, excepto Rege*). Thus, Rupilius is a close associate of Brutus, one of the *propraetor's* officials, one of the tax-gatherers. We also read in the lines about Rupilius' reply (S.1.7.28-31) that he is likened to a tough and invincible pruner of vines (*durus/ vindemiator et invictus*). This can also refer to Rupilius Rex being a tax official on the staff of Brutus, in particular responsible for collecting tax with farmers, as Horace writes in lines 25-26 that Rex had come like the Dog-star, hostile to farmers (*excepto Rege; canem illum/ invisum agricolis sidus venisse*). Penniless Rupilius, who was proscribed in 43 B.C., had sought safety in flight to rich Asia where he joined Brutus. Many of the men like Rupilius were tax-gatherers who were expected to raise an agreed amount of money and who could keep the surplus which they managed to extort; in other words, most of them were known to line their own pockets, often with considerable amounts. The reference to a tough and invincible pruner who cuts away excrescent growth may fit the image of the tough tax official who demands excessive taxes of a businessman, who is then forced to have his income cut to an absurd minimum, knowing that he cannot win. The reference to the cuckoo also fits this image. If according to PLIN.Nat.18.249 the pruning of the vines was not done before spring, the farmer was sneered at by passers-by who imitated the cry of the cuckoo.²⁴⁸ The relevance of Horace referring to this rural Italian habit in connection with a tax official may be the deliberate slowness with which the latter was used to do his work. The cause of those delaying tactics may have been the number of cases the

248 Conform Gowers (2012, 260). The text of PLIN.Nat.18.249 is: *In hoc temporis intervallo XV diebus primis agricolae rapienda sunt quibus peragendis ante aequinoctium non suffecerit, dum sciat inde natam exprobrationem foedam putantium vites per imitationem cantus alitis temporariae, quam cuculum vocant* (Meanwhile, in the period of the first fifteen days, the farmer must hurry with the work that he did not finish before the spring equinox; he knows indeed that from that time the base reproach to those who are still pruning their vines comes by someone imitating the cry of a bird of the season called the cuckoo).

official took on in order to maximize his results, or, which is more likely, that the tax collector took his time to put his victims under pressure.

Thus, in my interpretation, Rupilius Rex is a tax official and Persius is one of his victims (either both in real life or fictitious). The court case is about a tax issue, presumably an assessment of Persius by Rex for such an absurd amount that it pruned away the profits of the trader Persius.

The final lines of the poem are often seen as a pun or joke (see note 240), but I intend to show that S.1.7.32-35 is meant to reinforce the message of the poem as a whole. I will explain this message below when I summarize the poem. Lines 32-35, Persius' final outburst, read:

*at Graecus, postquam est Italo perfusus aceto,
Persius exclamat 'per magnos, Brute, deos te
oro, qui reges consuervis tollere, cur non
hunc Regem iugulas? operum hoc, mihi crede, tuorum est.'*

(And the Greek Persius, after his soaking with Italian vinegar, cries out "By the great gods, Brutus, I beg you, who makes a habit of removing kings, why not cut the throat of this Rex? Believe me, this job is just yours.")

Persius, who sees that he has no chance against the combined forces of Rupilius and Brutus, has the last word in the poem. His impertinent outcry looks like a desperate request to punish Rupilius, but is as much a personal attack on Brutus referring both to his part in the murder of Julius Caesar and to the role of his ancestor L. Junius Brutus who sent Tarquinius Superbus into exile in 510 B.C. Horace, however, does not mention what one would like to learn, that is the judgement that Brutus passes. The latter remains as aloof until the end as he was right away from the start of the poem. It seems to me that Horace depicts Brutus, with his pretensions of an Eastern king, not only as not in control of the process in the court allowing Persius' ingratiating, abuse and final personal attack, but also as condoning the actions of Rupilius. Brutus is not only incompetent in upholding the dignity and authority of the Roman *imperium*, but also collaborates with evil forces, such as the men who fill their pockets by extortion.

I concur with Gowers' (2012, 251-252) point that Horace raises in the present poem contemporary political issues of great importance, although I differ from her view with respect to Horace's intention writing S.1.7. She (2012, 251) argues that Horace "takes the bold step of exposing Octavian's Achilles heel, the fact that he was heir to a *rex*," and she poses the question: "Is he [Horace] really able to deflect his readers from the new [Octavian's] tyranny staring them in the face by looking backwards to Brutus, not just the scapegoat but also the republican conscience of Rome." I interpret the poem differently, namely that Horace shows his concern about the instability of the political situation in 36 B.C., and the urgent necessity of strong leadership that Octavian may provide. I will explain this interpretation in the following paragraph.

In summary, one key figure in the poem is M. Brutus, who had usurped the office of *propraetor*, provincial governor with *maius imperium*, that also "covers his judicial

function in the scene [of the *sermo*]” (Gowers, 2012, 258). He set himself up as an Eastern rex considering the flattery of Persius in lines 23-25.²⁴⁹ The other key figures are Persius and Rupilius Rex who had come to Brutus’ court on account of a dispute about taxes. Horace depicts a scene from the past with Brutus presiding over a court session in which the arguments are exchanged in an aggressive manner and in which eventually Persius, one of the litigants, suggests that Brutus settles the matter in a way he was used to: by murdering Rupilius Rex. This humiliating scene was the result of Brutus’ incompetence: seen to be enjoying the sumptuous life of the Eastern court, but not commanding the respect that a Roman official deserves. Brutus was removed at Philippi in 42 B.C., but Horace reminds his audience in this poem six years later (in 38 – 36/35 B.C.) that it’s the same old story over again of a Roman official who lives at the court in Alexandria and whose military and administrative achievements are minimal: Marc Antony’s fiasco in Parthia and his submission to Cleopatra’s ambitions of their own *imperium* in the East are a threat to Rome.²⁵⁰ Further, the enrichment by many officials still prevails in Asia, and nothing is done about it. I suggest that Horace transmits in S.1.7 an implicit message to Maecenas that is meant to show that he supports the political agenda of Octavian, that is that Marc Antony ought to be removed having mismanaged his military and political responsibilities. Horace will return to those issues in the next *sermo*.

Horace returns in **S.1.8** to contemporary events.²⁵¹ He presents in the opening lines the god Priapus, whose statue stands in an old burial ground for the poor on the Esquiline, which was turned into beautiful gardens by Maecenas as part of Octavian’s programme of improving many places in Rome. More about these grounds later. S.1.8.1-7 reads:

*OLIM truncus eram ficulnus, inutile lignum,
cum faber, incertus scamnum faceretne Priapum,
maluit esse deum. deus inde ego, furum aviumque
maxima formido; nam fures dextra coercet
obsconoque ruber porrectus ab inguine palus;
ast importunas volucres in vertice harundo
terret fixa vetatque novis considerare in hortis.*

(Once I was a trunk of a fig-tree, a useless piece of wood, when a carpenter, uncertain whether he should make a stool or a Priapus, chose rather that I should be a god. Since, I am a god, the

²⁴⁹ For Brutus’ office in Asia, see also DuQuesnay (1984, 37); Gowers (2012, 250; 257).

²⁵⁰ My interpretation of S.1.7 is contrary to Buchheit (1968), who interprets the poem as a piece of literary criticism.

²⁵¹ For S.1.8., see Anderson (1982, 74-83); Brown (2007, 169-174); DuQuesnay (1984, 38-39); Gowers (2012, 263-280); Oliensis (1998, 68-70; 72-74); Welch (2001). Tupet (2009, 284-329) gives an extensive outline of Horace and magic in S.1.8. For the strong connection between S.1.8 and Callimachus’s *Iambs* 7 and 9, see Freudenburg (1993, 105-106).

greatest fright for thieves and birds; for thieves are controlled by my right hand and by the red pale extending obscenely from my loins; while the reed stuck to the top of my head frightens the troublesome birds and keeps them from settling down in the new gardens)

Gowers (2012, 266) observes that “Priapus’ new lease of life [from trunk to god] after unpromising beginnings epitomizes not just the reinvigoration of the graveyard and Rome as a whole under Octavian [...], but also H.[orace]’s own salvaged fortunes after the dead end of Philippi.” With respect to S.1.8, I will argue that the poem, like the previous one, shows indeed Horace’s confidence after the salvage of his fortunes. I observed already in the introduction to this section (2.2.4) that in S.1.7 and S.1.8 Horace chooses as his subjects for discussion contemporary major issues. He does this presumably in order to demonstrate that he also has a contribution to make in those fields and again to show that he supports the policies of Octavian and Maecenas. I intend to demonstrate that the major issues are not only about revitalising Rome, but also, and in my view primarily, about issues like the threat of foreign *mores* to Roman society. Magic had not only spread among Rome’s lower classes, but according to Watson (2003, 181) “one of the most striking things about magic at Rome was the degree of penetration which it had attained among the upper classes.”²⁵² Anderson (1982, 75) observes that “the events of Horace’s ‘anecdote’ [in S.1.8] do not arouse much critical interest” and that commentators have not dealt with the poem in its own right, but treated it as anomalous to the other poems in S.1. Anderson sees S.1.8 as carefully composed “with qualities analogous to those of the other Satires in Book I.” In my view, an analysis of the poem within the functional frame will reveal that it is much more than a narrative about gardens, a minor deity and witches, and that Horace discusses indeed major issues. But, let us first consider Priapus’ roles in this.

Priapus, originally a fertility god from Lampsacus (modern Lapseki, opposite Gallipoli) in the Hellespont, became the name-giver of the “Priapic model,” an image for Roman sexual humour. According to Richlin (1992, 58) “the general stance of this figure is that of a threatening male. He is anxious to defend himself by adducing his strength, virility, and (in general) all traits that are considered normal.” His exposed and erect phallus described in line 5 is his chief traditional weapon (see Gowers, 2012, 268-269). I will return to the significance of this characteristic when I discuss the finale of the poem, where Priapus manages to frighten off undesirable visitors without using his traditional weapon. According to Uden (2007, 198), Priapus’ customary position was as a guardian of either vegetable and flower gardens or of tombs.²⁵³ For the first time Priapus has been installed in an elite pleasure garden. He has here also another, new role and that is that of Horace’s spokesman/commentator in one of his *sermones*,

²⁵² For Priapus, see Eitrem (1942, 63-67); Richlin (1992); Uden (2007; 2010). For magic in Rome, see Liebeschuetz (1979, 126-139); Tupet (2009); Watson (2003, 176-182) in his commentary on *Epod.5*.

²⁵³ For Priapus as the image for Roman sexual humour, see Richlin (1992, 57-65; 116-127).

in addition to, as we will see later, that of expelling evil forces, like witches. I concur with what Zetzel (1980, 61) writes about the role of Priapus, namely “as a literary fiction in the context of the book.” I hope to demonstrate at the end of the discussion of S.1.8 that by his choice for Priapus as spokesman Horace connects the events described in the poem with Cleopatra and Marc Antony.

Priapus describes his new environment in lines 8-16. First, he tells us of the history of the site on the Esquiline, which was originally a cemetery for slaves and paupers. The corpse of a slave used to be brought there from their narrow cells (*angustis cellis*) in a cheap coffin (*vili in arca*), arranged by (*locabat*) a fellow-slave (*conservus*) (lines 8-9). Next, Priapus also mentions in lines 10-11 that the site served as (*stabat*) a communal grave (*commune sepulcrum*) for the poor masses (*miseræ plebi*), and for men like the jester Pantolabus and spendthrift Nomentanus (*Pantolabo scurrae Nomentanoque nepoti*).²⁵⁴ Horace shows in line 11 his familiar poor opinion of parasites and spendthrift new rich, who finish up in the gutter and are buried in a cemetery like this. The size of the plot is given in S.1.8.12: *mille pedes in fronte, trecentos in agrum* (thousand feet in frontage, and three hundred in depth) makes twenty six thousand square metres (= 2,6 ha.).²⁵⁵ This line and the next one are a piece of Horatian irony. He writes that the plot has a *cippus* (pillar) that gave to understand that the monument was not to be passed to heirs (*dabat: heredes monumentum ne sequeretur*): a mass grave as a bequest. But, the line precedes nicely the description of the new plot which Maecenas will bequeath to the citizens of Rome. Lines 14-16 read:

*nunc licet Esquiliis habitare salubribus atque
aggere in aprico spatari, quo modo tristes
albis informem spectabant ossibus agrum;*

(Today people may live on a wholesome Esquiline and stroll on the sunny mound, from which recently they had a gloomy view of a plot disfigured with white bones)²⁵⁶

The cleaning-up measures of the old site on the Esquiline were part of the rebuilding and modernizing of Rome by the new regime that was started in 36 B.C. by Octavian and his supporters, among them Maecenas and Agrippa, and to be paid for by the planned military campaigns in the East. The programme held not only the erection of new buildings, but also, as Appian in *Bellum civile*.5.132 (= V.547) mentions, the slaughter of thieves and robbers in 36 B.C. by Sabinus, and Agrippa's expulsion of astrologers and witches from Rome in 33 B.C. Agrippa's activities were described by Cassius Dio (49.43.1 and 49.43.5).²⁵⁷ Thus, Priapus discovers that his task is not to

²⁵⁴ According to Gowers (2012, 270), Pantolabus (“Grab-all”) is “a ‘typical’ comic parasite’s name.” For Nomentanus, whom also figured in S.1.1.102, see note 80.

²⁵⁵ For the calculation of the area I am indebted to Gowers (2012, 270).

²⁵⁶ For the rendering of lines 15 -16, I followed the suggestions of Gowers (2012, 272).

²⁵⁷ For the programme of modernizing Rome and the expelling of witchcraft, see DuQuesnay (1984,

chase away thieves and animals, or to have a chat with promenaders in the pleasant new surroundings, but to remove witches, who have taken over the site. It turns out to be a thankless task. He says in lines 17–22:

*cum mihi non tantum furesque feraeque suetae
hunc vexare locum curae sunt atque labori,
quantum carminibus quae versant atque venenis
humanos animos: has nullo perdere possum
nec prohibere modo, simul ac vaga luna decorum
protulit os, quin ossa legant herbasque nocentis.*

(whereas for me thieves and wild beasts used to disturb this place do not cause me as much care and pain, as those witches who manipulate with spells and love potions human souls: no way I can destroy them or prevent them from collecting bones and harmful herbs, as soon as the wandering moon has brought out her beautiful face)

Priapus recognized the witches; they are repulsive Canidia and her companion.²⁵⁸ In lines 23-26, we learn that Priapus saw them with his own eyes (*vidi egomet*), and he describes the witches in great detail. Canidia walks around with her black cloak tucked up (*nigra succinctam palla*), barefooted (*pedibus nudis*) and with her hair unloosened (*passoque capillo*) filling the place with shrieks (*ululantem*) together with

38-39); Gowers (2012, 264; 271); Watson (2003, 179-180; 2007, 101). Sabinus is perhaps C. Calvisius Sabinus (consul in 39 B.C.). Appian in *Bellum civile*. 5.132 (= V.547 at Étienne-Duplessis, 2013, 110) refers to this as follows: Σαβίνος ὑπὸ Καίσαρος αἰρεθεὶς εἰς διόφθωσιν πολλὴν μὲν εἰργάσατο φθόρον τῶν ἀλισκομένων, ἐνιαυτῷ δ' ὁμως εἰς εἰρήνην ἀφύλακτον ἅπαντα περιήγαγε (Ordered by Caesar to redress the situation Sabinus made a great slaughter of the captured [outlaws], but nevertheless he brought back everywhere peace and quietude). Cassius Dio described Agrippa's activities as follows in 49.43.1 (Freyburger & Roddaz, 1994, 150): Τῷ δ' ὑστέρῳ ἔτει ἀγορανόμος ὁ Ἀγρίππας ἐκὼν ἐγένετο, καὶ πάντα μὲν τὰ οἰκοδομήματα τὰ κοινὰ πάσας δὲ τὰς ὁδοὺς, [...], ἐπεσκεύασε (Agrippa became by his own choice aedile in the next year, and he repaired all public buildings and all roads) and in 49.43.5 (Freyburger & Roddaz, 1994, 151): Ἀγρίππας μὲν δὴ ταῦτά τε ἐποίησε, καὶ τοὺς ἀστρολόγους τοὺς τε γόητας ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἐξήλασεν (Agrippa did not only do this, but he also banished the astrologers and sorcerers from Rome).

258 For Canidia, see Gowers (2012, 273-274); Tupet (2009); see also Henderson (1987, 111; 116); Oliensis (1998, 68-90). Contrary to Gowers (2012, 273), who approvingly quotes Oliensis (1998, 77) that Canidia “exercises sexual control over H.[orace] [...]. Specifically political interpretations may limit what is at heart a sexual battle between female overheatedness and male debility, two spheres which might be merged in the concept of ‘male hysteria under political pressure.’” I will argue below, when I summarize the significance of *Epod.*17 for S.1.8, against the view that Horace had a sexual relationship with Canidia. Gowers and Oliensis miss Horace's use of the first-person *persona* in *Epod.*17. In my view, there is much value in Mankin's (2010, 100) suggestion for the name of Canidia: “her [Canidia's] name seems to point to two associations, with the ‘dog’ (*canis*) and the furiously ‘dogged’ genre of *iambus* (conform *Ep[od].6*), and with ‘old-age’ (*canities*) and the decrepit impotence not only of the poet, but of Rome as it collapses into ruin (*Ep[od].16,1-2*) under the weight of its ancient curse (*Ep[od].7,17-20*).” (*italics* are mine).

her companion Sagana, who is bigger than she (*Sagana maiore*). Their pallor is a dreadful sight (*pallor utrasque/ fecerat horrendas aspectu*).

Then, poor Priapus sees them engaged in those horrible witches' activities, which fill nearly half the poem in lines 26-45. Apparently, Horace wants to impress upon us the terrible wickedness and dangers of black magic. Through the medium of Priapus, he depicts in those lines a scene that could be seen at many places in Rome and in Italy. I will explain below in detail the poet's reason for using the "persona" of Priapus. The latter is a functional reference to Cleopatra and Antony. Horace himself does not feature in the poem, as he wants to get it absolutely clear that he never experienced such a séance, but that he retells what he learned from others. Thus, what Priapus describes in S.1.8.26-45 are the witnesses' tales of the customary forms of black art, such as necromancy and psychedelic experience. Oliensis (1998, 69 note 9) points out that the psychedelic scene of lines 34-35 is "commonplace" black magic "modelled on Jason's supplication of Hecate in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica* 3.1214-1217" suggesting that those kind of hallucinations have their origin in Eastern witch-rituals. The story starts with necromancy in S.1.8.26-29:

*scalpere terram
unguibus et pullam divellere mordicus agnam
coeperunt; cruor in fossam confusus, ut inde
manis elicerent, animas responsa daturas.*

(they began to scrape the ground with their nails and to tear in pieces a black lamb with their teeth; its blood was poured into a trench, that from there they could conjure up the ghosts, souls that would give them answers)

Priapus also alludes to maenadic behaviour (*mordicus*) in S.1.8.27. Then, he describes in the scene of the two dolls both Canidia's efforts to win over by magic a lover and the psychedelic trance. S.1.8.30-36 reads:

*lanea et effigies erat, altera cerea: maior
lanea, quae poenis compesceret inferiorem;
cerea suppliciter stabat servilibus ut quae
iam peritura modis. Hecaten vocat altera, saevam
altera Tisiphonen; serpentis atque videres
infernus errare canis, Lunamque rubentem
ne foret his testis post magna latere sepulcra.*

(there was one image of wool, and another of wax; the woollen one was larger, which could crush the smaller one by its punishments; the waxen one stood in supplication like a figure about to die in the manner of a slave. One witch called on Hecate, the other on savage Tisiphone; one could see serpents and bitches from Hell straying about, and the blushing Moon hiding behind the tall tombs, that she might not witness such deeds)²⁵⁹

²⁵⁹ I owe the rendering of S.1.8.32-33 (*suppliciter.....modis*) to Gowers (2012, 275).

In the “ritual puppet-show” (Oliensis, 1998, 70) of lines 30-33, Priapus sees two images, one of wool and one of wax. The significance of the wool is that it can protect by warding away evil spirits and that of the wax is that the lover can be punished by melting the wax in the flame, also causing the melting of his heart. The larger woollen one stands for Canidia, who aims to win over a reluctant beloved by magic. The smaller waxen one represents the lover, who is dominated by the superior Canidia. The waxen image returns in lines 43-44 when Priapus sees that the fire blazed higher from the waxen image (*et imagine cerea/ largior arserit ignis*). The ritual described does not necessarily refer to Canidia and her reluctant lover, but can also depict her act for a customer of her magic. Contrary to Gowers (2012, 275-276), I interpret the scene of the two dolls (S.1.8.30-33) as Horace’s description of black magic that was a core business of witches aimed at winning over a reluctant lover for which they were handsomely paid. I do not see that Priapus witnesses in those lines “a ‘ritual puppet show’ with voodoo dolls, one administering punishment, the other supplicating, which anticipates the conflict between H.[orace] and Canidia in *Epod.17*” (Gowers, 2012, 275). In the meantime, Hecate, the goddess of witchcraft, and Tisiphone, one of the Furies, are invoked. The psychedelic experience can be recognized in the description of the ghastly creatures like serpents and female hellhounds roaming around frightening the modest moon so much that she hides behind the tombs avoiding the obscene sight. Presumably, the moon does not blush primarily out of modesty, but out of anxiety when she, in a right-thinking mind because she cannot be brought into trance, encounters such harrowing witchery.

Next, Priapus swears to the verity of his story in lines 37-39 imagining his most dreaded fate. The scarecrow Priapus fears that crows befoul his head with their excrements (*merdis caput inquinat albis/ corvorum*), and the guardian of the site Priapus is afraid that the boy Julius, or cissy (*fragilis*) Pediatia or the thief (*fur*) Voranus piss and shit on him (*mictum atque cacatum/ Iulius et fragilis Pediatia furque Voranus*). Because there is a limit to everything for Priapus, he decides in line 40 to cut a long story short (*singula quid memorem*) and he quickly finishes his story in S.1.8.40-45:

*quo pacto alterna loquentes
umbræ cum Sagana resonarent triste et acutum,
utque lupi barbam variae cum dente colubrae
abdiderint furtim terris, et imagine cerea
largior arserit ignis, et ut non testis inultus
horruerim voces Furiarum et facta duarum?*

(how the shades, speaking in turn with Sagana, gave back a sad, shrill sound, how they [the witches] furtively concealed a wolf’s beard and the tooth of a spotted snake in the ground, how

the fire blazed higher from the waxen image, and how as a witness I shuddered with fright at the words and deeds of the two Furies, although I did not go unavenged?)²⁶⁰

Priapus did indeed not enter into a detailed description of the horrible acts of black magic. The two Furies, Canidia and Sagana, spoke with the ghosts they conjured up in lines 28-29, who answered them with sad sounds suggesting that they were not happy souls. Priapus does not tell us what he heard and saw. The wolf's beard and the snake's tooth are the witches' precautions against counterspells. Line 45, when Horace tells us about Priapus' fear and which introduces the final peak of the events, evokes Priapus' fear caused by the psychedelic scene that he just witnessed. We will see in the last five lines of the poem that Priapus gets into a state where he no longer can control his bodily functions. I will return to this point when I discuss S.1.8.46-50. In addition, the foul scene produces not only Priapus' fear, but also radiates a sense of degeneration. Horace wants to indicate that those meetings are out of place in modern civilized Rome, the centre of the world. It is feasible that such stories of degenerate sessions are the result of anti-Egyptian and anti-Eastern propaganda, and that the reality was much healthier. In the latter case, the plans for development of the Esquiline conform to Horace's picture of the future city.

Before discussing the finale of S.1.8, I will first present my understanding of Horace's views on witchcraft as expressed in the poem. Therefore, it is useful at this stage to chart related texts in which he examines the subject. At the time, witchcraft was a very topical issue that concerned the new regime for several reasons. The leadership's unease was not only about the "traditional" black magic and the crime it attracted, ranging from theft and dealing in magic drugs and potions to murder, but also about the resulting sexual debaucheries. In addition, there was apprehension about the foreign influence on Roman society, particularly among the upper classes, of which many were attracted by Cleopatra and Egyptian culture (see also note 252). Horace subscribes to this concern, which is apparent from the fact that, apart from pointing out or alluding to the dangers of black magic in several poems, he mentions Canidia by name not only in S.1.8, but also in S.2.1 and S.2.8, and in *Epod.3*, *Epod.5* and *Epod.17*, which is saying a good deal. In the last lines of S.2.8 – closing the books of *Sermones* – he repeats his view on the hazards of sorcery, when he writes *velut illis/ Canidia adflasset peior serpentibus Afris* (as if Canidia breathed on those, worse than African serpents); he considers Canidia and her black art more dangerous than African serpents, the most menacing of their sort.

In order to gain more insight in Horace's attitude to the dangers of black magic, a poem which he wrote in the same period (38 – 30 B.C.) as S.1.8, should be considered here, namely *Epod.17*.²⁶¹ The *epodos* is particularly important as Horace continues

²⁶⁰ In S.1.8.41, I follow Gowers (2012, 277) with *resonarint* instead of *resonarent* in OCT.

²⁶¹ *Epod.17.1-7* is an echo of the boy's words in *Epod.5.1-10*. Both opening passages are a plea for

in this poem his story of S.1.8. Consequently, if S.1.8 is read together with *Epod.17*, significant indications about the meaning of S.1.8. can be found, as the *epodos* contains many echoes of the *sermo*. *Epod.17* refers back to S.1.8 in several ways. *Epod.17.8-18* is a catalogue of Canidia's activities on the Esquiline. *Epod.17.8-10* alludes to magic healing. *Epod.17.11-14* describes Hector's body given up to birds of prey and wild dogs (*addictum feris/ alitibus atque canibus*) alluding again to Canidia's activity on the funeral site at the Esquiline. *Epod.17.15-18* depicts how the arch-witch Circe permitted Odysseus' men to have their mind and voice returned (*mens et sonus/ relapsus*) alluding to a psychedelic experience by Odysseus' comrades.²⁶² Next, Horace refers back to S.1.8, when Canidia says to him in *Epod.17.56-59*:

*inultus ut tu riseris Cotyttia
vulgata, sacrum liberi Cupidinis,
et Esquilini pontifex venefici
impune ut Urbem nomine implevis meo?*

(will you be unrevenged for ridiculing Cotytto's festival that you made known to all, the sacred act of free Love, and will you, the high priest of magic Esquiline, be without fear of punishment for filling Rome with my name?)

These lines give Canidia's reply to Horace's appeal that she stops tormenting, but they also refer to Priapus' words in S.1.8. *Epod.17.56* is an echo of the words of Priapus in S.1.8. 44-45 when he said *et ut non testis inultus/ horruerim voces Furiarum et facta duarum* (and how as a witness I shuddered with fright at the words and deeds of the two Furies, although I did not go unavenged). Further, Canidia mentions in the above passage that she celebrated Cotytto's festival at the Esquiline, a deity of Thracian origin related to Artemis-Bendis, whose rites were secret licentious activities "characterized by extreme wantonness" (Watson, 2003, 573).²⁶³ However, according to Watson (2003, 573) "it seems unlikely that the goddess was ever worshipped in Rome, which may account for the unusual account given by Horace." In my opinion, *Epod.17* and S.1.8 can also be understood that Cotytto was indeed worshipped in Rome, but that Horace gives a fictitious story in both poems. Other references to Greek mythical sorcerers and sorceresses in *Epod.17* are also relevant to our understanding of S.1.8, as those relate to what Horace regards as Eastern barbarism threatening traditional Roman values.²⁶⁴ We find Telephus, Circe, Nessus' blood, and others.²⁶⁵

mercy to Canidia and in both the word *per* is repeated three times invoking gods and books (*libros*) in the former and gods and children (*liberos*) in the latter passage. Conform Mankin (1995, 274).

262 For the passages from *Epod.17*, see also Mankin (1995, 275-278). For Circe, see Tupet (2009).

263 For Cotyttia, see Watson (2003, 572-573).

264 For the Eastern origins of magic, see Liebeschuetz (1979, 130-133).

265 Lowrie (2009a, 108-110) discusses *Epod.17* from a different perspective, that is "what poetry can and cannot do" to change Canidia's reputation, i.e. the power of poetry over magic. This subject is rather far removed from my focus.

So far the examination of *Epod.17* as a sequel to *S.1.8*. A second issue that needs our attention is that of Horace speaking directly in *Epod.17* – in the first person singular – to Canidia pleading that she stops tormenting him with her magic. It seems that, in the words of Mankin (1995, 278), Horace recites in *Epod.17* “his sufferings, admits his fault in doubting Canidia’s power, and asks how he can end his torment.” Words like *dedi satis superque poenarum tibi* (I have suffered enough and more than enough punishment by you) in *Epod.17.19*, and the examples of the physical and mental effects of his suffering, such as in *Epod.17.21 fugit iuventas et verecundus color* (my youth and modest complexion have disappeared), *nullum ab labore me reclinat otium* (no peace releases me from my suffering) in line 24, and other lines suggest that Horace refers to himself. Next, Horace bewails in a long passage, *Epod.17.27-52*, the lack of prospect of better times, and asks what *he* must do to make her stop torturing *him*; he says in line 45: *et tu, potes nam, solve me dementia* (and you, because you can do it, set me free from my madness). Towards the end of this passage, he attempts to coax Canidia into ceasing her evil actions. For example, in lines 47-48 he refers back again to the scene on the Esquiline, promising that he could say that she is not the kind of old woman who cleverly disturbs the recently buried ashes in the graves of the poor (*neque in sepulcris pauperum prudens anus/ novendialis dissipare pulveres*), while we know from *S.1.8* that this is precisely what she did. Canidia’s triumphant reply in *Epod.17.53-81* seems to suggest that Horace is the loser in the confrontations with the sorceress: her black art will win. But the final line, *Epod.17.81*, throws a different light on this. Canidia asks the rhetorical question *plorem artis in te nil agentis exitus?* (should I weep over the results of my art since it has no effect on you?). Horace says by means of Canidia’s words that her art does not accomplish anything against him, thus that he is not a loser but that she may come off the loser.

Thus, Horace imagines in *Epod.17* his final confrontation with Canidia; it is final as she does not return in his poetry after *S.2.8* and *Epod.17*. He wrote the *epodos* in the first person and although he seems obsessed by the power of Canidia’s magic, I assert that he did not intend to intimate that he personally suffered by her magic. I mentioned already in section 1.3.1 (“Autobiography in Horace’s poetry”) his use of the first-person *persona* in *Epod.17* by which Horace does not relate real-life experiences with the evil witch, but uses the form of the first-person *persona* as a functional reference to the generally known activities of witches and the destructive consequences of their art to Roman society.

This also relates to the questions, discussed by several scholars, whether Horace either was perhaps Canidia’s lover, or at least participated in the witches’ sessions of wild love-making to an unknown woman, not Canidia.²⁶⁶ Concerning the first question whether Horace was Canidia’s lover, Mankin (1995, 277) states that in *Epod.17.15-18*

²⁶⁶ For the relationship between Horace and Canidia and a broader exposé of Horace’s misogyny, see Oliensis (1998, 68-90).

“H.[orace] may be implying that he has slept with Canidia.” I will explain below that I concur with the contrary view as expressed by Watson (2003, 534) that “it has become almost an article of faith that the agonies which the poet describes so graphically in *Epode* 17 are the pangs of love [...]. This is a misconception. Nowhere in the *Epode* is there any suggestion that Canidia desires Horace to fall in love with her.” Concerning the second question that Horace participated in a witches’ session, we saw that Canidia indeed refers in *Epod.*17.58 to him as the high priest of magic Esquiline, which may suggest that he was a participant in rather than an observer of the events on the Esquiline. In his commentary on line 58, Watson (2003, 573-574) states that the words *Esquilini pontifex venefici*

may be understood in two ways, of which the first seems superior: (1) far from being merely, as he would have us believe, an *observer* of the magical ceremonies on the Esquiline, Horace is a participant, in fact their leading spirit (*pontifex*), an impertinent and outrageous accusation, but one to which knowledgeable opponents of magic have always been liable. (2) [...]: in condemning Canidia’s magic rites, Horace has improperly arrogated to himself one of the functions of the *pontifices*, [...] The first explanation seems preferable, as more linguistically straightforward.

I concur with Watson who does not interpret the events on the *Esquiline* as described in S.1.8 and *Epod.*17 as historic with Horace as participant, but who sees him as a “knowledgeable opponent of magic.”²⁶⁷ However, I do not support the view of Oliensis (1998, 77) writing about *Epod.*17, who from a different perspective points at the misogyny of the *Epodi* “which attributes the decline of Rome to the sexual misconduct of Roman women. [...] But it would be a mistake to reduce the sexual epodes to allegories or moralizing diagnoses of the contemporary political scene. [...] Horace is not a detached analyst of current events but an enmeshed participant.”²⁶⁸ Gowers (2012, 273), writing about S.1.8.24, states that “she is vilified for being repulsive, but exercises sexual control over H.[orace].”

Although issues of extreme wantonness in female and male sexuality are at stake in both S.1.8 and in what Oliensis calls the “sexual epodes,” it is my opinion that several arguments of different nature can be raised against both the first view that Canidia “exercises sexual control over H.[orace],” and against the second view that the real Horace was an “enmeshed participant.” With respect to the first view, I contend that the emphasis in Canidia’s fictitious reply in *Epod.*17 is not that Horace was her lover, but on the damage he did in the fictitious story of S.1.8 to her reputation of a

²⁶⁷ For the tendency of outrageously accusing opponents, see Watson (2003, 574) who refers to CIC. *Sest.*17.39 for evidence of “a comparable piece of malicious exaggeration.” The text in *pro Sestio* relates to P. Clodius who, accused of spying upon the *Bona Dea* rites, was called by Cicero *stupratorum sacerdos* (a priest of debauchery). In the same line he was further characterized by Cicero as *sororis adulter* (his sister’s lover), *veneficus* (sorcerer), *testamentarius* (forger of wills), *sicarius* (assassin) and *latro* (bandit).

²⁶⁸ For the immorality of Roman women as a cause of the evils of the Roman world, see Liebeschuetz (1979,92-94).

sorceress.²⁶⁹ Concerning the view that Horace was a participant, I assert firstly that Canidia reproaches Horace that he ridiculed Cotytto's rites of free love, which also indicates that he was not a member of a party who revelled wantonly in those acts of free love. Secondly, there are no indications in Horace's other poems that he suffered the physical and mental effects of his putative active participation as described in *Epod.17*, such as sudden ageing (*Epod.17.21*): the reduced vitality described in line 21 exemplifies that of the victims of black magic in Rome and Italy in general. Nor are there indications that Horace did not find release from suffering (*Epod.17.24*) and that he suffered from a trauma (*Epod.17.25-26*), as he continued to have the peace of mind to work and write: the lack of respite and the trauma illustrate again in general the mental burden that the victims of the witches have to bear. Thirdly, Canidia tells Horace in *Epod.17.53-81* that she will have her revenge in an incoherent outburst, that suggests that she suffered from a deranged mind, possibly under the influence of one of her potions. Horace implies by means of this reaction to his appeal that he was right to have made known to all her wicked sorcery by his disclosure of her imagined activities upon the Esquiline in *S.1.8*. The narration, of her real or fictitious activities symbolizes the dangers of the many real magic rites in Rome at the time. Finally, there is also no reason to suppose that Horace had knowledge of the excesses of magic rites in Rome as a result of personal participation; he could have learned about those from the discussions of the subject with his companions or simply from hearsay. It is reasonable to expect that the theme of *S.1.8* and that of *Epod.17* match the context of Horace's disquiet about the growing Eastern influence on matters of mental culture caused by, among other matters, the involvement of individuals in Eastern forms of witchcraft, for example those of Cotytto, a deity of Thracian origin.

In summary, the above evidence shows that Horace voices in *Epod.17* the generally felt concern caused by the widespread sorcery that appeared to still be ongoing in Rome as if the measures taken seem to had no effect. Horace himself is not a participant in those sexual games, and it is feasible that his Canidia stories are poetic fiction. This is not to say that the kind of sessions described did not take place in Rome, but it is not unlikely that what we read is the result of hearsay. Horace suffers metaphorically and by substitution the mental and physical torments of the victims of sorcery, and I concur with Mankin's (1995, 273) statement that "this suggests that Epode 17, like the other Canidia poems, is another symbolic representation of the curse afflicting both individual and city."

Returning to *S.1.8*, we left Priapus a few lines before the finale of the poem. The last lines have a great surprise in store for us. He tells in *S.1.8.46-50*, that he let a mighty fart with the noise of a bladder bursting, splitting his figwood bottom in two

269 For the emphasis in Canidia's reply, see also Watson (2003, 534): "Nowhere in the *Epode* is there any suggestion that Canidia desires Horace to fall in love with her: her intention rather is to take revenge upon him for mocking her publicly."

(*nam displosa sonat quantum vesica pepedi/ diffissa nate ficus*), which produced the desired result.²⁷⁰ The witches ran off to the city (*at illae currere in urbem*), with Canidia losing her false teeth and Sagana her high wig (*Canidiae dentis, altum Saganae caliendrum/ excidere*) and both their herbs and enchanted love-knots (*incantata vincula*) falling from their arms (*excidere lacertis*). It made a very funny showpiece (*cum magno risuque iocoque videres*). The interpretations of the unusual method with which Priapus frightens the witches away differ considerably. In line 5, Priapus' erect phallus is presented as his chief weapon to frighten undesirable visitors, while in the end a fart brings about the witches' flight. I suggested above that Horace emphasizes in Priapus' words of S.1.8.40-45, which is the passage just before the "fart" passage, the deranged state of Priapus' mind and loss of control of his bodily functions due to his psychedelic experience. Letting off the fart demonstrates the loss of control. Anderson (1982, 79-81) argues that in S.1.8 the poisons of the witches "remind us of the poisonous invective of lampoons and the Lucilian tradition," and that Priapus after his fart "invites us to laugh at the comic discomfiture of the witches." In other words, Anderson says that the end of S.1.8 is like S.1.7.22 and S.1.7.33-35 (see also note 247), about which he concluded earlier that it appears from the laughter that Horace dramatizes a basic theme of his satiric disagreement with Lucilius, that is "that simple laughter achieves more than spiteful invective." It seems to me that it is unlikely that S.1.8 is aimed at Lucilius. First, the phallus is specifically connected with the Priapic tradition and not with Lucilius, and farting is a "reversal of the traditional phallic one, but equally combative" (Hallett, 1981, 342; Gowers, 2012, 279). Second, as I will argue below, the context of the poem is the increased concern about black magic in Rome. I concur with Gowers' (2012, 279) statement that "the fart has the desired effect of sending the witches packing with a *gesture of contempt*."²⁷¹ Priapus' fart and the laughter of line 50 not only symbolize Horace's contempt for witchcraft and witches, but also ridicule the witches. In addition, the passage expresses his scorn for the many in Rome and Italy who keep their perpetrators in their profitable business. I will argue below that Horace's objective was not to make a statement about Lucilian invective, but that in the present poem he focuses on serious contemporary political issues.

I have already mentioned in the discussion of the opening, that Horace connects the events described in the poem with Cleopatra and Marc Antony by his choice of Priapus as narrator of the story and Canidia as the chief culprit. Horace, like he did in S.1.7, introduces again the opposition East-West with the roles he gave those two. Although a functional reference generally applies to one person or one event only, this is slightly different in this case. Here I interpret Priapus as a functional reference to both Cleopatra and Marc Antony and their liaison. Priapus, the mythical son of Dionysus and Aphrodite, played an important role in the cult of Dionysus in Hellenistic

²⁷⁰ For Priapus' fart, see Gowers (2012, 278-279); Hallett (1981).

²⁷¹ *Italics* are mine.

Egypt. Aphrodite refers to Cleopatra, who had been introduced in Rome as equal to Isis/Aphrodite, when she joined Julius Caesar there in 46 B.C. as the queen of Egypt. Dionysus refers to Antony, who let himself be applauded as the New Dionysus during his campaigns in Asia. When Antony ordered Cleopatra to meet him in Tarsus in 41 B.C. to discuss her contribution to the war effort, she made a magnificent entry on board of her ship as Aphrodite/Venus, the ancestress of the Julian house whose statue was still in the temple of Venus Genetrix in Rome. Schäfer (2006, 125-128) points out that a Hellenistic statue was found in Pompeii of Venus leaning on a statuette of Priapus.²⁷² Thus, the figure of Priapus in S.1.8 was easily recognized by the readers of the poem as referring to both Antony and Cleopatra. Plutarch (*Ant.*25, 1-2) writes about the meeting in Tarsus that an intelligent contemporary as Q. Dellius immediately saw the power of Cleopatra.²⁷³ He understood that she captured men not only by her beauty or by sexual attraction, but mostly by her intelligence paired with her determination to be queen of a powerful empire. During the meeting in Tarsus she floored Antony with a grandiose show of her luxurious taste, her intelligence and social skills. This was the start of a twelve-year relationship that lasted until their deaths in 30 B.C. In the winter of 41 B.C. Cleopatra brought Antony to Alexandria. Plinius the Elder in his *Naturalis Historia* (*Nat.*9, 119-121) described the extravagant feasts and meals at the queen's court, and Plutarch (*Ant.*28 and 29) does not omit to portray the Roman prejudices concerning the extravagance, waste and decadence of the court in Alexandria, as Antony indulged with enthusiasm in Cleopatra's favours. Increasingly Cleopatra took over control of political affairs.²⁷⁴ Plutarch (*Ant.*60.1) hints that Antony was dazed by (Cleopatra's?) narcotics, as he mentions that when Octavian decided in 32 B.C. to wage war against Cleopatra, he said "that Antony was not master of himself as he was under the influence of drugs (*ὑπὸ φαρμάκων*).” Plutarch (*Ant.*61,3–62,1) also writes that the territories in the East stood opposed to those in the West, and he leaves no doubt that Cleopatra was the leader.

We saw that Horace also alludes in *Epod.*17 to Eastern mythical sorcerers and sorceresses and to Cotytto's festival at the Esquiline, a deity of Thracian origin related to Artemis-Bendis, whose rites were secret licentious activities characterized by extreme wantonness. Thus, in this *Sermo* and in the last *Epodos*, both written a few

272 Statue of Venus in the Museo Nazionale di Napoli Inv. 152798; see also Schäfer (2006, 305 note 11). For Cleopatra and Marc Antony in Alexandria, see Schäfer (2006, 121-137); Weeda (2010, 108).

273 For Quintus Dellius, see *HOR.Carm.*2,3.

274 For Antony's luxurious life at Alexandria, see also Griffin (2004, 41); Schäfer (2006, 134-137; 185-187). My interpretation of S.1.8 as a highly political poem in which Horace reveals the increasing influence of Cleopatra on Antony in matters of strategic policy is contrary to the view of Griffin (1993, 7) who states that "to give this rather laboured squib [S.1.8] a political thrust, it must be argued that the poem 'deals with the transformation of the burial ground on the Esquiline into the magnificent *horti* of Maecenas', [quoting DuQuesnay, 1984, 38] 'reminding us of the benefit which Maecenas has conferred upon the city by ridding it of such nuisances'."

years before Actium, Horace writes about sorcery and alludes by means of Priapus to Cleopatra, who held sway over Antony and many Romans through Eastern sorcery and magic. Horace shows in S.1.8 and in *Epod.17* that he considered sorcery and magic, that had penetrated both the lower and upper classes of Roman society more than was sound, to be dangerous for Rome. The connection with Cleopatra suggests the danger of all the dark eastern forces which could demolish Roman values, not just by sorcery but also by possible military and political action by Cleopatra and Antony. A substantial part of the Roman elite allied to the Egyptian queen and Antony would not be helpful in the event of a military action by the two. Added to this, at the time of writing of S.1.8 black magic was also associated with the followers of Sextus Pompey, as Pliny the Elder writes in *PLIN.Nat.7.178*. Tupet (2009, 328-329) recognizes that Horace's condemnation of magic is also a political statement. She (2009, 328) writes "Horace, en écrivant ces poèmes sur la magie, a donc servi la politique impériale. Mais on ne peut lui dénier une part de sincérité personnelle (Therefore, Horace aided the imperial policy, when he wrote these poems about magic. But, one cannot deny him an element of personal frankness)." I interpret her words that she does not suggest that Horace wrote S.1.8 as part of Octavian's propaganda. I concur with her view because there are many indications that Horace came independently to his view about the dangers of magic, which happened to correspond with those of the political leadership.²⁷⁵

In conclusion, I will summarize first S.1.7, followed by a summary of both S.1.7 and S.1.8 as Horace raises, apart from specific issues in each poem, in both the same strategic issues. Specifically, in S.1.8, Horace calls attention to the dangers of sorcery and magic not only for the mental and physical health of those who take part in it, but also for the growing Eastern influence sapping the fortitude of Rome. It is likely that he therefore also supported the formation by Maecenas of "some kind of precursor of the Vigiles, a sort of police force cum fire service" (DuQuesnay, 1984, 38), who could deal with the witches' activities.²⁷⁶ Most likely he supported Maecenas' transformation

275 Part of *PLIN.Nat.7.178* reads: *bello Siculo Gabienus, Caesaris classium fortissimus, captus a Sexto Pompeio, iussu eius insica cervice [...], uti Pompeius ad se veniret aut aliquem ex arcanis mitteret; se enim ab inferis remissum habere quae nuntiaret. misit plures Pompeius ex amicis* (During the Sicilian war, Gabienus, the bravest man of Caesar's fleet, was captured by Sextus Pompey, who ordered to cut his throat [...], that Pompey should come to him [Gabienus] or that he should send one of his trustworthy men; because he was sent back from the underworld with a message. Pompey sent a number of his friends). For Sextus Pompey and black magic, see also DuQuesnay (1984, 38-39); Liebeschuetz (1979, 119-139); Watson (2007, 101): "a push in the 30s by Octavian and his ministers to stamp out magic, and simultaneous attempts to brand Sextus Pompey and his followers as devotees of necromancy (significantly, Canidia is shown practising this in the contemporaneous *Satires I*)." For the "push to stamp out magic," see also note 257.

276 Acc. to Cassius Dio (49.16.2) (Freyburger & Roddaz, 1994, 126): "One Gaius Maecenas, a knight, took care of the remaining matters in Rome and in the rest of Italy, both then and for a long time afterward" (τά τε ἄλλα τὰ ἐν τῇ πόλει τῇ τε λοιπῇ Ἰταλίᾳ Γαίος τις Μακίνας, ἀνὴρ ἵππεύς, καὶ τότε καὶ

of the Esquiline, and the final lines can be read as complimenting Maecenas on his efforts: the witches are a good riddance. The strategic issues referred to in both poems are the threat from Parthia and Egypt, and the alliance between Cleopatra and Marc Antony. Horace alludes in both to the latter's submission to Cleopatra. In S.1.7, he implicitly reproaches Antony with his mismanagement of his military and political responsibilities, and in S.1.8 with his compliance with Cleopatra's aspirations to create her own *imperium* in the East. Horace transmits in both the message to Maecenas that he supports the political agenda of Octavian, that is that Marc Antony ought to be removed, and that he takes Octavian's side in the struggle for power against Antony.

2.2.5 *Sermones* 1.9 and 1.10: Maecenas' Circle: No Place for Nouveau Riche. Horace's Literary Programme for Several Genres; the Literary Schools Revisited

Having attended to weighty matters as the state of the *imperium* and the future of the conflict between Octavian and Antony in the previous two poems, Horace returns in **S.1.9** to the central issue of the state of his relationships with Maecenas.²⁷⁷ He pursues in the present poem the subjects that he described in S.1.5 and S.1.6., that is his appreciation of being admitted to the circle of Maecenas and his contentment with his achievements so far. I noted already briefly in section 2.2.3 at the conclusion of my analysis of S.1.5 that the fifth and the present *sermo* also have much in common in structure. Both poems describe a journey, albeit the one in S.1.5 from Rome to Brundisium is much longer than the stroll in Rome in S.1.9. Gowers (2012, 305) notes already that both poems were written with "humour with a light touch." In addition, I note that the opening lines of the two poems are also somewhat similar: S.1.5.1 reads *EGRESSUM magna me accepit Aricia Roma* (After I left mighty Rome, Aricia took me in) and S.1.9.1 is *IBAM forte via Sacra, sicut meus est mos* (I happened to be strolling along the Via Sacra, as I am used to). Further, both poems are also concerned with meeting people, both strangers and friends. For example, in S.1.5.34-36 the meeting with pompous local dignitary Aufidius Luscus is recorded, and in S.1.5.51-70 that with vulgar Sarmentus, whom he sees as a parasite. Horace writes about those strangers in a condescending manner, not wanting to be associated with them in any way. I hope to demonstrate in the coming analysis of S.1.9 that this is very similar to Horace's response to the impertinent fellow who dominates the scene in this poem. With respect to friends, he expressed in S.1.5.39-44 the joy of his association with his colleagues, Virgil, Varius and Plotius. We will see in S.1.9.60-74 first his delight

ἔπειτα ἐπὶ πολὺ διώκησεν).

²⁷⁷ For S.1.9 in general, see Anderson (1982, 84-102); Buchheit (1968); Cloud (1989, 65-67); Connors (2005, 133-135); Courtney (1994); (Gowers (2012, 280-304); Henderson (1993); Mazurek (1997); McGann (1973); Musurillo (1964); Oliensis (1998, 37-39); Rooy van (1972); (Rudd, 2007, 74-85); Welch (2001).

and relief when his dear friend Fuscus Aristius arrives (*Fuscus Aristius occurrit, mihi carus*), but afterwards his disappointment when Fuscus fails to come to his rescue.

The similarity in theme between S.1.6 and S.1.9 appears for example in S.1.6.122-123 with the enjoyment he finds in his intellectual pursuits of reading and writing. The style of the narration in the opening line of S.1.9 also recalls the words at the end of the sixth *sermo*: in S.1.6.122 he stays in bed till ten o'clock (*ad quartam iaceo*) and then takes a stroll (*post hanc vagor*), and in S.1.6.128-129 he states that the life he enjoys is only for those who are released from burdensome and pitiable ambition (*haec est/ vita solutorum misera ambitione gravique*).

When I discussed S.1.5, I argued that I consider the events described in the poem as examples of Horace's poetic fiction. In my view, there are several arguments for also interpreting the stroll and the confrontation with the impertinent fellow of S.1.9 as such. Firstly, the analogy of structure and theme between the fifth and the ninth *sermo* suggests that Horace worked in the same pattern. Secondly, as I briefly indicated in the introduction of S.1.5, the objective of those two poems was primarily to present to Maecenas his views on their relationship. I explained in the analysis of the fifth *sermo* that Horace gave those views by using the form of the first-person *persona* (Horace) who presents himself as engaged in fictitious events. This way Horace could arrange an informal setting for the interchange of views and Maecenas could choose whether to react or only to listen.

S.1.9 starts with a description of one of the pleasures of his life in the city, that links closely with the words of the closing lines of S.1.6: he is released from burdensome and pitiable ambition. The first words of S.1.9 express that he has the opportunity to be more pleasantly occupied. S.1.9.1-2 reads:

*IBAM forte via Sacra, sicut meus est mos,
nescio quid meditans nugarum, totus in illis.*

(I happened to be strolling along the Via Sacra, as I am used to, pondering some trifling matters, totally absorbed in thought)

Then in S.1.9.3-5, Horace is roughly roused by a man whom he only knows by name running up to him and grasping his hand (*occurrit quidam notus mihi nomine tantum,/ arreptaque manu*), and who says to him "how are things, dear chap?" (*quid agis, dulcissime rerum?*). Horace replies curtly "fine at the moment, and all the best to you" (*suaviter, ut nunc est, inquam, et cupio omnia quae vis.*). However, Horace was not well rid of the man that easily. S.1.9.6-8 reads:

*cum adsectaretur, 'num quid vis?' occupo. at ille
'noris nos' inquit; 'docti sumus.' hic ego 'pluris
hoc' inquam 'mihi eris.'*

(as he kept following me, I got in first "nothing else you want, is there?" And he said "you should become acquainted with me; I am a poet." And to this I said "so much the better")

In lines 8-13 Horace desperately tries to shake off the pest (*misere discedere quaerens*), starts to quicken his leisurely pace (*ire modo ocius*), stops now and then (*interdum consistere*), and whispers something or other in his slave-boy's ear (*in aurem/ dicere nescio quid puero*) without telling us what he whispers. The sweat stands in his shoes (*cum sudor ad imos/ manaret talos*; literally: while the sweat trickled down to the lower parts of my ankles). He kept grumbling to himself (*aiebam tacitus*) "Bolanus, happy in your hot temper" ('*o te, Bolane, cerebri/ felicem!*').²⁷⁸ Bolanus is unknown, but Gowers (2012, 286) suggests that he perhaps was "a satirist with a more open style of operation." Horace tells us in S.1.9.12-13 that the pest goes on burbling about all kinds of things, but Horace mentions in particular his praise for the quarters of the city and the whole of Rome (*cum quidlibet ille/ garriret, vicos, urbem laudaret*), presumably referring to Octavian's refurbishing programme. Horace decides that the best way to get rid of the man is to give him the cold shoulder. In lines 13-21 the pest shows himself in his true colours: stubbornly persistent he clings to Horace, who initially refuses to reply (*ut illi/ nil respondebam*). The man, however, reads Horace's mind saying in S.1.9.14-16:

*'misere cupis' inquit 'abire;
iamdudum video: sed nil agis; usque tenebo;
persequare hinc quo nunc iter est tibi.'*

(he said "you desperately want to go away; I saw that a long time ago. But it's no use, I'll keep with you all the way; I'll stay with you from here to the end of your journey.")

Horace breaks his silence, perhaps with a white lie or telling the pest the real purpose of his stroll: a social call. In lines 16-18 he says "there is no need for you to make a detour" (*'nil opus est te/ circumagi'*). He is planning to visit a sick man, whom the pest does not know, a long way off across the Tiber (*'quendam volo visere non tibi notum:/ trans Tiberim longe cubat is'*). The reference '*prope Caesaris hortos*' ("near Caesar's gardens") suggests that Horace's (probably fictitious) patient lived in or near to the quarter of modern Trastevere. The gardens left by Julius Caesar to the people of Rome were on the hill called *Janiculum* (modern Gianicolo) on the right bank of the Tiber, near Trastevere. However, Horace's poor excuse does not put the impertinent fellow off, making the poet at his wits' end. S.1.9.19-21 reads:

*'nil habeo quod agam et non sum piger: usque sequar te.'
demitto auriculas, ut iniquae mentis asellus,
cum gravius dorso subiit onus.*

("I have nothing to do and I am not averse to walking; I'll stay with you all the way." My ears drooped, like an unwilling donkey's, when it has got a load too heavy for its back)

278 I follow Gowers' (2012, 286) rendering of *cerebri felicem*.

Instead of dropping his plan, the fellow even goes so far as to display his poetic and artistic qualities. S.1.9.21-25 reads:

incipit ille:

*'si bene me novi non Viscum pluris amicum,
non Varium facies: nam quis me scribere pluris
aut citius possit versus? quis membra movere
mollius? invideat quod et Hermogenes ego canto.'*

(he began: "If I know myself well, you will not regard Viscus or Varius more as a friend than me: for who can write more verses than I, or write faster? Who can dance more gently? And my singing makes even Hermogenes envious")

The pest could not have done worse. He mentions the wrong people or qualities. L. Varius Rufus is indeed a good friend of Horace, whom he mentioned already in S.1.5.40 as one of the friends on the journey to Brundisium and in S.1.6.55 as the friend who together with Virgil introduced him to Maecenas. He will mention Varius seven more times in his work, often in the same breath with Virgil. Although one of the Visci brothers or both also belonged to the circle of Maecenas, nothing certain is known of them, but there are no indications that Horace ranks him or them as a special friend.²⁷⁹ The fellow makes a serious mistake with respect to Horace by placing himself above Virgil for Horace's affection. The fellow's next assertion that he can write verses fast and many is also a fundamental error in Horace's eyes. He obviously did not read what Horace wrote about Lucilius in S.1.4.9-10: Lucilius was faulty, in an hour he would often dictate two hundred lines standing on his head [lit. standing on one foot = with great ease], as though it were a big deal (*nam fuit hoc vitiosus: in hora saepe ducentos, / ut magnum, versus dictabat stans pede in uno*). And finally, Horace should not be reminded of the despicable Hermogenes who was described by the poet in S.1.3 as a hypocrite very able to change sides, eventually probably to Sextus Pompey.

Maecenas will immediately recognise that the impertinent fellow is not "one of them." The fellow seems to demonstrate that he does not know Horace and his friends at all and that he projects an image of Horace and his associates that does not correspond to reality. However, if one reads the poem from the perspective of his credentials for Maecenas, it is likely that Horace wrote the passage of S.1.9.21-25 with intent to prepare the ground for the (fictitious) dialogue between Horace and the fellow in S.1.9.43-60. In that case, the design of the poem is that Horace lets the pest, an outsider, describe Maecenas' circle as a group that is nothing more than an ordinary collection of people, who spend their time dancing and singing and are

²⁷⁹ L.Varius Rufus is mentioned in S.1.10.44, 81; S.2.8.21, 63, *Ep.*2.1.247, *Ars.*55, *Carm.*1.6.1, of which four times together with Virgil. The Viscus brothers are mentioned in S.1.10.83 and Viscus Thurinus in S.2.8.20. White (see note 45) mentions the Visci as belonging to the circle of Maecenas.

interested in nothing else. This gives first-person *persona* Horace the opportunity to communicate to Maecenas in lines 43-60 that he feels that he belongs to a circle of high intellectual and artistic repute. He says in lines 48-49 that the members of the group do not live as the pest thinks they do, and that their standards are higher than those of similar circles or of those in a patron/client arrangement. All this points again to a poem, in which the scene of the stroll, the pest accosting, and the visit to the court are poetic fiction.

Then, Horace seizes his chance to regain the initiative (*interpellandi locus hic erat*). In lines 26-27 he poses the question “do you have a mother or kinsmen, who are concerned for your well-being?” (*est tibi mater,/ cognati, quis te salvo est opus?*). Horace rebukes the fellow in the form of an apparently innocent question, that can be understood as a way of saying “clear out, go and annoy your relatives, they may be impressed by your superior qualities.” Horace hopes that this may send the bore packing, but the latter either ignores the question or is too dense to understand the point. He gives a straight answer in lines 27-28 “not one. I buried them all” (*haud mihi quisquam;/ omnis composui.*). Horace tries again: “Lucky they are; now I’m next” (*felices! nunc ego resto*).

In lines 29-34, Horace shows his frustration that the bore clings to him and instead of enjoying his future days with Maecenas and his companions, he sees for his mind’s eye a future with this impertinent fellow with perhaps many more of those in his trail: a fate worse than death. This reminds him of a prophecy from his boyhood. S.1.9.29-34 reads:

*‘confice; namque instat fatum mihi triste, Sabella
quod puero cecinit divina mota anus urna:
hunc neque dira venena nec hosticus auferet ensis,
nec laterum dolor aut tussis, nec tarda podagra;
garrulus hunc quando consumet cumque: loquaces,
si sapiat, vitet, simul atque adoleverit aetas.’*

(“finish me off; for the grim fate hangs over me, which an old Sabellian woman, shaking her prophetic urn, prophesied to me when I was a boy: ‘no dreadful poisons or hostile sword, no pleurisy or cough or slow-footed gout shall kill him. But a garrulous man will devour him at some time or other. If he be wise, let him avoid the loquacious as soon as he matures in age.’”)

The prophecy in lines 31-34 was given to Horace by an old Sabellian woman when he was a boy. Horace is rightly terrified as he thinks that he has now met “the garrulous man [who] will devour him,” namely the pushy fellow who does not stop talking. We saw in the discussion about Horace’s origins in section 1.3.1 that Williams (1995, 301-304) presents the interesting proposition that Horace was not born in Venusia itself, but somewhere in the region. I quoted Williams (1995, 303) that “the poet regards himself as belonging to one of the pre-Roman Sabellian tribes.” Williams (1995, 301) specifically refers to S.1.9.29, when he says:

Horace specifically represents himself as a Sabellian. Hence the terrifying prophecy given to him as a child that he suddenly remembers when he cannot escape from the pushy social climber (neither poison nor sword nor illness will be the end of him, only a compulsive talker); this prophecy was given to him by an old Sabellian woman.

Williams supports his proposition by also referring to Horace meeting the jurist C. Trebatius Testa in S.2.1. His argument is that the latter was perhaps the grandson of a Trebatius whom Appian in *Bellum civile*.1.228-229 mentions.²⁸⁰ This latter Trebatius was the leader of rebel forces in Apulia during the Social War in 89 B.C., at the time that Venusia came again under Roman control. Williams (1995, 303) suggests that “the families of the poet and the jurist had been friends of long standing, and shared in common the same puzzle over tribal identity.” In my view, Williams’ proposition that Horace was of Sabellian origin is very attractive; that is not to say that I consider either S.1.9, or the prophecy of the Sabellian woman as autobiographical.

What does the prophecy mean? Horace says that if he were to be forced to spend his time with insensitive simple-minded men like the compulsive talker in what resembles an intellectual and artistic wasteland, he would rather be dead. But, the arrival of the two at Vesta’s temple in line 35 (*ventum erat ad Vestae*) may be the beginning of the saving of Horace. S.1.9.35-40 presents the next wrangle between the two. It was about ten o’clock in the morning (*quarta iam parte diei/ praeterita*). Horace tells us this presumably to let us know that he spent already some good two hours with the fellow. We learn from S.1.9.36-37 that as it happened it was also the hour the fellow had agreed to meet at the temple of Vesta the plaintiff in a case against him and next to appear (before the praetor) in court, bail having been granted, and if he failed to appear, he could lose the case (*et casu tunc respondere vadato/ debebat; quod ni fecisset, perdere litem*).²⁸¹

The pest’s next attempt to engage Horace in his plans is described in S.1.9.38-40. He asks that Horace does him a favour as a friend by helping him (*si me amas inquit paulum hic ades.*), by being present at the court and by giving legal advice. The pest wants the best of both worlds: Horace who cannot escape from him and Horace who supports him in court. Horace gives primarily an answer on the second option,

280 Appian’s text (Goukowsky & Hinard, 2008, 48-49): *Τρεβάτιος δ’ αὐτόν, ὁ τῶν Σαυνιτῶν στρατηγός, ποταμοῦ διείργοντος, ἐκέλευεν ἢ περᾶν ἐπ’ αὐτόν ἐς μάχην ἢ αναχωρεῖν, ἵνα περάσειεν* (Trebatius, the general of the Samnites, who was separated by the river [Aufidus], urged him either to cross the river and fight or to withdraw so that he himself could cross). For the question whether Horace grew up in Venusia proper or in the wider region, see also the discussion at S.1.5.89-91.

281 According to Cloud (1989, 66) Horace is not right when he says in line 37 that “if the pest fails to answer bail, he will lose his case (*litem*) whereas, strictly speaking, he will lose his bail-money rather than his case, for there will not be a case to lose.” The pest and the plaintiff were still at the first stage when the praetor “would clarify the legal form of the dispute between them and then remand the case to be decided by an adjudicator (*iudex*)” (Cloud, 1989, 65-66). For the juridical background, see also Gowers (2012, 292).

presumably to show up the fellow's opportunism. He uses strong language refusing when he says "I am damned, if I am capable of standing up in court, or have knowledge of civil law; and I am in a hurry, you know where" (*inteream si/ aut valeo stare aut novi civilia iura;/ et propero quo scis*'). This answer gets the fellow into trouble. He is so keen to stay in touch with Horace that he seems prepared to lose his bail and indeed the case by not showing up. The pest thinks aloud in lines 40-41: "I ask myself what to do, whether to leave my case or you (*dubius sum quid faciam* inquit, / *tene relinquam an rem*). Horace answers as expected "me please" (*me sodes*), and the pest says also as expected "no, I won't [leave you]" (*non faciam*'). In the following lines, the two move on again; the pest leads the way (*et praecedere coepit*), and Horace follows him meekly admitting his defeat as it is difficult to fight with one's victor (*ego, ut contendere durum est/ cum victore, sequor*).

I mentioned above that I regard the passage that follows, S.1.9.43-60, the core of the poem. Horace voices in those lines what he sees as the power of Maecenas and his companions. His statement begins with a question posed by the pest in lines 43-48:

'Maecenas quomodo tecum?'

*hinc repetit: 'paucorum hominum et mentis bene sanae;
nemo dexterius fortuna est usus. haberes
magnum adiutorem, posset qui ferre secundas,
hunc hominem velles si tradere: dispeream ni
summosses omnis.'*

(He [the pest] resumes from this point: "how do you get on with Maecenas? One who has few friends, one with sound judgement. Nobody used his good fortune more skillfully. You could have a good assistant, who could take the second place, if you would introduce yours truly [the pest]: may I perish, if you would not send all the others away.")

According to Gowers (2012, 294) "for this section [lines 44-60], the two voices [of Horace and the pest] run together confusingly," and she states that line 44 "is probably H.[orace]'s voice." The poet, who intends to write positively about Maecenas' capacity to bring people together, refers back in lines 44-45 to what he wrote in S.1.6 about Maecenas' powers of discernment in choosing his friends, which he also praised in S.1.6.63-64 and before in S.1.6.5-8 and S.1.6.51-52. However, I do not conclude that it therefore follows that those words were spoken by Horace and not by the pushy fellow. Although either of them could be the "speaker," I conclude that on grounds of the context of lines 45-48 (the pest offering himself to be Horace's assistant in Maecenas' group) the pest is the "speaker" in those lines.²⁸² But, there

²⁸² My view is also contrary to Oliensis (1989, 38), who like Gowers sees Horace as the speaker of line 44: "Horace replies by answering what he takes to be the 'real' question ('how do you think I would fare with Maecenas?'): 'He's a man of limited acquaintance and of very sound mind' (*paucorum hominum et mentis bene sanae*, 44)." I place the quotation-marks acc. to the OCT, i.e. at different places than Gowers (2012, 54).

is yet another important aspect to S.1.9.43-48, that is that those lines are meant by the poet as a preparatory step for his “first-person *persona*” fictitious reply in lines 48-52 and indeed in the ensuing fictitious dialogue in lines 52-60. Horace’s purpose of the dialogue is the same as that in for example S.1.6, namely to offer the evidence of his worthiness of Maecenas’ friendship. In S.1.9, the poet chose the medium of the fictitious meeting with the pushy fellow for communicating this message to Maecenas. His description of the meeting is an opportunity to depict the special character of the circle. Oliensis gives a similar reading of S.1.9.48-53 as I do; she (1998, 39) states “But what matters here is less the truth-value than the pragmatic value of Horace’s idealizing description of Maecenas’ circle. The encounter gives Horace a chance to act the part of a faithful friend – a man who knows both to keep his mouth shut and when to open it.” S.1.9.45, ‘*nemo dexterius fortuna est usus*’ (“nobody used his good fortune more skillfully”) can be read in two ways, either the fellow’s commentary on Maecenas’ success in choosing his associates or on Horace’s success in being chosen. According to Oliensis (1998, 38), line 45 refers to the latter’s success: if it is so difficult to approach Maecenas [*paucorum hominum*], you Horace did well for yourself being accepted. Contrary to Oliensis, I read the words “nobody used his good fortune more skillfully” as in fact a continuation of the words in line 44: “one who has few friends, one with sound judgement.” In summary, both lines (44 and 45) refer to Maecenas and the poet gives those lines to the pest who says: Maecenas has few friends, but he is a man of good judgment and used this most skillfully to choose those friends.

The pest continued harassing Horace when he offered in his good offices to the poet by suggesting that he could well be a suitable (S.1.9.45-46) (*adiutor*) assistant of Horace, enabling him to rise even further in Maecenas’ estimation. Once he holds the post, the schemer will make sure that Horace sends all the others (*omnis*), his good friends, packing. In the words of Brown (2007, 180) “displacing Horace’s ‘rivals’ in Maecenas’ esteem.”

Then, Horace “speaks” the important lines 48-52 in reply to this suggestion of the brute. S.1.9.48-52 reads:

*‘non isto vivimus illic
quo tu rere modo; domus hac nec purior ulla est
nec magis his aliena malis; nil mi officit’ inquam
‘ditior hic aut est quia doctior; est locus uni
cuique suus.’*

(I said “we don’t live there the way you think; no house is more faultless or more unfamiliar with such evil; it doesn’t hurt me that someone is richer or more learned than I am; each has his own place.”)²⁸³

283 There is a significant difference in punctuation between OCT and other editions, e.g. Brown (2007, 78; 180), Gowers (2012, 54; 295), Rushton Fairclough (Loeb), (1999, 108), which give for lines 50-51: *nil mi officit, inquam, / ditior hic aut est quia doctior* (it doesn’t hurt me, I can tell you, that someone

In this poem with his credentials, the first-person *persona* Horace, who speaks here as the poet Horace would, gives in these lines a warm compliment to Maecenas for the mutual relations within the circle of associates. White (1993, 38) observes that “it makes more sense to suspect that Horace’s picture [of the relations among Maecenas’ protégés] in *Satire* 1.9 is greatly idealized.” Horace’s picture may be idealized, but it is very appropriate to the purpose of the *sermo*, that is his explanation to Maecenas that he feels at home in the latter’s company. Gowers notes that S.1.9.51 refers back to S.1.1.40 where Horace says *nil obstat tibi dum ne sit te ditior alter* (nothing can stop you, so long as you can prevent someone else to be richer than you), speaking of the greedy men who do not stop amassing riches. Horace shows in S.1.1-1.4 repeatedly his concern about these themes, which he sees in the unlimited ambition and pursuit of luxury of several groups in Roman society. S.1.9.51 is in the words of Gowers (2012, 295) “a calculated disavowal of *invidia* (envy) and *ambitio*.”

The ensuing exchange between Horace and the pest in S.1.9.52-60 shows the latter’s colours. The first reaction of the fellow is one of disbelief. In line 52 he says to Horace: “you are telling a tall story, hardly credible.” (*magnum narras, vix credibile.*). Horace answers: “all the same, that’s how it is.” (*atqui/ sic habet.*). Then, the fellow says in lines 53-54 “you make me all the keener to get close to him.” (*accendis, quare cupiam magis illi/ proximus esse.*).²⁸⁴ In the next lines, Horace encourages the pest to try his luck to be admitted, presumably because he is fed up with the man and his offensive manners. At the same time, he does not believe that Maecenas would be impressed by the fellow and would not accept him anyway. Horace urges him in S.1.9.54-56 to attack the “fortress-Maecenas” suggesting that he will win if he wants to:

*‘velis tantummodo, quae tua virtus,
expugnabis; et est qui vinci possit, eoque
difficilis aditus primos habet.’*

(“you have only to want it, such is your spirit, you will take the fortress; and he is a man who can be won, and that is why he makes the first approaches difficult”)

Horace lets it appear in that Maecenas is difficult to approach, because he wants to protect himself knowing that he can be won. The fellow walks into the trap in lines 56-60:

*‘haud mihi deero:
muneribus servos corrumpam; non, hodie si
exclusus fuero, desistam; tempora quaeram;
occurram in triviis; deducam. nil sine magno
vita labore dedit mortalibus.’*

is richer or more learned than I). I follow the OCT – edition.

284 For lines 53-54, I have used Gowers’ (2012, 296) rendering.

“I won’t let myself down. I will bribe his slaves with presents. I will not give up, if I am refused to-day. I shall seek out the right moment. I will run into him accidentally in the streets. I will escort him. Life did not give anything to mortals without great effort.”)

In the passage of lines 54-60, Horace feels obviously that only by expressing himself strongly the fellow can be brought to reason. The pest is not slow to react announcing a very aggressive strategy to break into Maecenas’ circle. Gowers (2012, 296) points out that the words that both use is “a new round of military metaphors,” suggesting that the battle between the two reaches its peak. In my opinion, the words used by the fellow do not have primarily a distinct military ring suggesting that he was a military man, but they typify him even more as an aggressive businessman with unscrupulous methods: bribery, dubious tenacity, at the cost of his victims seizing his opportunities. There is yet another side to the kind of reaction put into the fellow’s words by the poet. The words of S.1.9.54-60 may also be meant as to indicate to Maecenas the perception that many in Rome have of him and his companions: an exclusive clique with too many connections with the people in power.

This is also one of the themes of the next section, S.1.9.60-74. At the beginning of this section it seems that Horace is rescued by his good friend Aristius Fuscus. In lines 60-61 we read: while he goes on in this way, look, Aristius Fuscus bumped into us, a dear friend of mine (*haec dum agit, ecce/ Fuscus Aristius occurrit, mihi carus*). Porphyrio in his commentary on S.1.9.60 identifies Aristius Fuscus as a very distinguished grammarian at the time (*praestantissimus grammaticus illo tempore*), and in that on *Ep.1.10* as a writer of comedies (*scriptorem comoediarum*). Aristius Fuscus returns in S.1.10.83 – together with poets like Virgil, Plotius Tucca, C. Asinius Pollio and others approving of Horace’s verses (*probet haec*) and praising (*laudet*) these. Aristius Fuscus was most likely not a member of Maecenas’ circle, but a friend of Horace from a different background.²⁸⁵ Aristius, the dear friend of Horace appears to know the mysterious fellow quite well (*et illum/ qui pulchre nosset*) (lines 61-62). Horace and the fellow stop to have a chat with Aristius (*consistimus*), and the poet clearly hopes that his friend will help him out. A diffident conversation starts in lines 62-63: *‘unde venis?’ et/ ‘quo tendis?’ rogat et respondet* (he asked me “from where do you come?” and “where do you go?,” and he told me his errand). I take it that Aristius asked the questions (*rogat*). The story does not give us either Aristius’ answer (*respondet*) or that of Horace: thus it is not clear to which errand Horace may have referred: his stroll along the Via Sacra, his feigned visit to a sick man across the Tiber of lines 16-18, or his expedition to the court as a companion and advisor of the fellow of lines 38-40. The expedition to the court is the most likely in the light of

285 Nisbet & Hubbard (2001, 261-262); Rudd (2007, 75-76). Aristius Fuscus is the dedicatee of *Carm.1.22* (“*Integer vitae*”), and in *Ep.1.10* we meet him again. White (1993, 35-63) does not mention Aristius Fuscus as a member of Maecenas’ circle (see also note 45).

Aristius' excuse in lines 69-70 when the latter says that he cannot be involved as it is the thirtieth Sabbath. I will explain this in more detail below.

Horace, however, is desperate to tell him his predicament with the fellow as S.1.9.63-68 shows:

*vellere coepi,
et pressare manu lentissima bracchia, nutans,
distorquens oculos, ut me eriperet. male salsus
ridens dissimulare: meum iecur urere bilis.
'certe nescio quid secreto velle loqui te
aiebas mecum.'*

(I began to tug [his cloak], and to squeeze his unresponsive arms, nodding and rolling my eyes for him to deliver me. Sick joker that he was, he chose to laugh and fake incomprehension: I seethed with rage. "Surely you said that there was something you wanted to tell me in private")²⁸⁶

In spite of Horace's pinching and winking and his efforts to have a quick word with Aristius, he does not succeed in getting the latter interested. The words in lines 67-68 about something that Aristius wanted to tell Horace in a private talk are a pretence to set the pushy fellow apart, but Aristius does not react in the way Horace had hoped. Although Aristius joins in Horace's game, he plays for time: in lines 68-70 he answers "I remember it well, but I will tell you on a more suitable moment" (*'memini bene, sed meliore/ tempore dicam'*). He explains his refusal with the excuse that "to-day is the thirtieth Sabbath. Do you wish to fart at [= insult] the circumcised Jews?" (*'hodie tricesima sabbata: vin tu/ curtis Iudaeis oppedere?'*). The excuse is generally not satisfactorily explained. McGann (1973, 89) sees the excuse as "maliciously offering only a piece of pseudo-erudition," but does not explain this view.²⁸⁷ In my opinion, the most likely general conclusion is the one formulated by Gowers (2012, 300) that the excuse refers to a "conscientious objection to civic duties (specifically serving as witness/prosecutor) because today is the thirtieth Jewish Sabbath." Gowers' conclusion assumes that Horace had the opportunity to inform Aristius about the nature of his involuntary errand, that is that the fellow and he were on their way to the court. The meaning of the "thirtieth Sabbath" cannot be explained satisfactorily, but it may refer to an important Jewish feast-day when one is not permitted to do any work, particularly such as serving as a witness or a prosecutor. That is why Aristius says that he does not want to insult the Jews, but his grounds for his respect for the Jewish rules are not made clear. The view that Aristius pretends that respect for religious rules motivates him to refuse assisting Horace is endorsed in S.1.9.70-72. For, however it may be, Horace refers to religious principles when he replies "I have

²⁸⁶ The OCT has in line 64 *pressare* (to clutch at). I follow Gowers (2012, 299) and others who argue for *pressare* (to squeeze) as the preferred manuscript reading. I have also used Gowers' rendering of lines 65-66, *male salsus/ ridens dissimulare*.

²⁸⁷ For the meaning of Aristius' excuse, see also Gowers (2012, 300).

no religious scruples” (*nulla mihi inquam/ religio est*), and Aristius answered “but I have. I am somewhat weaker in character, one of many. Excuse me, we will talk another time” (*at mi: sum paulo infirmior, unus/ multorum: ignosces: alias loquar.*). That is the end of the meeting with Aristius without a chance for Horace to explain his problem with the fellow. The disillusioned Horace gives in S.1.9.72-74 his calm commentary on this fictitious event: to think that such an evil day had dawned on me! The rotter disappears and leaves me in a fix (*huncine solem/ tam nigrum surrexe mihi/ fugit improbus ac me/ sub cultro linquit*).²⁸⁸ I do not concur with Rudd (2007, 76) that “Fuscus turns traitor. Horace’s hopes are again dashed, and the scene closes leaving him a helpless and deserted victim.” But, Horace does not bring Aristius Fuscus on the stage to show the failure of a friendship. Aristius remains a friend in S.1.10, in *Carm.*1.22 and *Ep.*1.10. It seems to me that the “excuse” of his religious scruples which Aristius makes to the first-person *persona* Horace is a pretext, as Aristius had decided not to become involved in a potential conflict about the admission of somebody, whoever he may be, to Maecenas’ circle.

At this point in the mini drama, we have three actors who in different ways are concerned with membership of the circle of Maecenas. The first one is Horace, whose position we know: appreciating that he was admitted to the circle and content with his achievements so far. The second one is the anonymous fellow who is keen to advance his career by being admitted, but whom Horace does not see as a suitable candidate. He is not and will not be one of them, although Horace does not explicitly state this. We have to glean his opinion from the allusions in the present poem. The picture we get is that of a man, who is highly ambitious but very impertinent and brash. He introduces himself in line 7 as a scholar and in lines 22-25 as an accomplished poet, dancer and singer. As far as Horace is concerned, however, he boasts of the wrong qualities like his fast writing, and admires the wrong people, like Hermogenes. He is also aggressive and vulgar in pursuing his goals. Horace pursues in S.1.9 subjects that he described in S.1.1, S.1.5 and S.1.6. For example, Gowers notes that S.1.9.51 refers back to S.1.1.40. Line 51 of the present poem is in the words of Gowers (2012, 295) “a calculated disavowal of *invidia* (envy) and *ambitio*.” In addition, the opening of S.1.9 links closely with the final lines of S.1.6: Horace is released from burdensome and pitiable ambition. Further, I noted that S.1.9 also contains significant echoes of S.1.5. The present and the fifth *sermo* have not only much in common in structure, but the two also share partly a common theme. The meeting with the pushy fellow of S.1.9 reminds us of the meetings with a pompous local dignitary in S.1.5.34-36 and that with a vulgar parasite in S.1.5.51-70, with both of whom Horace does not want to be associated. Horace gives us some indications with respect to the fictitious social position of the pushy fellow of S.1.9. He tells us in S.1.9.12-13 that the fellow praises particularly the quarters of the city

²⁸⁸ For the rendering of *huncine solem/ tam nigrum surrexe mihi!* in lines 72-73, I followed Gowers (2012, 301).

and the whole of Rome, presumably referring to Octavian's refurbishing programme. If we look at the key characteristics of the fellow, namely his ambition, envy, and common behaviour, I suggest that he is a nouveau riche businessman known for his very shady methods in his ventures. Although he showed himself off as a scholar, poet, and singer of sorts, I conjecture that it is more likely that he, in view of his appreciation of Octavian's building programme, symbolizes one of the many who got rich in real estate. The extravagance in building was a particular touchy political issue at the time of writing *S.1.9*. Horace himself wrote two poems about the issue, namely *Carm.2.15* and *Carm.2.18*.²⁸⁹ The latter is most likely written in the years before 30 B.C., when he also wrote the books of *Sermones*.²⁹⁰ Nisbet and Hubbard (2004, 288) note that "the Roman orators were fond of denouncing extravagance, particularly in building." Contemporary evidence is found in Cicero's *Pro Sestio* (*CIC.Sest.93*).²⁹¹ The third actor who is concerned with membership of the circle of Maecenas is Aristius Fuscus, although in a very different role. He is not a member of Maecenas' circle. I conjecture that the reason why Aristius refuses to help Horace in his predicament with the pushy fellow is that Aristius symbolizes the position of the man who takes exception to the exclusive character of the group and thus does not want to be involved. We saw already that the passage *S.1.9.54-60*, which precedes directly the one about the arrival of Aristius, can be read as a description of the perception by many in Rome of Maecenas and his companions as an exclusive clique with too many connections with the people in power. Those who rejected the circle of Maecenas may have felt that the poets therefore could only survive as their masters' voices. I argue in Weeda (2010) that Horace, like Virgil and Propertius, succeeded to maintain their independence and wrote not only panegyric and supportive poetry, but also critical

289 For the issue of luxurious building by the new rich, see my discussion of *Carm.2.15* and *Carm.2.18* at the end of my analysis of *S.1.1* and *S.1.2* (section 2.2.1), my discussion of *S.1.1.61-62*, and notes 79 and 102.

290 Acc. to Nisbet & Hubbard (2004, 290-291) the date of *Carm.2.18* cannot be proved. The authors, however, point out that on grounds of intertextual similarities with both *VERG.G.2.461-471* and *LUCR.2.20-31* it is likely that Horace wrote *Carm.2.18* before *Virgil G.2*. They (2004, 291) conclude that "if Horace has priority, the poem must be assigned to the triumviral period soon after the acquisition of the Sabinum [*Carm.2.18.12-14*]." Horace received the use of the estate at some time before 31 B.C.; hence the poem was likely written around 31 B.C. See also Weeda (2010, 128) and the section about Horace and Maecenas (1.4) of this book.

291 Cicero's text in *Pro Sestio.93* is: *villam aedificare in oculis omnium tantam, tugurium ut iam videatur esse illa villa, quam ipse tribunus pl. pictam olim in contionibus explicabat* (that he [Gabinus] is building for all to see such a mansion that the villa, of which he himself when he was tribune of the commons displayed in the past a picture before meetings, that that villa looked like a hut). For a general discussion of the rejection of luxury, see Nisbet & Hubbard (2004, 288). For a discussion of "the evils of wealth" in *HOR.Ep.1.10*, in which the poet also addresses Aristius, see Williams (1968, 578-579; 596-599). Luxurious villas were already denounced by M. Porcius Cato (234-149 B.C.) in *CATO. orat.174*, 185.

political commentary about Octavian's policies and actions. Further, in lines 61-62 we are told that Aristius *illum/ qui pulchre nosset* (knew the fellow quite well), and presumably also knew what the man wanted Horace to achieve with Maecenas. The reason that Aristius did not want to be involved was that he did not want to embarrass his friend Horace. A second option is that Aristius symbolizes the man who previously was refused membership. In that case, it is self-evident that he does not want to know, despite his friendship with Horace.

The last five lines of S.1.9 close this mini drama, when the *persona* Horace is suddenly delivered. By chance the plaintiff of the fellow arrives and he does his own arrest to take the fellow to the tribunal for the clarification of the case by the praetor. The plaintiff had the right to do so under Roman law. There is a bit of shouting to and fro, and the figurative Horace offers his ear to be touched, which means that he is prepared to be a witness to the arrest. The fellow is carried off and thank the god of poetry Apollo Horace is delivered and his death by the garrulous man of the prophecy in lines 29-34 has been averted. S.1.9.74-78 reads:

*casu venit obvius illi
adversarius et 'quo tu turpissime?' magna
inclamat voce, et 'licet antestari?' ego vero
oppono auriculam. rapit in ius: clamor utrimque:
undique concursus. sic me servavit Apollo.*

(by chance his opponent comes face to face with him and shouts loudly "where to do you go, you swine?, and [to me] "can I name you a witness to the arrest? I proffer my ear. He drags [the fellow] into court; shouting on both sides and tumult everywhere. Thus Apollo saved me)²⁹²

The last words in line 78 *sic me servavit Apollo* (Thus Apollo saved me) gave rise to much discussion. Miller (2009, 39-44) examines different opinions.²⁹³ He (2009, 41) considers the option that "Apollo rescued Horace not just from a general nuisance [the fellow] but from an egregious poet who characterizes his work in terms diametrically opposed to Horace's Callimachean ideals." This option refers to the fellow who boasts in lines 23-24 (see my discussion above) of his great quantity of verses and of "his speed at churning them out." Another option is that the words are an allusion to Brutus who at a drinking party had quoted a Homeric phrase referring to Apollo from either *Iliad* 16.849 or *Iliad* 20.443, probably in the presence of Horace. Miller (2009, 43) states also "that at Philippi 'Apollo' was said to be Brutus' watchword," an additional reference to Brutus. Miller (2009, 43) notes that "once again he [Horace] distances himself from his allegiance with Brutus and the republican cause a few years previously with an indirect reference." Although I am in sympathy with the view that Horace distances himself from his previous association with Brutus in several *sermones* in S.1, the

²⁹² For *licet antestari* in line 76, I use the rendering of Gowers (2012, 302).

²⁹³ For Apollo's role in S.1.9.78, see also Gowers (2012, 303-304); Welch (2001, 173, note 25).

indirect reference that Miller sees in the final word of S.1.9 (Apollo) is going too far. In my view, Horace intimates that he considers himself a mature poet, whose destiny is in the hands of the god of poetry as he will explain in the next *sermo*.

In summary: I argue in this book that the main objective of S.1 is to demonstrate to Maecenas that he will be a trustworthy member of the circle of Maecenas and that his past with Brutus is finished. Those are also the main themes of S.1.9, in which he depicts himself as a full member of Maecenas' circle expressing in S.1.9.48-52 his appreciation of the way the circle is organised by Maecenas. However, Horace also shows in this poem that he has friends who do not want to be involved with Maecenas, like Aristius Fuscus. It is likely that those friends perceive Maecenas and his companions as an exclusive clique with too many connections with people in high office. The poem shows Horace's pride at being recognised as somebody close to Maecenas, albeit by a pushy nouveau riche. He also feels perfectly capable of assessing whether somebody fits as an associate. The pushy nouveau riche, probably someone who made his money in real estate, clearly did not meet the criteria. But, without the help of Aristius he managed to get out of the predicament with the pest. And he is sure that Maecenas would go along with his judgement that a man like the pest would not fit. Further, Horace makes in S.1.9.78 the point that he has developed into an accomplished poet as he is saved from the nuisance of the fellow by Apollo, the god of poetry. Finally, with respect to the autobiographical nature of S.1.9, and indeed S.1.5, I refer to Williams' (1968, 569) statement that "in fact, no accurate answer is possible to the question whether Horace 'really experienced' the events which he describes [...]. What is important is that the answer to the question is irrelevant to the judging of the poem." Next, Williams (1968, 570) states that in S.1.9 "the poet narrates the event from a position inside it, but this is mainly due to the very large scale of the narrative and to the poet's humorous treatment of it." I differ from Williams' view. My position on the autobiographical nature of both *sermones* – and indeed on others as well, as I explain in the analyses of the poems concerned – is that I assume that some events were really experienced by Horace, although presumably at different occasions, but that other events were invented. Horace gives us mixtures of both. S.1.9 as a whole is with respect to the historicity of the events similar to S.1.5, parts of S.1.6, S.1.7, and S.1.8. Horace creates narratives that serve his purpose of presenting his views on important issues for Maecenas to make up his mind about Horace's reliability in matters political. He uses regularly the instruments of the first-person *persona* and the functional reference to launch an opinion and open a discussion. In this way Horace prepares his platform as a commentator on political and social issues. In the final *sermo*, S.1.10, he will be again concerned with his style of delivering his message and literary orientation, like he did in S.1.3 and S.1.4.

We saw that the last word of S.1.9, "Apollo," can be understood as a prelude to **S.1.10**: Horace invokes the god of poetry because he considers himself a mature poet. The name of the god of poetry is a bridge leading to the opening of S.1.10, in which the poet

will again present among other matters a statement about his literary orientation.²⁹⁴ However, there is a minor problem with this opening as the first eight lines are generally regarded as spurious; the lines are only found in one family of manuscripts and in other less reliable manuscripts. In addition according to Freudenburg (1993, 170), the style and the fact that none of the ancient commentators and authors seem aware of the lines also point to a problem of authenticity.²⁹⁵ Notwithstanding, I will briefly discuss those, as “even if they are not original, the lines constitute fascinating marginal comment on S.[1.]10” (Gowers, 2012, 309). The fragment is written by a supposed Horace and addresses the same question as the one in S.1.10 proper. This is according to Gowers (2012, 309)

how to position himself vis-à-vis his great predecessor [Lucilius]. He [the pseudo Horace] elects to present the case against Lucilius by stressing the refinements of modern literary criticism [...], rather than taking a moral or social line (as he did in S.[1.]4) against those who show unthinking reverence for works of the past.

The fragment of S.1.10.1fr.-8fr. reads as follows:²⁹⁶

*[LVCILI, quam sis mendosus, teste Catone
defensore tuo, pervincam, qui male factos
emendare parat versus; hoc lenius ille,
quo melior vir et est longe subtilior illo,
qui multum puer et loris et funibus udis
exoratus, ut esset opem qui ferre poetis
antiquis posset contra fastidia nostra,
grammaticorum equitum doctissimus. ut redeam illuc:]*

(Lucilius, how mistaken you are, I will prove decisively on the evidence of Cato, your champion, who gets ready to correct your poorly executed verses. He is more gentle, because he is a better and much subtler man than the one who was much prevailed upon as a boy by lashes and moist ropes, so that there might be someone who could help the poets of old against our contempt, the most learned of equestrian grammarians. To continue with the case in point)

The author of the interpolated introduction makes the point that Lucilius’ verses are poor and that Cato will provide the evidence. Horace made the same point earlier in S.1.4 about Lucilius’ style and explicitly not about the content and his criticism of moral misconduct. Cato in S.1.10.1fr. is most probably P. Valerius Cato from Gaul who

294 For S.1.10, see Brown (2007, 182-194); Feeney (2009a); Freudenburg (1993, 100-104; 106; 165-184; 209-211; 2001, 66-71); Gowers (2012, 304-338); Rudd (2007, 92-124); Zetzel (2006). Freudenburg (1993, 209-211) discusses a different relationship of S.1.9 with S.1.10: “*Satires* 1.9 lends meaning to 1.10 [...] *Satires* 1.9 [modelled after Catullus 10] improves upon the contemporary imitators of Catullus in terms of their varietal technique, censured in 1.10.”

295 For the issue of the authenticity of the first eight lines, see also Gowers (2012, 309).

296 I indicate that the lines are part of the fragment by adding “fr.” to the number of the line.

according to Gowers (2012, 310) “allegedly studied Lucilius as *pupillus* of the first-generation antiquarian Vettius Philocomus (Suet.*Gram.*II.1) in the late 80s BC.” Gallus called him a stern literary critic and Furius Bibaculus may have written about him “that he formed a new canon single-handed” (Nisbet, 1995, 391).²⁹⁷ Cato is described in the fragment as a civilized man who can be expected to correct Lucilius’ style in a much subtler (*longe subtilior*) manner than someone who as a child was bullied into awe of Lucilius. If the author of the fragment knew Horace’s experience of his schooling by Orbilius in Rome described in *Ep.*2.1.69-71 and in *S.*1.6.76-80, the boy (*puer*) of line 5fr. may well refer to young Orbilius and may suggest that the latter became a teacher, who was fond of flogging (*plagosum Orbilium*), as he himself experienced bullying as a boy.²⁹⁸ This identification *puer* is supported by the words of line 8fr. *grammaticorum equitum doctissimus* (the most learned of equestrian grammarians): Orbilius was an *eques* and a well-known grammarian.²⁹⁹ If one accepts that the identifications of Cato (as Valerius Cato) and the *grammaticorum equitum doctissimus* (as Orbilius) are feasible, the unidentified author of the fragment conveys the following view: Lucilius’ verses are faulty indeed and what Horace wrote in *S.*1.10 about those faults (of style) has the approval of the civilized commentator Cato, who is a far subtler adjudicator of the poets of old than for example Orbilius.

In *S.*1.10 proper Horace himself speaks again starting with a short résumé of *S.*1.4.1-13. Horace criticizes not only Lucilius’ style of composing his verses in *S.*1.10.1-3, but he also testifies in *S.*1.10.3-4 to the fact that he had praised earlier Lucilius for his satiric power. *S.*1.10.1-4 reads:

*Nempe incomposito dixi pede currere versus
Lucili. quis tam Lucili fautor inepte est
ut non hoc fateatur? at idem, quod sale multo
urbem defricuit, charta laudatur eadem.*

(certainly I said that Lucilius’ verses run on with disordered foot. Who is an admirer of Lucilius so foolishly as not to admit this? And yet, he is also praised at the same page because he rubbed down Rome with much wit)

297 For P. Valerius Cato, see Gowers (2012, 310); Nisbet (1995, 391-393); Suetonius writes about Valerius Cato in Suet.*Gram.*11 (see also Kaster, 1995, 151-161). The specific reference to Cato’s study of Lucilius with Philocomus is in Suet.*Gram.*2: *Laelius Archelaus Vettiusque Philocomus [pronuntiabant] Lucilii saturas familiaris sui, quas legisse se apud Archelaum Pompeius Lenaeus, apud Philocomum Valerius Cato praedicant* (Laelius Archelaus and Vettius Philocomus spoke in public about the satires of their friend Lucilius, which Lenaeus Pompeius reported having read with Archelaus, and Valerius Cato with Philocomus); *italics* are mine.

298 For the identification of the second critic as Orbilius, see Nisbet (1995, 393): “This is surely Horace’s old teacher, Orbilius of Beneventum.” For Horace’s schooling by Orbilius, see also section 1.3.2, note 28, and my discussion of *S.*1.6.76-80 in section 2.2.3.

299 For Orbilius’ status as *eques* and profession as grammarian, see SUET.*Gram.*9. For Orbilius, see also Folkerts (1972). Horace’s remark in *S.*1.6 that he was taught as a boy in Rome together with sons of the elite also alludes to the equestrian status of Orbilius.

In order to ease the comparison, I will first quote S.1.4.1-13 again.

EVPOLIS atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae, 1
atque alii quorum comoedia prisca virorum est,
si quis erat dignus describi quod malus ac fur,
quod moechus foret aut sicarius aut alioqui
famosus, multa cum libertate notabant. 5
hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus
mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque; 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: nam ut multum, nil moror.

(Eupolis and Cratinus and Aristophanes, true poets and the other men of principle of Old Comedy, if there was anyone deserving to be described as a ruffian and a thief, as an adulterer or murderer, or as otherwise notorious, they censured him with great freedom of speech. Lucilius wholly depends on them, and then he followed changing only metre and rhythm. He was witty, keen, but rugged in the composition of verses. In fact in this [ruggedness] he was faulty: in an hour he would often dictate two hundred lines standing on his head [lit. standing on one foot = with great ease], as though it were a big deal: when he flowed in his muddy stream, there was much you would like to remove: he was garrulous, and too lazy for the toil of writing – I mean of writing properly. For I am not interested in quantity)

Horace recalls in lines 1-3 of the tenth *sermo* the stylistic shortcomings of Lucilius mentioned in lines 6-13 of the fourth *sermo*. I will not repeat here the discussion of the latter, but only recall the conclusion. Lucilius carried the rugged versification to excess: the fault was due to his rapid work. Next, in S.1.10.3-4 Horace recalls S.1.4.1-5, a description of the subject matter that the poets of Old Comedy treated and he recorded with approval that they censured with great freedom of speech. In addition, the words *quod sale multo/ urbem defricuit* (because he rubbed down Rome with much wit) in S.1.10.3-4 are an echo of S.1.4.7-8, where he says that Lucilius was *facetus, / emunctae naris* (witty and keen). He is positive about the manner in which Lucilius succeeded as a Roman successor to the best of the Old Comedy. In short, Horace was in S.1.4 critical of the style and not of the content of Lucilius' verses.³⁰⁰ Horace also refers back in S.1.10.16-17 to the opening lines of the fourth *sermo*; I will present my interpretation of this reference below. For the details of the discussion of the fourth *sermo*, I refer to that of S.1.4 in section 2.2.2.

³⁰⁰ Conform Freudenburg (1993, 101): "Far from apologizing for his earlier [in S.1.4] assessment of the Lucilianus character, the satirist [Horace] confirms his earlier views in very straightforward terms. He criticizes Lucilius for stylistic harshness, that is, his rough, unrelenting compositional style, not the harsh spirit of his invective."

However, without delay Horace reduces his praise of Lucilius in S.1.10.3-4 in the following long passage, S.1.10.5-39. His line of argument goes as follows. If I were to condone a particular fault in Lucilius' poetry, I could just as well allow the same in any other poet's work. Thus, the key characteristic for his choice of any other poet in the present passage is that the latter shows a fault which he also identified with Lucilius. His first target among past and recent poets is Decimus Laberius (106-43 B.C.) in lines 5-6, followed by Licinius Calvus (82-47 B.C.) and Catullus (84-54 B.C.) in line 19, Pitholaus of Rhodes (first century B.C. – after 45 B.C.) in lines 20-24, and M. Furius Bibaculus of Cremona (born ab. 100 B.C., lived to a great age) in lines 36-39. I record at this stage two other features which he adds to his criterion for choosing any other poets. Firstly, all poets whom Horace censures in S.1.10.5-39 are known to have written lampoons against Julius Caesar, which suggests that Horace makes a political statement in favour of Julius Caesar and Octavian. Secondly, he will connect with his views on Lucilius' and any other poet's style his commentary on several other contemporary political issues. In each case, I will examine the issues concerned.

Horace says in lines 5-6: *nec tamen hoc tribuens dederim quoque cetera: nam sic/ et Laberi mimos ut pulchra poemata mirer* (however in granting him [Lucilius] this, I would not also give him the rest: for on that principle I should also admire the mimes of Laberius as beautiful poetry). Decimus Laberius was like Lucilius a Roman knight, who wrote according to Gowers (2012, 313) “mimes, ribald, semi-improvisational sketches with abrupt, haphazard endings.” Laberius wrote in an invective style, which Horace condemned in his and Lucilius' poetry. He also wrote lampoons aimed at amongst others Julius Caesar. Horace demonstrates to Maecenas by his rejection of Laberius' mimes that he not only dislikes the poetic qualities of Laberius, but also disapproves of the latter's attacks on Octavian's adoptive father and thus makes an implicit political statement against the anti-Caesarians.

Next, Horace states in lines 7-17 his view on the attributes of good poetry. The passage reads:

*ergo non satis est risu diducere rictum
auditoris: et est quaedam tamen hic quoque virtus:
est brevitae opus, ut currat sententia, neu se
impediat verbis lassas onerantibus auris;
et sermone opus est modo tristi, saepe iocoso,
defendente vicem modo rhetoris atque poetae,
interdum urbani, parcentis viribus atque
extenuantis eas consulto. ridiculum acri
fortius et melius magnas plerumque secat res.
illi scripta quibus comoedia prisca viris est
hoc stabant, hoc sunt imitandi:*

(So it is not enough to make the listener grin from ear to ear – and yet there is also some merit in that. One needs brevity, in order for the train of thought to run on, and not to get entangled with words that overwhelm exhausted ears. You also need a style which is sometimes severe, often playful, sustaining the role, now of orator and poet, from time to time that of the sophisticated

wit, who reserves and weakens the strength of his speech on purpose. Humour very often decides important issues more forcefully and better than stinging severity. The writers of Old Comedy were successful in this [brevity and variety], and in this they must be imitated)³⁰¹

Horace argues in this passage that there is nothing wrong with humour, although it should not be the only feature of the poem. He considers two other qualities essential for good poetry, which Lucilius' work lacks, that is: *brevitas* and *varietas*. Brevity guards against jumbled thoughts and tired listeners and variety makes that the listener's attention will be held. In the words of Freudenburg (1993, 101) variety is lacking in Lucilius' work, because he "is too much given to the grand style (*tristi sermone*) of the epic poet and rhetor, and too little adept at the restrained humorous mode (*iocosus sermone*) of the educated wit."³⁰² The passage S.1.10.7-17 can be understood in a limited sense, namely that Horace sketches the stylistic qualities for satire, but it looks to me that Horace charts in those lines attributes which apply to several genres of poetry, in some of which he is already actively engaged. Horace uses in line 17 emphatically *hoc* (this) twice relating to all the stylistic qualities mentioned in lines 9-15: in short *brevitas* and *varietas*. In other words, Horace sees as standards of good poetry sharply worded thoughts and variety of presentation. The poets of Old Comedy possessed those. Lines 16-17 have an additional significance, that is not stylistic. Horace also refers back in S.1.10.16-17 to the opening lines of the fourth sermo when he uses the same words (*comoedia prisca viris*) in both S.1.10.16 and in S.1.4.2. Thus, he reminds us in S.1.10 of a third quality in which the poets of Old Comedy were successful: the example set by the poets of Old Comedy in censuring people and groups freely, with *libertas* (freedom of speech), which is the essence of S.1.4.1-5.³⁰³ This third quality should be copied too.

Thus, S.1.10.7-17 is the second echo in S.1.10 of S.1.4 (after the one in S.1.10.1-4). Horace restates in this second echo his view on the characteristics of good poetry. Those include stylistic aspects, *brevitas* and *varietas*, matters of content, and *libertas* in the choice of subject-matter for censure and in the freedom with which the censure is carried out. I do not take for granted that Horace meant to say in S.1.4 that the examples set by the men of Old Comedy should be restricted to satiric poetry. In my discussion of S.1.4.38-62, I looked at his views with respect to *ingenium* and *ars, res* and *verba*, and also at issues from general classic literary theory like the anticompositional theory and metathesis and at one of the concepts as treated by

³⁰¹ The renderings of *risu diducere rictum/ auditoris* in lines 7-8, and of *sententia* in line 9 are by Gowers (2012, 313; 314).

³⁰² For variety as a quality in any literary genre, see also Freudenburg (1993, 180-184).

³⁰³ Conform Freudenburg (1993, 102): "The scholiast correctly regards the claim at line 17, 'in this they [the Old Comic poets] are to be imitated,' as a stylistic tenet." Freudenburg does not discuss the observation that *comoedia prisca viris* in S.1.10.16 refers to the success the poets of Old Comedy had in censuring.

Philodemus, *parrhesia*.³⁰⁴ In my opinion, Horace did not write about those issues in S.1.4 from the perspective of satiric poetry, but rather from that of poetry in general. Therefore, I suggest that the same holds for the issues raised in S.1.10.1-17, that is, that this passage represents Horace's view on poetry in general. S.1.10 does not redefine the literary position of Roman satire after Horace, but defines indeed Horace's own literary position: with respect to style and with respect to content and freedom of speech. I will explain my view in detail below after I have discussed S.1.10.48-49.

Next, Horace sneers in S.1.10.17-19 at Hermogenes and an anonymous *aper*, immediately followed by a long passage in lines 20-35 in which he speaks up for linguistic purity, condemning the inclusion of Greek words. First, I will look at lines 17-19:

*quos neque pulcher
Hermogenes umquam legit, neque simius iste
nil praeter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum.*

(neither the pretty Hermogenes, nor that *aper* trained to recite Calvus and Catullus ever read them [the poets of Old Comedy])

Horace disliked Hermogenes very much and saw him as an empty-headed playboy, who could not be expected to have ever read Aristophanes and the poets of Greek Old Comedy. On grounds of S.1.10.17-19, scholars argued that Hermogenes was a Neoteric and a follower of Catullus and Calvus. The latter, however, had attacked Hermogenes in the past and thus it is unlikely that Hermogenes was a supporter of him; this is indirectly reported by *Cic.Fam.7.24.1* and by Porphyrio (at S.1.3.1).³⁰⁵ Scholars resolved this issue by concluding that Horace writes in S.1 about two different men: Tigellius and a second man called Hermogenes.³⁰⁶ Freudenburg (1993, 170) points out that there is no need for “a second, otherwise unknown, Tigellius.” I concur with Freudenburg's (1993, 169) point that the argument for two different men is generally built upon the assumption “which has never really been challenged, that the passage just quoted [S.1.10.17-19] proves the Hermogenes of *Satires* 1.10 a Neoteric, yet the lines in question claim only that Hermogenes never read the Old Comic poets. It is the unnamed ‘ape,’

304 For the issue of the unity of *ingenium* (talent), *ars* (skill), *res* (content) and *verba* (style), see also Oberhelman & Armstrong (1995, 249-254).

305 Cicero relates in *Fam.7.24.1* that the addressee (M. Fabius Gallus) had been hard at work on an issue concerning Tigellius (= Hermogenes). Cicero mentions that in his opinion the latter was condemned in the past sharply by Calvus in a bitter biting poem in the style of Hipponax (*eumque addictum iam tum puto esse Calvi Licini Hipponacteo praeconio*). Porphyrio (Meyer, 1874, 199) in his commentary of S.1.3.1 writes: *at Licinius Calvus de eodem Hermogene loquens Sardum dixit Sardi Tigelli putidum caput uenit* (and Licinius Calvus speaking about the same Hermogenes as Sardinian said that the stinking head of the Sardinian Tigellius comes).

306 For the identities of Tigellius and Hermogenes, see note 91, and my discussions of S.1.2.1-3 and S.1.3.129-130.

[...] not Tigellius, who is accused of ‘singing’ only the works of Calvus and Catullus.” There is in addition to Freudenburg’s point a second argument: Horace’s focus in S.1.10.7-19 is his view on standards of good poetry, which I mentioned above, namely *brevitas*, *varietas*, and *libertas*. Lines 17-19 close this passage before considering a new subject, that is the mixing of Greek and Latin. Hermogenes is specifically mentioned by Horace as one who does not meet his standards. He is the opposite of a Neoteric, as he was “noted for his flamboyant amplification against the reverse extreme of strict Neoteric brevity” (Freudenburg, 1993,170). However, I cannot go along with the conclusion that Horace in S.1 writes about one Tigellius only. Freudenburg’s suggestion does not explain the opposition between the funeral of a Tigellius in the second sermo and a Hermogenes (Tigellius) who is very much alive in the tenth.

Thus, I accept the solution of DuQuesnay (1984, 56), which addresses the incompatibility between the funeral of a Tigellius in the second sermo along with his appearance in the third at S.1.3.1-13. At the same time, the option I prefer does not hinge on the assumption that Hermogenes was a Neoteric. In my view, the dead Tigellius of S.1.2 is Marcus Tigellius Hermogenes, whom Porphyrio describes in his commentary on S.1.2.1-3, namely the musician of Julius Caesar’s household, and later of that of Cleopatra and whom Augustus also liked. He died presumably in 40 or 39 B.C. The other man is the living Hermogenes of S.1.3.128-133, 1.4, 1.9 and 1.10, who was also a Sardinian and who defected in 38 or 37 B.C. to Sextus Pompey, who in the summer of 39 B.C. retained control over Corsica, Sardinia and Sicily. The islands were well-known as recruiting areas for Sextus. In addition, the name of Hermogenes suggests that he was a freedman, and it is known that Sextus recruited many followers from those (see also note 160). I differ from DuQuesnay (1984, 56) that it was the dead Tigellius “who would have been singled out for extensive criticism.” The defection of Hermogenes to Sextus made him the target of Horace’s criticism. In order to differentiate clearly between the two, when I write Tigellius I refer to the dead man of S.1.2 and when I write Hermogenes I refer to the living man. This does not apply in the case of a translation from the Latin.

The other man mentioned, who apes Calvus and Catullus cannot be identified, but refers most likely to somebody whose knowledge and pursuit of poetry does not go beyond Calvus and Catullus. The words in lines 18-19 are a condemnation of the *aper*, and not of the two poets. Yet, Horace refers presumably intentionally to the neoteric poets Calvus and Catullus. Both poets wrote anti-Caesarian lampoons, but both were eventually reconciled with Julius Caesar, as recorded by Suetonius (SUET. *Jul.*73). We can only guess at the reason why Horace bracketed the three poets and the *aper* in lines 17-19. In my view, it is not likely that he held the same low opinion of Calvus and Catullus as we know he did of Hermogenes and apparently also did of the *aper*. We are not informed of the details of Horace’s professional relationship with Calvus. He did not object to Catullus’ poetry in the same manner as he did to that of Lucilius, although he rejected the more decadent facets of Catullus’ poems and

postured himself more reservedly in matters of love.³⁰⁷ Contrary to Catullus, he was also more restrained in his criticisms. Wiseman (1988, 132) points out that Catullus' "obscene abuse of Piso, Memmius and Caesar was as unrestrained as Lucilius' attacks on Scaevola, Lentulus and Metellus, and delivered with equal impunity." Wiseman states that Horace was more inhibited than both Catullus and Lucilius because Horace feared that his victims would go to law if he offended them too much, and because Horace's inferior social position compared to Lucilius and Catullus also played a part. In my opinion, Lucilian types of attack were out of place in S.1 as Horace himself mentioned at several occasions. I explained that this was because he wrote S.1 as a collection of poems aimed at self-presentation. In addition, there is also a political aspect to Horace's commentary, as I noted in my introduction to the passage S.1.10.5-39. It seems to me that Horace expresses in lines 17-19 a wish to keep his distance from the four men (the three named and the *aper*) because at least Calvus and Catullus had a well-known history of disturbed relations with the Caesarian faction caused by their anti-Caesarian invectives in the past. It is likely that Horace, who tries in S.1 his hardest to prove that after his association with Brutus he can turn into a reliable member of Maecenas' circle, wants Maecenas to appreciate that the two men may not have shaken off their political past in the same way as he has. Horace may have had still a second reason not to commit himself too much concerning Catullus. When I discussed in section 2.1 the influence of Greek *iambus* on Horace, I mentioned that it is likely that the latter knew of Maecenas' sympathy for Catullus' poetry. According to Watson (2003, 19) two remaining fragments of poems by Maecenas addressed to Horace (fragments 2 and 3, Courtney, 2003) contain "explicit echoes of Catullus." Thus, Horace may have thought it prudent not to be too critical of Catullus' anti-Caesarian views. It follows on grounds of DuQuesnay's (1984, 56) suggestion that the Sardinian Hermogenes defected to Sextus Pompey in 39 B.C. that Hermogenes could not be trusted anyway. This would also explain why Hermogenes in S.1.10.79-80 is linked to a silly Fannius (*ineptus Fannius*), who may be C. Fannius, an adherent of Sextus. Thus, a potential association of the three men with Maecenas and his company was fraught with difficulties.

307 For Horace and Catullus, see Freudenburg (1993, 169); Heyworth (2001); Putnam (2006); Quinn (1963, 141-148, esp. 146-148); Wiseman (1988, 132-133). Gowers (2012, 317) referring to Putnam (2006) states that Catullus' "relationship with H.[orace] is ambiguous [...]: they share a similar literary aesthetic." Putnam (2006), traces indeed Catullus' presence in Horace's poetry, but finds this especially in his lyric poetry, the *Carmina*. Although Putnam (2006, 5) states: "whether we are dealing with matter or manner, with mode of presentation or with content, Horace seems to have set no limits on the aspects of Catullus to which he was drawn," we find only the single reference (2006, 60) to the *Sermones*: the bore of S.1.9. Putnam mentions this one example from the *Sermones* when he discusses Horace's ability "to reveal much about characters of whose names we remain ignorant." In my view, Putnam did not address the question of Horace "sharing a similar literary aesthetic" with Catullus in the *Sermones*.

Horace introduces a new subject for criticism of Lucilius, and begins the passage devoted to the mixing of Greek and Latin words quoting someone defending the habit in lines 20-21: *‘at magnum fecit quod verbis Graeca Latinis/ miscuit.’* (“but it was a great achievement the way he [Lucilius] mixed Greek words with Latin.”).³⁰⁸ Although good poetry relies to a high degree on variety, Horace is of opinion that Lucilius was too unrestrained with his Grecisms.³⁰⁹ He does not condone mixing Greek and Latin in Pitholeon’s poetry either. Horace’s rejection of the interlocutor’s defence of the quality and poetic value of Grecisms is given in lines 21-23:

*o seri studiorum! quine putetis
difficile et mirum, Rhodio quod Pitholeonti
contigit?*

(Such late learners! Do you really think that it is difficult and surprising what Pitholeon of Rhodes achieved?)

The suggestion that the name Pitholeon was a Greek-Latin mix for metric reason from Pitholaus to Pitholeon (*πίθων* = *ape* + *oleo* = I smell of) is attractive.³¹⁰ This also suggests the likely identity: the wit M. Otacilius Pitholaus (first century B.C. – after 45 B.C.), who came to Rhodes for study and went native. Horace pokes fun at his interlocutor: no wonder he mixed Greek and Latin. The change in name also exemplifies “the humorous possibilities of such a change” (Freudenburg, 1993, 169 note 101). Pitholaus, however, wrote a eulogy of Pompey and lampooned Julius Caesar (see Suet. *Jul. 75*).³¹¹ It is not clear whether he was one of the Neoterics as well. But it is feasible that Horace – as in the cases of Laberius, Calvus and Catullus – is also antipathetic of Pitholaus on grounds of his history of lampooning Julius Caesar. In addition, there may be a second reason for Horace’s rejection of Grecisms, one of a political nature. We saw that he in S.1.8 alluded to the pressure from the East, that is Parthia and Egypt. This was not only military, but also culturally. He was concerned about the future resilience of Rome and the loss of traditional values. We will see below that Horace broaches again the subject of Romans writing Greek in S.1.10.31-35, where he relates that Quirinus, the deified Romulus, once forbade him to fill up the crowded Greek ranks (*‘magnas Graecorum malis implere catervas’*) of poets (line 35). Although Quirinus’ interdiction does not refer to the mixing of Greek and Latin, but to the writing of verses in Greek, the allusion to the god is relevant. It was not

308 For the mixing of Greek and Latin in S.1.10, see Freudenburg (1993, 166-168).

309 Conform Gowers (2012, 318): “Lucilius was indeed lavish with satirical Grecisms.”

310 For the name Pitholeon, see Freudenburg (1993, 169); Gowers (2012, 319); Rudd (2007, 120; 147).

311 For M. Otacilius Pitholaus, see Kaster (1995, 297-299). For Pitholaus lampooning Julius Caesar, see Frank (1925, 74 note 6). Conform Rudd (2007, 120): “Frank is [...] probably right about Pitholaus – if we accept the usual identification of Pitholeon ([line] 22) with Pitholaus.” For Horace and the Neoterics, see Freudenburg (1993, 163-173); Rudd (2007, 119-121).

“his father,” or a colleague poet, or Maecenas who advised him, but the guardian of Roman values, Quirinus himself, who ordered him to write Latin verse. This signifies that Horace felt obviously very strongly about resisting the penetrating Greek cultural influence, also in his own domain, and that he saw the growing domination of foreign culture as a loss of being Roman.³¹²

Horace’s negative opinion about the mixing of Greek and Latin seems to be inconsistent with his words in S.1.4.8, in particular with his criticism of Lucilius’ lack of refinement in the composition of his verses. In S.1.10.23-24 Horace’s interlocutor says that blending the Latin with Greek words introduces a more refined composition, similar to the mixing of Latin Falernian with Greek Chian wine. Lines 23-24 read: ‘*at sermo lingua concinnus utraque/ suavior, ut Chio nota si commixta Falerni est*’ (“but a style which blends both languages is sweeter, as when Falernian wine is mixed with Chian”). Horace argued in S.1.4 that Lucilius should use a more refined style, but he does not agree that a more refined composition is created by introducing the “sweeter” sounds of foreign Greek words. This is consistent with the criticism he levelled against Lucilius in S.1.10.20-24 using the Greek. Horace rejected the anticompositional theory as supported by the Stoics, who favoured a rugged word order. Eliminating the ruggedness would not be achieved by the introduction of foreign words. This view was compatible with his view that the Latin language and Roman culture needed to be protected.³¹³

Next, Horace considers in lines 25-30 the issue of mixing Latin with Greek in the legal profession. He changes in line 25 from the use of Greek in poetry to that in oratory. S.1.10.25-30 reads:

*cum versus facias, te ipsum percontor, an et cum
dura tibi peragenda rei sit causa Petilli?
scilicet oblitus patriaeque patrisque, Latini
cum Pedius causas exsudet Publicola atque
Corvinus, patriis intermiscere petita
verba foris malis, Canusini more bilinguis?*

(Does this rule hold good, I ask you, only when one writes verses, or also when one has to fight the hard case of the defendant Petillius? Obviously, when Pedius, Publicola and Corvinus sweat out their cases in Latin, one would like them to completely forget fatherland and father mixing native with foreign words, like a bilingual from Canusium, wouldn’t one?)³¹⁴

312 For the defence of Latinitas, see Gowers (2012, 318).

313 For anticompositional theories and the views of the Stoics, see my discussion of S.1.4.9-13 in section 2.2.2 and note 135.

314 In line 27 I follow contrary to OCT Bentley (1711) w.r.t *oblitus/oblitos*, as I think Bentley’s reading makes better sense within the context; see also Gowers (2012, 320). I follow Gowers (2012, 320) w.r.t *Latine/Latini*.

Petillius in line 26 is Petillius Capitolinus, whose trial is mentioned in S.1.4.93-100. Porphyrio reports that he stole the gold crown of Jupiter Capitolinus, when he was in charge of the temple, but was acquitted by Julius Caesar; the story is probably an invention, and it is more likely that he was accused of embezzlement. But, his trial was presumably very much in the public eye, the more so as Petillius was well-born and belonged to the political elite. I concur with Knorr's (2005) arguments that Pedius and Publicola are probably two distinct individuals and that Corvinus is M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus, a military man, and also a patron of the literary; Ovid and Tibullus moved in his circle and according to Knorr (2005, 397) "he was considered to be one of the best speakers of his time and a notorious stickler for pure Latin" (see also note 45).³¹⁵ Canusium in Apulia was originally a Greek settlement, whose inhabitants spoke Greek and the local Oscan dialect and also (some?) Latin.

The answer to the rhetorical question in the above passage is that one would like to see the orators in public appearances, like for example members of the Senate and lawyers in court, speak correct and pure Latin. If this were not the case, Roman culture would be seriously eroded. Thus, Horace's rejection of the unacceptable mixing of Greek and Latin in formal and public rhetoric is consistent with his previous repudiation of the practice in poetry. My view is contrary to that of Knorr (2005, 398), who argues that "Messalla would not be the best person to appeal to for support. Messalla insisted on pure Latin in his prose, but he had no qualms about writing *Greek poetry* himself."³¹⁶ However, Horace's point is about the mixing of Greek and Latin, and not about a Latin speaker, like Messalla, writing Greek poetry. On account of what Quirinus forbade Horace to do in S.1.10.31-35, namely writing Greek verse, Horace and Messalla would presumably agree to differ on that point. But, both Messalla and Horace rejected presumably the mixing of Greek and Latin in a text, prose or poetry.

He returns in S.1.10.31-35 to the subject of the function of the Greek language in writing poetry after his reflections upon the function of Greek in writing prose. He narrates a "personal experience," that is a dream he claims he once had. In lines 31-32 he asserts that he also once wrote little verses in Greek like Messalla (*atque ego cum Craecos facerem,[...],/ versiculos*), although he was also born on this side of the Adriatic sea (*natus mare citra*), again like Messalla and also like the bilingual from Canusium. We saw already that Quirinus appeared after midnight, a vital hour as dreams at that time come true and forbade him to write verses in Greek (*vetuit me tali voce Quirinus,/ post mediam noctem visus cum somnia vera*) (lines 32-33). Quirinus

315 For Petillius Capitolinus, see Brown (2007, 135) and the discussion at S.1.4.93-100. For Pedius and Publicola, see Knorr (2005, 397): "Pedius is probably identical with the Q. Pedius who served as quaestor urbanus in 41 B.C.E.," and Publicola is "L. Gellius Publicola (cos. 36 B.C.E., the year before the publication of *Satires I*) is known primarily as a soldier and politician."

316 *Italics* are mine.

actually said to Horace in the dream in lines 34-35: “it would be crazier than carrying timber to the wood, if you chose to fill up the crowded Greek ranks [of poets]” (*in silvam non ligna feras insanius ac si/ magnas Graecorum malis implere catervas*). The expression in Latin that something “is as crazy as carrying timber to the wood,” is equivalent to the English “as crazy as taking coal to Newcastle” or the Dutch “as crazy as bringing water to the sea.” I have explained above that I read those lines about the lack of linguistic purity as Horace’s statement about the regrettable growth of Eastern influence in Rome and the need to resist the penetrating Greek cultural influence on Latin literature.

The last victim of Horace’s criticism of past and recent poets and literary modes is *turgidus Alpinus* (the inflated man of the Alps) in S.1.10.36-39. Porphyrio identifies *turgidus Alpinus* as M. Furius Bibaculus of Cremona, who returns in S.2.5.41.³¹⁷ Furius Bibaculus, a Neoteric poet of the first century B.C., wrote an epic *Annales Belli Gallici* about Julius Caesar’s campaigns. It is not clear whether he also wrote a second epic, an *Aethiopsis*, about Memnon, the son of Aurora, who was killed by Achilles in the Trojan war. None of his works is extant. The identification of *turgidus Alpinus* depends much on the two references by Horace in S.1.10.36-37, namely on *iugulat Memnona* (he murders Memnon) referring to the lost epic *Aethiopsis*, and on *defingit Rheni luteum caput* (puts into shape the muddy head of the Rhine) referring to the also lost *Annales Belli Gallici*. Both references are seen as sarcastic disparagements of Bibaculus’ poetry by Horace. The validity of the identification is controversial. On the one hand, according to Freudenburg (1993, 103 note 82) “the identification of *Turgidus Alpinus*

317 For the identification of *turgidus Alpinus* by Porphyrio as M. Furius Bibaculus the following is relevant. Porphyrio (Meyer, 1874, 240) refers in his commentary on S.1.10.36 to Memnon, which is understood as an allusion to Bibaculus’ *Aethiopsis*. Porphyrio’s commentary reads: “*turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona: hexametris uersibus nimirum describit. et belle ‘iugulat Memnona’ dilogos (= διλογος) ait*” (while the inflated man of the Alps murders Memnon, he wrote without doubt in hexameters. And falsely he said “he murders Memnon”). Horace also writes about Furius (Bibaculus) in S.2.5.41: “*Furius hibernas cana nive conspuet Alpis*” (Furius spat white snow upon the wintry Alps). Porphyrio (Meyer, 1874, 263) wrote as commentary on this line: “*Furius hibernas cana niue. hic uersus Furi Bibaculi est. ille enim cum uellet Alpes niuibus plenas describere, ait Iuppiter hibernas cana niue conspuet Alpes*” (Furius: wintry with white snow. This line is by Furius Bibaculus. For when Furius wanted to describe the Alps full of snow, Furius said Jupiter spat white snow upon the wintry Alps). Within the context of a discussion of extravagant metaphors, Quintilian also refers in *Inst.*8.6.17 to this line without mentioning M. Furius Bibaculus by name. *QUINT.Inst.*8.6.17 reads: *Iuppiter hibernas cana nive conspuet Alpes* (Jupiter spat white snow upon the wintry Alps); the commentary in Russell (2001, 435) states that this line is by “Furius Bibaculus. fr. 15 Courtney (2003, 198).” Further, *QUINT.Inst.*10.1.96 refers to Bibaculus: *iambus non sane a Romanis celebratus est ut proprium opus, quibusdam interpositus: cuius acerbitas in Catullo, Bibaculo, Horatio [...] reperitur* (iambic has not been particularly practised by Romans as a separate genre, but by some included in other metres: one finds its bitterness in Catullus, Bibaculus and Horace). For the identification of *turgidus Alpinus*, see Freudenburg (1993, 103); Gowers (2012, 323); Nisbet (1995, 393-395); Rudd (2007, 289-290); Gundel (1967).

(1.10.36) with M. Furius Bibaculus seems the best option given the similarities between *Satires* 1.10.36 and Horace's jibe against Furius, also a writer of historical epic, at *Satires* 2.5.39-41." On the other hand, Rudd (2007, 289-290 note 52) states "so one turns without much confidence to the view that Horace's Furius was contemporary with but distinct from Bibaculus." A further relevant point made about Bibaculus is a line in *TAC.Ann.*4.34 (Goelzer, 1959, 197) that *carmina Bibaculi et Catulli referta contumeliis Caesarum leguntur: sed ipse diuus Iulius, ipse diuus Augustus et tulere ista et reliquere* (the poems of Bibaculus and of Catullus, which are filled full of invectives against both Caesars, are still read: yet even the deified Julius himself and also the deified Augustus tolerated them and left them in peace). This can be considered supportive of the identification of *turgidus Alpinus* as Furius Bibaculus, as all other poets whom Horace censures in *S.1.10.5-39* are known to have written lampoons against Julius Caesar: Laberius (line 6), Calvus and Catullus (line 19), and Pitholaus of Rhodes (line 22). Horace repeats with his functional reference to Furius Bibaculus the political statement about his condemnation of the poets who lampooned Julius Caesar that he made before.

Yet, whatever the identity of *turgidus Alpinus* may be, it is clear that Horace did not rate his epic highly. He put it quite plainly in line 36 that he condemned his style: the sarcastic *turgidus* (inflated, pompous) and *iugulat Memnona* (he murders Memnon). The latter qualification reminds me of *S.1.4.59-62*, when Horace raises the subject of metathesis and asserts that rearranging verses is like murdering the poet: *praeponens ultima primis, / non, [...] / invenias etiam disiecti membra poetae* (placing last things before first, [...] you would not find the limbs even of a dismembered poet).³¹⁸ *Turgidus Alpinus* rearranged perhaps an existing epic about Memnon and did not care that he created inadmissible changes to the meaning of the Memnon story.

Contrary to the pompous *Alpinus*, Horace pretends in lines 37-39 that he only writes trivial poetry for his own pleasure. *S.1.10.37-39* reads:

*haec ego ludo,
quae neque in aede sonent certantia iudice Tarpa,
nec redeant iterum atque iterum spectanda theatris.*

(I play about with these, which are neither to be heard in the Temple [of the Muses] striving for Tarpa's adjudication, nor to come back again and again to be seen in the theatres)³¹⁹

Tarpa is Maecius Tarpa, who was appointed in 55 B.C. by Pompey as adjudicator of literary competitions. Horace's words show of course not only his false modesty, but are also a rejection of the struggle for attention by the poets discussed in this section.

³¹⁸ For metathesis, see also my discussion of *S.1.4.59-62*.

³¹⁹ Porphyrio's commentary on *aede* in line 38 is: *in aede Musarum, ubi poetae carmina sua recitabant* (in the temple of the Muses, where poets recited their poems).

Horace's attitude is also in line with his other statements about his desire for privacy, as for example in *S.1.6.122-123* and in the opening lines of *S.1.9*, and his denial of publicity for his poetry. Horace will testify in *S.1.10.73-74* that he does not attempt to reach large audiences, and about twenty five years later he still held the same opinion. He stated in his *Epistula ad Augustum* (*Ep.2.1.214*) again his preferred option asking Augustus to look favourably on his art, which is poetry for private reading: *lectori credere* (to put themselves in a reader's hands). In his earlier *Ep.1.19*, written between 23 and 19 B.C., he expressed similar feelings. At the end of his life when he wrote his *Ars Poetica*, he again poured scorn on the writing for large audiences and showed himself dismissive of the taste of large crowds either in the theatre or in someone's townhouse.

Then, in the passage *S.1.10.40-49*, Horace focuses his attention on contemporary poetry, his fellow poets. He begins with his friend Gaius Fundanius, a comic poet of the New Comedy, who features prominently in *S.2.8*, and who also belonged to the circle of Maecenas (see note 45).³²⁰ According to Gowers (2012, 325) Horace praises Fundanius because he had "the good taste to imitate elegant Terence, not sloppy Plautus (cf. *Ep.2.1.58-59*, *AP* 269-271), though his characters' names are still Greek-derived." Horace demonstrates this in lines 40-41 using Terentian names: Davus is "a cunning slave in *Ter.Andria* [...]" and Chremes is the duped father in *Ter.Phormio*" (Gowers, 2012, 325). *S.1.10.40-42* reads:

*arguta meretrice potes Davoque Chremeta
eludente senem comis garrere libellos
unus vivorum, Fundani;*

(you alone of those living, Fundanius, can chat in congenial scripts, where a sly courtesan and Davus make sport of old Chremes)

Note how cleverly Horace, using *eludere* (to make sport of) in line 41, refers back to his own *ludere* (to play about) in line 37, suggesting that Fundanius and he are partners in writing with a light touch.

Next, in *S.1.10.42-43*, he addresses C. Asinius Pollio (76 B.C. – A.D.4), a military man, consul in 40 B.C., and retired from politics soon afterwards. He was a committed Republican and a supporter of Julius Caesar. It is likely that he was involved in the land expropriations in Northern Italy after Philippi (see also note 122). He was also a literary critic, author of a historical work and poet of tragedies and founder of the first public library in Rome. Gowers (2012, 326) notes that Pollio "upheld H.[orace]'s criteria of *Latinitas* and *urbanitas*."³²¹ *HOR.Carm.2.1* is dedicated to Pollio's History of the Civil Wars. In *S.1.10*, Horace lauds Pollio as the "acknowledged [living] master

³²⁰ For Gaius Fundanius, see Rudd (2007, 95): "When Horace began his career as a poet the main genres were capably represented: Virgil was writing pastoral, Fundanius comedy, and so on." See also Harrison (2015, 41-42); Rudd (2007, 217-220; 222).

³²¹ For C. Asinius Pollio, see also Gundel (1964).

of his genre, tragedy,” with the following words: *Pollio regum/ facta canit pede ter percusso* (Pollio sings the deeds of kings in iambic trimeters).³²²

The next poet in this line-up of famous poets is L. Varius Rufus (ab.70 - ab.15 B.C.), poet in the epic genre, of whom Horace narrates in S.1.6.55 that he was introduced by him and Virgil to Maecenas and to whom Horace refers as one of his friends in S.1.5.39-44, during the journey to Brundisium, and in S.1.9.23, during his unfortunate stroll along the Via Sacra with the pushy fellow. His tragedy *Thyestes* was enacted in 29 B.C. at the games after Actium.³²³ Horace does not refer to the latter in S.1.10.43-44, and as the *Thyestes* is his only extant work, that was not yet produced at the time, Horace refers obviously to an earlier work of Varius that is unknown to us. Lines 43-44 read: *forte epos acer/ ut nemo Varius ducit* (Varius, spirited like nobody else, composes vigorous epic). Virgil is then praised in S.1.10.44-45 for his *Eclogae*, pastoral poetry with commentary on Octavian’s land confiscations in Northern Italy after Philippi. He showed himself in the *Eclogae* very concerned about the disappearance of the small farms and voiced his compassion with the suffering smallholders. Horace writes: *molle atque facetum/ Vergilio adnuerunt gaudentes rure Camenae* (the Muses relishing the countryside have granted to Virgil tenderness and elegance). Horace also used the word *facetus* in S.1.4.8, which I (and many others) translated as “witty” (see above at the introduction of this analysis of S.1.10). For S.1.10.44, the meaning of “elegance” for *facetum* is also given by QUINT.*Inst.* 6.3.19-20. This fits the context of the *Eclogae* better than for example “charm.” Horace wants to demonstrate with the words *molle*, which I take to mean in S.1.10.44 “mild, tender,” and with *facetum* his approval of Virgil’s way of showing his compassion by means of the very refined images and imaginative allusions in the *Eclogae*.³²⁴ This concurs very much with my own view of the *Eclogae*, and I feel honoured by Horace’s endorsement of my view, that the *Eclogae* show on the one hand Virgil’s critical concern with the future of the countryside and on the other his compassion with the farmers.

³²² Conform Brown (2007, 188): “Pollio: in the context of *unus vivorum* 42 and *ut nemo* 44, the acknowledged master of his genre, tragedy (indicated by the subject-matter *regum facta*).”

³²³ For L. Varius Rufus, see also Schmidt (1975a).

³²⁴ QUINT.*Inst.* 6.3.19-20 (Butler, 1977, 448-449): *Facetum quoque non tantum circa ridicula opinor consistere. Neque enim diceret Horatius, facetum carminis genus natura concessum esse Vergilio. Decoris hanc magis et exultae cuiusdam elegantiae appellationem puto* (I also do not think that *facetus* only inheres in texts which excite laughter. If so, Horace [in S.1.10.44-45] would certainly not have said that nature had granted Virgil a *facetus* character in his verses. *I think that in this case the word is rather used for something of grace and joyful elegance*). *Italics* are mine. For the details of my reading of Virgil’s *Eclogae*, see Weeda (2015, 54-84). My rendering of *molle* (tenderness) is contrary to Zetzel (2006, 46): “*molle*, however, is less unequivocally positive: despite all the favourable connotations [...], it also may have overtones of decadence and effeminacy.” In Zetzel (2006, 46 note 27), however, he states: “The interpretation of Putnam (1995) 305-6 takes *molle* as unequivocally positive, as many critics.”

After Virgil, it is in S.1.10.46-47 the turn of P. Terentius Varro Atacinus (of Atax, 82 – 35 B.C.), born in Gallia Narbonensis; hence his *cognomen* which refers to the river Atax (modern Aude) in the province. We know that he translated Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica* in Latin, and that he wrote an epic called *Bellum Sequanicum* about Julius Caesar's campaign against Ariovistus and two didactic poems, a geographical (*Chorographia*) and an agricultural (*Epimenides*). Only a few fragments of those works have survived. Whether he also wrote *Satires* is a vexed question: there are no extant satires, although Horace appears to refer in S.1.10.46-49 to Varro Atacinus writing satire. Two ancient testimonies, one by Propertius and another by Ovid in the *Tristia*, imply that Varro also wrote elegiac love poetry, in which he among other matters sang of a girl called Leucadia. PROP.2.34.85-86 reads: *sic quoque perfecto ludebat Iasone Varro/ Varro Leucadiae maxima flamma suae* (Varro also sported those when he completed his tale of Jason. Varro who was the brightest flame of his Leucadia). OV.Tr.2.439-440 reads: *is quoque, Phasiacas Argo qui duxit in undas, non potuit Veneris tacere suae* (he, too, who guided the Argo to the waters of the Phasis [a river in Colchis] could not pass over his own love affairs in silence). The words "he, too, who guided the Argo to the waters of the Phasis" is understood as referring to Varro Atacinus' translation of the *Argonautica*, and not to the original by Apollonius Rhodius. This interpretation is reinforced by the context of Ovid's line, where the man who guided the Argo is placed among a number of Roman elegiac poets. OV.Tr.2.421-422 reads: *neve peregrinis tantum defendar ab armis,/ et Romanus habet multa iocosa liber* (I should not defend myself with foreign arms [foreign/Greek writings] only, as Roman books also contain much frivolity). Then, Ovid mentions, among many other examples, Catullus who sang of Lesbia and his loves abroad, Calvus who revealed his own adventures, Gallus and Lycoris, and Tibullus. Some scholars ascribe satiric poetry to Varro; they do this, however on grounds that look to me rather dubious. For example Schmidt (1975b, 1140) writes that Varro's "production contains [...] Satires (HOR.S.1.10.46), in which he among others sang of – like Lucilius' Collyra – a beloved under the pseudonym of Leucadia (PROP. 2.34.85f, OV.Tr. 2.439f)."³²⁵ Although the testimonies by Propertius and Ovid lead me to the conclusion that Varro wrote elegiac rather than satiric poetry, S.1.10.46-49 suggests that Varro wrote indeed satires. As these appear to be completely lost, the question remains probably unresolved. S.1.10.46-49 reads:

*hoc erat, experto frustra Varrone Atacino
atque quibusdam aliis, melius quod scribere possem,
inventore minor; neque ego illi detrahere ausim
haerentem capiti cum multa laude coronam.*

³²⁵ For P. Terentius Varro Atacinus, see Schmidt (1975b). The German text of Schmidt (1975b): Varro's "produktion umfaßte [...] Satiren (Hor.s.1, 10, 46), in denen er u.a. – vgl. Lucilius' Collyra – eine Geliebte unter dem Pseudonym Leucadia besang (Prop. 2, 34, 85f. Ov.trist. 2, 439f.)." For the text by Propertius, see Schuster (1914, 89).

(this kind of writing, which had been tried in vain by Varro of Atax and some others, was what I could do better, although not as well as its inventor; nor would I presume to take from him the crown that remains attached to his head with so much glory)

If *hoc* in line 46 looks backward it can only refer to *satire* if Horace had first-hand knowledge of Varro of Atax's satiric writing, which has since completely disappeared. If *hoc* looks forward, "this kind of writing" refers without question to satire in view of what follows in lines 48-49 (*inventore* etc.) and the context of the whole passage of lines 50-71; both I will discuss presently. Further, we may safely assume that Horace's first-hand knowledge of Varro's production was far superior to ours today.

According to S.1.10.46-47, Horace obviously did not rate Varro of Atax's achievements in satiric poetry and those of some others highly. An interesting question is whether he includes among the "some others" Varro's namesake M. Terentius Varro from Reate, who wrote four books of verse satire and one hundred and fifty of Menippean satire. Still, Horace could do better, although not as well as its inventor Lucilius (*melius quod scribere possem, / inventore minor*). Horace makes an important statement in lines 48-49: he does not presume to take the crown of satirical poetry from Lucilius. Gowers (2012, 328) describes those two lines as "a mock-deferential bow from the inheritor to the inventor of satire." I interpret Horace's words that he does not want to be the inheritor, but that he bows out of satiric poetry.

In connection with Horace's statement that he does not intend to be a writer of satire, it is useful to summarize Horace's position with respect to his ideas about standards of good poetry. We saw above at the discussion of S.1.10.1-17 that Horace does not define in S.1.10 his position with respect to satiric writing, but that he defines his position with respect to style and content of his poetry in general. He was already writing or would soon commence to write in at least two additional genres simultaneously with the writing of S.1 and S.2: *Epodi* in the iambic genre, and the lyric poetry of many *Carmina* (Odes). According to Nisbet and Hubbard (2001, xxviii) "it would be rash to assume that the epodes were finished before the odes were begun." The same can be argued for the *Sermones* and the *Carmina*. Many of the *carmina* of the first book were written before 30 B.C.³²⁶ As he intends to write his political commentary in different genres, he cannot afford to restrict his views on his poetic orientation to one genre only. I noted in my introduction to the discussion of S.1.4.3-5 that, although Horace accepted that the genre of satire should hold wrong-doers freely and openly to reproach, I did not find that Horace ever addressed in S.1.1-1.3 wrong-doers directly, either in a mild or an agonistic Lucilian fashion. I conclude at the end of S.1 that

326 For the dating of *Epod.*, see note 7. For the dating of the poems in *Carm.*1, see Nisbet & Hubbard (2001, xxvii-xxxvii). Acc. to Nisbet & Hubbard (2001, xxviii-xxx) the following *carmina* were most likely written between 35 and 30 B.C.: 1.9, 1.11, 1.14, 1.15, 1.16, 1.18, 1.20, 1.23, 1.27, 1.35, 1.37, 2.13, and 2.17. The books of *Epistulae* and *Ars Poetica* were written after 23 B.C. For the dates of the books of *Epistulae* and *Ars Poetica*, see Ferri (2007, 121-131); Mayer (1994, 1-52).

no satiric poetry appeared in the rest of the book. I have come to this view on the following grounds. The whole of S.1 (including S.1.10) is a collection of his credentials in which Horace presents himself as a worthwhile future political commentator, associated with Maecenas. I also noted in my discussion of S.1.3.29-34 that Horace considers in those lines his future style of delivering critical commentary in general: that means not in the role as the satirist, but in that as a commentator of political issues in several genres.³²⁷ S.1.3.29-34 anticipated S.1.10.46-49 in which he says that he does not intend to become the successor to Lucilius. Hence, my conclusion that the first book of *Sermones* does not belong to the satiric genre. Further, if Horace was the leading satirist after Lucilius who set the new standards for the genre, particularly in S.1.4 and S.1.10, it is peculiar that he never wrote any satire, neither in S.1 and S.2 nor in any other work.

Horace continues the discussion of the work of Lucilius in S.1.10.50-71 starting with a brief recapitulation of S.1.4.11-13, formulating in lines 50-51 the crux of his criticism of Lucilius' style: "but I said that his work flows muddy, and often carries more that needed to be removed than needed to be left."³²⁸ Next, he refers to Lucilius himself in order to legitimise his criticism. S.1.10.50-55 reads:

*at dixi fluere hunc lutulentum, saepe ferentem
plura quidem tollenda relinquendis. age, quaeso,
tu nihil in magno doctus reprehendis Homero?
nil comis tragici mutat Lucilius Acci?
non ridet versus Enni gravitate minores,
cum de se loquitur non ut maiore repressis?*

(but I said that his work flows muddy, and often carries more that needed to be removed than needed to be left. Come, I ask you, do you, a scholar, find no faults in the great Homer? Doesn't Lucilius, obliging he may be, want to change anything in the work of the tragic poet Accius? Doesn't he laugh at lines of Ennius that want dignity, when he speaks of himself as no greater than those he criticized?)

Lucilius noted faulty details in Homer and in Ennius and the tragic poet L. Accius (170 – ab. 84 B.C.).³²⁹ Horace's point is that if Lucilius criticized the great poets, he and his followers like the Pompeians should not be offended when a "great" poet like Lucilius gets his own back (see also the discussion of S.1.4.5).

Horace works his previous criticism of Lucilius out further in the long passage that follows, S.1.10.56-71, and also places the criticism within the contemporary

³²⁷ See also my discussion of S.1.3.29-34 in section 2.2.2.

³²⁸ For a discussion of S.1.10.46-71, see also Freudenburg (1993, 179-184). I owe the rendering of *plura quidem tollenda relinquendis* in line 51 to Gowers (2012, 329).

³²⁹ For the Lucilius' fragments with his criticism of Homer, Ennius and Accius, see Gowers (2012, 329).

context. In addition, he finds some mitigations for Lucilius' harsh style. S.1.10.56-64 reads:

*quid vetat et nosmet Lucili scripta legentis
quaerere, num illius, num rerum dura negarit
versiculos natura magis factos et euntis
mollius, ac si quis pedibus quid claudere senis,
hoc tantum contentus, amet scripsisse ducentos
ante cibum versus, totidem cenatus, Etrusci
quale fuit Cassi rapido ferventius amni
ingenium, capsis quem fama est esse librisque
ambustum propriis?*

(what forbids us, too, as we read the writings of Lucilius, to ask whether it was his own nature or the harshness of his subject matter which prevented him from writing verselets that were more finished and ran more smoothly; and if he were simply content with having words versified in hexameters, rather than loved having written two hundred lines before and after dinner? Like Cassius the Etruscan whose talent was more impetuous than a rushing river and who, the story goes, was cremated on top of his own books and cases)³³⁰

Horace recalls to mind his points of S.1.4.6-13, in which he criticized not Lucilius' content, but his style and which he closed in S.1.4.13 with the words *nam ut multum, nil moror* (for I am not interested in quantity), inferring that quality and subject matter should come first. He points out again in S.1.10 the lack of refinement and the verbosity of Lucilius blaming amongst other matters Lucilius' voluminous production at high speed, like Cassius the Etruscan, an unknown poet, whose output could serve as his funeral pyre. Yet, Horace raises in line 57 a new point, and the mere mention of the point shows that he tones down the criticism of Lucilius that he expressed in S.1.4. I intend to show that Horace looks more favourably on Lucilius when he goes deeply into the latter's poetry allowing for the political context of his age.³³¹ He asks whether Lucilius' lack of finish was caused by "his own nature or by the harshness of his subject matter?" I interpret the harshness of the subject matter as referring to the contemporary political context of Lucilius' writing. The question that Horace raises is whether the serious political issues of some hundred years ago and Lucilius' censure of those involved did not require an unpolished response; such reply was precisely what the malicious individuals of the past were deserving and what they understood. Horace suggests in the following passage S.1.10.64-71 that Lucilius would have written

³³⁰ For lines 57-60 (*quaerere ... contentus*) I used Gowers' (2012, 330) rendering.

³³¹ Conform Freudenburg's (1993, 179) statement : "In *Satires* 1.10, the satirist's tone is conciliatory, but he stands by his former criticisms." Contrary to Oberhelman & Armstrong (1995, 252-253): "The answer to Horace's question is obvious: nothing was wrong with the *res* Lucilius chose, but rather Lucilius lacked real *ingenium* and therefore *ars*." Oberhelman & Armstrong do not discuss whether *rerum dura* (the harshness of his subject matter) may have had an influence.

differently in Horace's own time. In the words of Gowers (2012, 330) "he would apply stricter Callimachean standards to his verse." But, before I discuss lines 64-71, I will briefly look at the political context in which Lucilius worked.

Gaius Lucilius (180- ab.102 B.C.) was a Latin from Suessa Aurunca, an Oscan city near Campania, part of *Latium novum*.³³² We saw already that he was a great-uncle to Pompey the Great (see at S.1.4.5) and belonged to a social class that was equivalent to the Roman equestrian order. It is known that some of his close relatives belonged to the Roman elite: a brother was a senator, whose daughter married Gnaeus Pompeius Strabo. Lucilius himself owned estates in Italy and Sicily (perhaps also in Sardinia); book III of his *Satires*, the *Iter Siculum*, described perhaps his journey to Southern Italy and Sicily to inspect his estates there.³³³ He lived the greater part of his life in Rome, although he probably never became a Roman citizen. In Rome he befriended some of the best-known philosophers of his age and he moved also in the best political circles. Scipio Aemilianus was a friend of his, whom he joined in 134 B.C. in the Numantine War in Spain. He returned probably in the next year to Rome, where by that time the unrest caused by the murder of the reformer Tiberius Gracchus, who as *tribunus plebis* (tribune of the people) started the programme of land re-distributions, was spreading. Lucilius completed in 131 B.C. his first books of *Satires* and he gave up writing in 105 B.C., three years before his death in Naples. According to Warmington (1967, xv),

the lifetime of Lucilius was the age which saw the spread of Rome's power over Greece, a steady increase of Greek influence in Italy, much inflow of wealth into Rome, the conquest of Spain, the destruction of Carthage, the stirring times of the Gracchi, the affair of Jugurtha, and the dangers of Cimbric and Teutonic invaders from the north.

During this period, Lucilius was heavily involved in writing about political issues. We saw already in section 2.1 (Introduction to the chapter) that Quintilian points out in *Inst.*10.1.94: *nam et eruditio in eo mira et libertas atque inde acerbitas et abunde salis* (for he [Lucilius] has an extraordinary learning and candor, and hence satirical severity and an abundance of wit). We also saw in the discussion of S.1.4.6-13 and parrhesia that Horace judges the work of Lucilius positively with respect to its critical spirit and candor. Thus, Lucilius censured freely many highly placed individuals of his time. To mention only a few: Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus, censor in 131 B.C., his son C. Caecilius Metellus Caprarius, praetor in 116 B.C., L. Cornelius Lentulus Lupus, *princeps senatus* in 131-125 B.C., Q. Mucius Scaevola Augur, praetor in 121 or 120 B.C., L. Licinius Crassus, tribune in 107 B.C., Q. Granius, tribune in 107 B.C., L. Opimius, consul in 121 B.C., and others.

³³² For Lucilius' life, see Fiske (1966, 64-68); Warmington (1967, ix – xx).

³³³ Lucilius' *Iter Siculum* is considered by Porphyrio (and followed by many scholars) the model of S.1.5, Horace's "Journey to Brundisium." I refer to my discussion of S.1.5 in section 2.2.3 and to note 178, where I argue that it is unlikely that Horace emulated Lucilius.

Warmington (1967, xix – xx) makes an interesting point in the final lines of his section about the life of Lucilius. He says

we see a man well acquainted with country-life, very fond of animals, particularly of horses and riding, who *lived also in a big city and watched its society and politics. He seems to have been independent all his life, fond perhaps of leisure, at any rate disliking any kind of official position.*³³⁴

It reads like an evaluation of Horace, the only difference being the harsh language of Lucilius compared to that of Horace. The latter recognized that the political context in which Lucilius worked was not all that dissimilar to that of his own age, that Lucilius' commentary on political and social issues was not dissimilar to his own ambition of becoming a political commentator, and that Lucilius kept his independence. In the lines that follow, Horace imagines how Lucilius would polish his style, if he were one of his contemporaries. S.1.10.64-71 reads:

*fuert Lucilius, inquam,
comis et urbanus, fuert limatior idem
quam rudis et Graecis intacti carminis auctor,
quamque poetarum seniorum turba: sed ille,
si foret hoc nostrum fato dilatus in aevum,
detereret sibi multa, recideret omne quod ultra
perfectum traheretur, et in versu faciendo
saepe caput scaberet vivos et roderet unguis.*

(granted, I say, Lucilius was obliging and had a sophisticated wit, granted, he was also more polished than an inexperienced originator of verse untouched by the Greeks was, and also than the crowd of older poets: still, if his life had been deferred by fate until our age, he would file away much, would keep cutting back all that stretched beyond the proper limit, and when he was shaping his verse he would often scratch his head and gnaw his nails to the quick)

Horace confirms in line S.1.10.65 again what he said about Lucilius in S.1.10.53, namely that Lucilius was *comis* (obliging). He paired this with the qualification *urbanus* praising Lucilius for his sophisticated wit. He used the same word in S.1.10.13-14, when he presented his view on the attributes of good poetry: *interdum urbani, parcentis viribus atque/ extenuantis eas consulto* (from time to time that of the sophisticated wit, who reserves and weakens the strength of his speech on purpose). We also saw that according to Gowers (2012, 326) S.1.10.42-43 shows that Pollio upheld Horace's criteria of *urbanitas*. Thus, *comis et urbanus* are two characteristics "that would admit Lucilius to H.[orace]'s literary coterie" (Gowers, 2012, 332). However, there is more to say about *comis et urbanus*. The words appeared already in S.1.4.90 in a negative context when Horace described the objectionable scandalmongering by the wrong type at the dinner party of the Roman patron. The man asperses everyone

334 *Italics* are mine.

in every possible way. Typically nouveau riche, those at table consider the man (in S.1.4.90) agreeable (*comis*) and witty (*urbanus*). In this way, Horace referred to their reprehensible habit of parroting the value system and the social standards of the upper classes. He condemned the empty talk of the new rich, who did not sincerely attempt to adopt good standards of behaviour; standards which Horace considered indispensable in a civilized society and which he expected Lucilius to meet without difficulty.

Lucilius' personal qualities do not only meet Horace's standards, but we read in lines 65 – 67 that he is also much more polished than expected. The traditional originators of new verse showed generally less refinement as they had not been immersed in the works of their Greek predecessors. Lucilius, however, was different as Horace already mentioned in S.1.4.1-2: Lucilius wholly depends on Eupolis and Cratinus and Aristophanes, true poets and the other men of principle of Old Comedy (*EVPOLIS atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae, / atque alii quorum comoedia prisca virorum est*), and in S.1.4.6-7: Lucilius wholly depends on them, and then he followed changing only metre and rhythm (*hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus / mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque*). Further, Lucilius is highly praised in lines 67-71, in which Horace says that, if Lucilius were still alive, he would be filing away much of his texts to the standards of good poetry, although scratching his head and gnawing his nails illustrate that he may have difficulty in doing. Thus, Horace expects that Lucilius could have met his standards of good poetry, in which *brevitas* (brevity), *varietas* (variety), and *libertas* (freedom of speech) were essential attributes. Summarizing Horace's opinion of Lucilius, I distinguish between Lucilius the literary and the political man. I interpret that Horace's opinion of Lucilius the literary man has developed in S.1 from one of rejection towards one of a fair degree of acceptance. Further, he expressed his respect for the political Lucilius. Horace may have concluded at this stage that the contemporary political circumstances were not very different from those in Lucilius' time: the land reforms started by the Gracchi and the unrest caused by the murder of the reformer Tiberius Gracchus giving rise to much social and political turmoil. Yet, Lucilius gave his commentary freely with great *libertas* setting an example that was very likely of great importance for Horace's own position. We saw in our discussion of S.1.4.5 and parrhesia that Lucilius was promoted as their man by the Republicans, who had adopted the position of being the defenders of free speech together with the hard-line Stoics and the Pompeians. He was fostered as the defender of Republican *libertas*. Thus, Horace, the associate of Maecenas and Octavian, touched with a rejection of Lucilius upon a very sensitive political issue. Horace's lack of appreciation of Lucilius could well be taken as an attack on the traditional republican value of freedom of speech, coming from someone near Octavian. Moving towards an appreciation of Lucilius, the champion of *libertas*, would at least reduce the power of the Republicans' point, if not remove the claim. I sympathise much with DuQuesnay's (1984, 30-32) point that, although Horace distanced himself from Lucilian invective, it is feasible that he followed the same Lucilius as a model upholding the values of *libertas*.

In the lines that follow, S.1.10.72-77, Horace gives his view on the kind of readership he rejects, and introduces the audience he prefers. I have already discussed in section 2.1 Horace's audience according to Gold's (1992, 161-175) classification. His view on the preferred audience cannot be severed from his objective writing S.1, the credentials for Maecenas. Yet, already at S.1.4.22-23 and S.1.4.71-74, and indeed at other occasions later in his career, he was very clear that he did not write for the large crowd (*Ep.*1.19.41-44 and *Ars.*212-213), and that he was not thrilled to see his poems as textbooks (*Ep.*1.20.17-18, "the letter to his little book").³³⁵ S.1.10.72-77 reads:

*saepe stilum vertas, iterum quae digna legi sint
scripturus, neque te ut miretur turba labores,
contentus paucis lectoribus. an tua demens
vilibus in ludis dictari carmina malis?
non ego: nam satis est equitem mihi plaudere, ut audax
contemptis aliis explosa Arbuscula dixit.*

(you must often cross things out, if you are to write what is worth a second reading, and you should not strive to get the admiration of the crowd, but that you be content with the select few as your readers. Or would you be so silly as to want your poems dictated in common elementary schools? Not me; just as unflinching Arbuscula, contemptuous of others, said when she was hissed of the stage: it is enough if the knights applaud me)³³⁶

Arbuscula (lit: a small tree) was a famous mime actress, like Cytheris with whom Marc Antony had a love affair (see the discussion of S.1.2.55-63 and notes 95 and 97). Mime actresses were at the time favourite girl friends of upper class men. Arbuscula states that what counts in her case is the opinion of the knights, who are the upper class connoisseurs of women and also the men with superior taste in matters of the theatre. By analogy, Horace asserts in lines 76-77 that he is only interested in the opinion of his poetry held by "literary knights," the upper class connoisseurs and friends of poets and the men with superior taste in matters of the poetic. Horace's preference for small, select audiences happens to fit his programme of writing S.1, as his objective is to obtain a favourable judgement by Maecenas and those close associates, whom Maecenas is likely to choose for involvement in the process of assessing Horace's candidature for membership.

In the final passage, S.1.10.78-91, Horace gets very specific about the men with whom he wants to be associated. Wedged between a few poets he does not want to know, he presents a long list of colleague poets and some members of the political elite. He says in lines 78-80:

³³⁵ For Horace's preferred audience, see also Weeda (2010, 47-48).

³³⁶ In line 72 *saepe stilum vertas* means literally: you must often turn your pen. One end of the *stilus* was pointed for writing and the other was flat for erasing.

*men moveat cimex Pantilius, aut cruciet quod
vellicet absentem Demetrius, aut quod ineptus
Fannius Hermogenis laedat conviva Tigelli?*

(should the bed bug Pantilius bother me, or Demetrius torment me because he carps behind my back, or silly Fannius, the table companion to Tigellius Hermogenes, because he belittles me?)

According to Rudd (2007, 136) these lines are “a few expressions of genuine dislike. They are to be found for the most part in 1.10, where they centre on characters like Hermogenes, Demetrius, Pantilius and Fannius.”³³⁷ Rudd argues that the name of Pantilius, who cannot be identified, is something more than word-play by Horace: *πᾶν τίλλειν* is “to nip everything.” I concur with Rudd (2007, 144), who argues that “the name is found in *C.[orpus] I.[nscriptio-num] L.[atinarum]*. X.5925 (Dess.6260), and it occurs here in a context full of personalities. The least we should assume is that Pantilius was a nickname for some carping critic of the day.”³³⁸ Like Pantilius, Demetrius cannot be placed. Rudd (2007, 124) brackets him with Hermogenes, stating that they “were professionals who made their living by teaching and study.” Both return in S.1.10.90-91 as teachers at a girls’ school. Rudd also suggests that they probably resented Horace’s friendship with Messalla, Pollio and Maecenas, and that they were likely politically hostile to Octavian. Fannius was mentioned by Horace already in S.1.4.21; he is identified by scholars either as a poet who wrote perhaps on themes of Stoic ethics, or as one of the brothers Fannii (see note 141). I concur with the view of Freudenburg (1993, 117) that the Fannius of S.1.4.21 and of S.1.10.80 are probably the same person, namely the poet. In S.1.4.21 he is depicted as a writer who promoted his own work to large audiences (the subject matter of the previous passage S.1.10.72-77), while the Fannius of S.1.10.80 is also one of many whom Horace mentions in the context of his detractors and friends: most of them are authors. Finally, it is useful to briefly review the history of Hermogenes, who figures prominently in S.1.10.18, 80 and 90, and who came on the scene for the first time in S.1.3.129 (see for details the discussion at S.1.10.17-19). According to Freudenburg (1993, 116), he was very able to “adjust himself to the changing political winds of the late Republic,” and

337 White (1993, 38) also states “that Horace himself testifies repeatedly to the division and spite which prevailed in the lower echelons of his milieu,” and he (1993, 38 note 8) argues that “the malice of companions is the leading theme of *Serm.*1.3 [especially lines 58-61], and the theme surfaces also at 1.4.78-103, [and at] 1.10.78-80.” The passages in S.1.3 and S.1.4 deal indeed with the themes of relationships among companions, but, contrary to White I read a particular focus w.r.t. those relationships. In the passage in S.1.3, Horace describes the manner in which he wants to present himself among friends, that is taking the liberty to tell Maecenas whatever he thinks that the latter should know; the largeness of Maecenas shows in the way he handles the situation. In the passage in S.1.4, he states that friends should certainly frankly criticize each other if necessary, but this should not be done in a malicious manner, but in a civilized style.

338 I found the name Pantilius in Mommsen & Henzen (1883, 721), *Inscriptiones Latinae antiquissimae ad C. Caesaris mortem*, IX. 91.

DuQuesnay (1984, 56) considers the possibility that Hermogenes defected to Sextus Pompey. Horace refers in S.1.4.71-72 to disreputable poets selling their books in shops, where they are being soiled by the unreliable Hermogenes, whom he mentions in the same breath with the vulgar crowd. Finally, Hermogenes is referred to in S.1.9.25, where Horace quotes the pushy fellow: “*invideat quod et Hermogenes ego canto*” (“and my singing makes even Hermogenes envious”). The four men, Pantilius, Demetrius, Fannius and Hermogenes, have in common that they were all critical of Horace’s poetry and of his political connection, although their criticism was presumably tinged with jealousy. Horace does not want to mix with them and they are most certainly no candidates for admission to the circle of Maecenas. He is not impressed by their attacks as long as he sees that men like Fuscus, Plotius, Varius, Maecenas, Virgil, Pollio, Messalla and others like his verses.³³⁹ The men who deserve such a place are addressed in the following passage S.1.10.81-90.

*Plotius et Varius, Maecenas Vergiliusque,
Valgius, et probet haec Octavius, optimus atque
Fuscus, et haec utinam Viscorum laudet uterque!
ambitione relegata te dicere possum,
Pollio, te, Messalla, tuo cum fratre, simulque
vos, Bibule et Servi, simul his te, candide Furni,
compluris alios, doctos ego quos et amicos
prudens praetereo; quibus haec, sint qualiacumque,
arridere velim, doliturus si placeant spe
deterius nostra.*

(Plotius and Varius, Maecenas and Virgil, Valgius and Octavius, and Fuscus, the best of men, may they approve of these [verses], and I wish that both Viscus brothers praise these! Without flattery I can mention you, Pollio, you Messalla, with your brother, and you too, Bibulus and Servius, and also with these you, fair Furnius, and several other intellectuals and friends, whom I discreetly do not mention. I should like these verses, whatever they are worth, be pleasing to them, and I shall be sorry if they are less agreeable than I hope)

339 Conform Harrison (2015, 41): “It has been well argued that within *Satires* 1 we find a kind of autobiographical progress of Horace from the excluded moralist of *Satires* 1.1-3 to the Maecenatic poet of 1.4 and beyond who has entered the literary establishment; [...] who in 1.10 takes his place amongst the leading writers of the day.” See also Zetzel (1980). Plotius is Plotius Tucca; Varius is L. Varius Rufus, epic poet, who together with Plotius Tucca later edited the *Aeneis*; C. Valgius Rufus, elegist; Octavius Musa, poet and historian; Aristius Fuscus (in S.1.10.83, in S.1.9.61, in *Carm.*1.22 (“*Integer vitae*”) and in *Ep.*1.10). He was a dramatic writer and scholar and a good friend of Horace; Viscus brothers, senators also mentioned in S.1.9.22; Pollio is C. Asinius Pollio, tragedian, orator, historian and general; Messalla is M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus, soldier, statesman and patron of among others Tibullus; Messalla’s brother is L. Gellius Publicola, statesman and literary patron; L. Calpurnius Bibulus, stepson of Brutus; Servius, either an unknown erotic poet or a relative of Messalla; Furnius, probably an orator. See also Brown (2007, 192-193); Gowers (2012, 335-337); Harrison (2015, 41-43). The mention of Bibulus is important for the dating of the release of S.1. He was in Rome in 36/35 B.C. See DuQuesnay (1984, 20); Gowers (2012, 336).

In this passage, Horace submits for approval his first book of *sermones* with his personal portrait and his views on a number of important matters to an impressive company of men. We have come full circle. The book in which Horace seeks to demonstrate that he can be a worthwhile member of the Roman intellectual elite begins with an address to Maecenas. The book closes with the names of fifteen men and many more whom he discreetly does not mention, who are his fellow intellectuals and friends. They are literary men, scholars and orators, and men in high public office and patrons of the arts. It looks that he attained his end.

Horace saved a final sneer for Demetrius (of line 79) and Hermogenes (here called Tigellius) wishing them good luck with their trivial pursuits which fit them better. According to Gowers (2012, 337) the two are “girls’ tutors, i.e. second-class teachers. This desultory but snide picture of a pampered ‘finishing school’ may allude to the female readers of maudlin neoteric love elegy.” Horace has done with them: they better “get lost.” The final three lines of the book, S.1.10.90-92, read:

*Demetri, teque, Tigelli,
discipularum inter iubeo plorare cathedras.
i, puer, atque meo citus haec subscribe libello.*
(but you, Demetrius and Tigellius get lost amongst the easy chairs of your female pupils. Go, boy,
and quickly add these lines to my little book)³⁴⁰

It is not absolutely clear whether the instruction to the slave-boy in the final line 92 refers to the scornful picture of Demetrius and Hermogenes or to the whole of S.1.10. I take it that the line refers to the whole poem as it reflects Horace’s relief that writing S.1 delivered the result: he had been admitted to Maecenas’ circle and the book should be distributed amongst the circle as soon as possible.³⁴¹ One never knows whether people change their mind and therefore: hurry up and make hay while the sun shines.

³⁴⁰ I used Gowers’ (2012, 337) rendering of *iubeo plorare* (get lost) in line 91.

³⁴¹ Conform Brown (2007, 193-194): “the slave is instructed to append satire 10 to the other nine, so that the book can be published amongst the select audience just specified. *citus* [quickly] is not without irony, suggesting that, despite Horace’s indifference to publicity and the need for slow, laborious composition, he is impatient to see the book published.”

3 Summary of *Sermones* Book 1: Horace's Credentials Containing Political Commentary; Virgil's *Eclogae* and Horace's *Sermones* Book 1 Compared

3.1 Introduction to the Chapter

In this chapter I aim to bring together the results of my study of the individual *sermones* and draw some general conclusions related to the first book of *Sermones* as a whole. Although Horace's main purpose writing the book is his self-presentation, he also presents in *S.1* commentary on some contemporary political issues. In this last chapter, I intend to sketch the nature of his self-presentation and his poetic choice, and also to determine the main issues of his political commentary that he intertwines through his representation. At first, I will present in section 3.2 summaries of the results of my analyses of the ten *sermones*.

Subsequently, I will discuss in section 3.3 my interpretation of the first book of *Sermones* as a collection of Horace's credentials for Maecenas and I will trace his efforts in getting accepted as an associate of the latter. *S.1* contains a number of his reflections on his poetic orientation and of his views on standards of good poetry. I will consider those within the context of his self-presentation. Next, I will examine in section 3.3 the main political themes which he presents in the book. Further, I will give in this section a broad outline of his political commentaries in his other work of the period of 38 – 30 B.C., and I will compare those with that in *S.1*. Consequently, I will examine the commentary he presents in *Sermones* book 2, the *Epodi* and some of the *Carmina* of the same period. I will make use of some of the results of my thesis (Weeda, 2010), in which I analysed the political content of the complete extant oeuvre of Virgil, Horace and Propertius.

Finally in section 3.4, I will compare Virgil's *Eclogae* and Horace's *Sermones* book 1 with respect to the nature of political commentary in either book. Both poets were born during the civil war and experienced the transition and political change from the Republic to the early Principate, and both lived and worked as associates of Maecenas.

3.2 Summary of *Sermones* Book 1

Concerning *S.1* as a whole, a clear distinction in two main matters of content is apparent. Firstly, Horace offers in *S.1.1* – *S.1.4* and in *S.1.10* his credentials by presenting his views on his poetic orientation and his standards for good poetry, on socio-political contemporary issues and on behaviour among friends. He chose and presented the issues in such a way that he maximized the chance of finding favour with Maecenas at the same time getting Maecenas and his audience of the latter's

associates accustomed to his future role as political observer and commentator. Secondly, he describes in S.1.5 – S.1.9 both his personal “experiences” and efforts to achieve his association with Maecenas and his position after actually having achieved membership of the latter’s circle. Many of the “events” and “experiences” described in S.1.5 – S.1.9 are poetic fiction with only a few autobiographical elements. In S.1.5 – S.1.9 Horace expresses his loyalty towards Maecenas and continues declaring his trustworthiness as an associate. S.1.10 stands apart as the poet is concerned with both matters of content. In S.1.10.1–77, he repeats his views on writing good poetry, while in the last passage (lines 78–92) he expresses his contentment with his newly found circle of colleagues and friends.

When one considers S.1.1 – S.1.9 from the point of structure of the poems, one notes that S.1.1 – S.1.4 are characterized by their focus on philosophical teachings and literary choices, written in a conversational mode of presentation. S.1.5 – S.1.9 is a series of anecdotes, apart from the first forty four lines of S.1.6. Horace narrates in S.1.5 a journey, in S.1.6.45–131 his “father’s” efforts for his education, his years with Orbilius and his typical day in Rome, in S.1.7 an experience with Brutus in Asia, in S.1.8 the events on the Esquiline with the witches, and in S.1.9 his meeting with the pushy nouveau riche on the Via Sacra. S.1.10.1–77 has again a focus on literary teachings.

With respect to the detail of the content of S.1, I will review each *sermo*. In this review, I present only my conclusions; the supporting evidence is given in the discussions of the individual *sermones* in section 2.2.

Horace chose as subject for discussion in **S.1.1** greed (*avaritia*), ambition (*ambitio*) and extravagance (*luxuria*), and shows his concern about the impact of the rejection of the old Roman values and the loss of moral standards by both common people and the new rich on the political stability in Rome and Italy. Immediately at the start of S.1, Horace recalls that the Stoic Fabius also recounted in his writings the conduct of different types of men. Horace achieves through the functional reference to Fabius two objectives. Firstly, the poet makes a statement about his style as a politically engaged poet: he intends to write in a sophisticated and subtle manner, as he will appeal to his readers’ education and sophistication. Secondly, he confronts through Fabius a whole group of contemporary poets, Stoics, republicans and generally men of a very different political leaning than his own; men, with whom he does not wish to be associated. Horace states not only that his style will not be as bombastic and unrestrained as that of Fabius and others, but also that contemporary philosophies such as Stoicism, are not necessarily the only guides to responsible behaviour. He believes that a return to the old Roman values might contribute to greater political and social stability and coherence. Thus, the opening of Horace’s first book of *Sermones* contains two important statements relating to his efforts to convince Maecenas: he asserted that he held the right political views, which were not those held by the extreme Stoics, of whom many were Octavian’s opponents, and he adds to this the positive statement that the old Roman values are the foundation of his outlook upon life.

The main part of S.1.1 (lines 28-107) is taken up with further detailed descriptions of greed, ambition and extravagance of distinct groups enabling Maecenas to judge the poet's convictions. At first, he returns to the subject with which he opened the poem: the discontent of many people, envying others. The discontented farmer, innkeeper, soldier or sailor have one thing in common, that is their desire to get rich and enjoy a comfortable retirement when old. Next, Horace censures greed for the following sixty-six lines asking the miser what the use of all his hidden silver and gold is. Horace explains that man ought not to cross natural borders, and that man does not need more food and drink than his body can cope with. He suggests that when a man lives in harmony with nature it does not matter whether he ploughs a hundred or a thousand acres, as long as he can take all he needs from the smaller piece of land. He also gives a forceful impression of man's greed and the consequences of stepping outside nature's bounds in the allegory of the man who needs a cup of water, but takes the cup from a wild river rather than from a tiny brook. Their greed makes them blind for the burden of amassing more riches than one needs. Similar to Virgil's placing the events described in *Ecl.*10 in his native area by the functional reference to the river Rhenus, Horace also uses a functional reference to the Apulian river Aufidus to locate in his native area the allegory of the greedy man having a drink. It is feasible that Horace refers here to what he experienced in his youth, when the greed and arrogant conduct of the new class of rulers, the military, called the shots in Venusia, and consequent destruction of the traditional social structure of his home town.

The poem started with the poet criticizing average citizens, like traders, sailors, soldiers, farmers, lawyers, innkeepers, but moves away from those towards misers, who, obsessed by their fear of losing their money, belong to the increasing group of nouveau riche. I come to this view on grounds of the specific choice of words. Using the words "a good many men (*bona pars hominum*)," Horace indicates that rather many people think that one cannot have enough. He wrote *bona pars* because he observed that this thinking was particular manifest within the large emerging group of the new rich, rather than in the circumscribed group of the old rich. In addition, Horace's rejection of the ways of the new rich is also a theme in each *sermo* of S.1, except in S.1.8. He points out that wealth cannot buy health, happiness or love. The miser is left to his own devices in times of sickness, even by his wife and children. Neither should one run to the other extreme, that is behaving as spendthrifts, who show their wealth. It is feasible that Horace makes a point of presenting these types as representatives of the new class of the rich, who could afford the most extreme opulence and indulge in excesses. Horace finishes S.1.1 with the conclusion that knowing when to stop is something that the greedy and ambitious men, for whom enough is not enough, never do. Horace warns them of the limitations in their search for power and wealth suggesting that they should follow the example of the well satisfied dinner guest, who does not stuff himself. He brings in the last line the Stoic Crispinus on the stage, that is in the role as an adherent of Sextus Pompey, a connection that Horace will examine at different places in S.1.

Horace's mention of avarice and ambition throughout the poem is significant. Horace depicts himself and Maecenas as very concerned about the erosion of moral standards, and its impact on the political situation. Horace attacking the vices of *avaritia*, *ambitio* and *luxuria* reacts to the contemporary hostile propaganda against the Triumvirs, principally, of course, Octavian. Censuring greed and ambition, he expresses a most likely widely held view in Rome that the greed of the powerful has led to the contemporary problems of civil war and political and social strife. In his opinion, however, it is the greed of the powerful from different layers of society (aristocrats, the new rich, freedmen and the military) that caused the contemporary problems, and not only the actions of the Triumvirs or Octavian. Further, the allusion of the final lines of S.1.1 to those of *Ecl.*10 is significant as Horace achieves two objectives by these final lines: firstly, a statement about his approach to writing poetry, namely that he does not carry on endlessly, but knows when to stop, and secondly the delivery of the message which the book of *Eclogae* expresses, that is a critical commentary on contemporary state of affairs. As it were, Horace associates himself with the political views of Virgil, who introduced him to Maecenas, and demonstrates thus that he is one of them. I interpret the two functional references, the one at the end of Virgil's *Ecl.*10 and the allusion to the Aufidus, as Horace associating himself with Virgil's condemnation in each *ecloga* of the expropriations and the expulsions in Italy and of the destruction and social upheaval caused by the civil war and its aftermath. One may wonder why Horace joins Virgil through those hidden allusions, and why he does not speak more openly. I suggest that at the time of writing S.1.1 Horace did not want to bring to light too openly a critical view of Octavian's involvement in the struggle for power. The outcome of the civil war was still undecided. Horace may have felt that as a new man in Maecenas' circle, blemished by his former allegiance to Brutus, he did better not to speak in his first poem too openly about delicate major political subjects in Maecenas' presence.

Horace introduces in S.1.2 a man called Tigellius, who together with one called Hermogenes feature in a number of places in S.1. I examine the issue of their identities in the opening of my analysis of S.1.2., and I come to the conclusion that Horace wrote about two different men: about the dead Tigellius in S.1.2 and S.1.3.4, and about Hermogenes at other places (S.1.3.129, S.1.4.72, S.1.9.25, S.1.10.18, 80 and 90). The difference between the two is important as the Tigellius (of S.1.2), who is praised by his entourage for his generosity, is a prototype of a playboy in first-century B.C. Rome, and symbolizes in S.1.2 the faults of the Roman patronage system which buys second-rate loyalty. Hermogenes symbolizes the many who tried to force their way into the social and political elite and exemplifies unreliability (see S.1.3.129).

Horace gives examples of people who do not know their border and who search for the extreme in financial matters being either a spendthrift or a miser, and for that in sexual exhibitionism in public. In the remainder of the poem, the lack of a middle course is also very apparent from the ways of men who do not know how to choose wisely their preferred ways of sexual gratification. They go for either the extreme

of adultery with a married woman or for that with a prostitute. Horace suggests the middle course: satisfaction of one's desires on a casual, dispassionate basis with a freedwoman.

Next, Horace introduces the sexual scandals of Roman high society. One of the scandals he refers to is that of an affair of a Marsaeus with an upwardly mobile mime actress. Horace condemns the lack of restraint of Marsaeus' extravagant conduct squandering his father's inheritance on his mistresses. The reference to a mime actress is especially of interest, as at the time mime actresses were favourite girl friends of upper class men, and the affair mentioned may allude to the affair of Marc Antony with Cytheris. Horace did not express his disapproval of Antony's affair, but he censured Antony's behaviour which was typical for the degeneration of standards within the elite. He explains the advantages of seeking sexual gratification with a prostitute or a woman, not a married woman (*matrona*) who is available. A prostitute shows openly what she has for sale, whereas a *matrona* can show off her attractive bodily parts and hide the less attractive. Thus, seeking the pleasures of a *matrona* is like the rich men's practice of buying horses that are covered up for inspection. Horace compares a genuine Roman lover to a genuine hunter who follows the hare in deep snow. But, he appreciates that he should give a realistic advice for satisfying man's sexual desires, and he gives his views on the best choice. He introduces an Epicurean analogy to separate unreal pleasures from real ones, by distinguishing the void from the solid. He continues the Epicurean analogy comparing the pains of sexual desire with hunger and thirst. When one is thirsty and hungry, a simple meal will do. He calls in the Epicurean Philodemus' aid who says that he wants for himself a woman who is available, although not for a high price, and does not hesitate to come when bidden. Philodemus wants something between a prostitute and a *matrona*: a freedwoman. Finally, the poet repeats his advice not to seek a *matrona* as there is always a chance of being caught out.

Horace places the events of the second satire clearly within the Roman upper class. He introduces two groups of men. The first group belongs clearly to the aristocracy or at least to the political/social elite (Galba, Sallust, Villius, Longarenus, Fausta), and the functional reference to Marc Antony. The second group is that of the wrong men within the retinue of Roman patrons (Tigellius, Cupiennius, and the nouveau riche Fufidius). The disdain with which he generally writes about a nouveau riche is very different from the note he strikes in this passage writing about the members of the aristocratic class, how much he may disapprove of their actions. A number of other allusions also supports the conclusion that we are seeing the upper classes in action. The second half of the poem does not have many names, but has a number of references to the lifestyle of the upper class: the buying of horses, the servants of the lady, the leisure pursuit of game. Although it seems that S.1.2 concerns chiefly the pursuit of sexual extremes, Horace's commentary covers the broader field of the common and unmannerly conduct of an increasing number of members of the upper class. At the time of Horace writing this sermo, a development of the structure of the

Roman and Italian social upper layer had materialized in new classes of rich people besides the traditional *optimates*, the old aristocratic families and landowners, from whom the members of the Senate and consuls were recruited. Apart from the lack of restraint of an appreciable number of aristocrats, Horace also addresses, like in S.1.1, that of the growing group of new rich. S.1.1 and S.1.2 share the same self-presentation: Horace makes it absolutely clear to Maecenas that he does not want to know that sort of people.

In **S.1.3**, Horace opens his discussion of how to communicate by presenting a probably fictitious story situated within the private bounds of a circle of friends. The story of obstinate Tigellius who did not want to sing and Octavian who restrained himself to force the singer demonstrates that people cannot be forced to speak and listen. Horace continues stating that Tigellius and others are the kind of people with whom he would rather not associate and communicate in his circle of friends. Tigellius is inconsistent and hypocritical, Maenius a shameless parasite, although of good parentage but a rather self-loving spendthrift, and Novius an unknown upstart.

Next, Horace considers the style and manner delivering his commentary in the future. Horace's lines are not those by a clumsy and inexperienced philosopher and moraliser but describe his clever strategy as to how to conduct himself in the highly politically charged environment of the post Republican era and emerging Principate. He considers how to deliver critical commentary in general, in the role as a commentator of political issues in several genres. He depicts the potentially most effective manner in which to convey his critical and potentially antagonistic commentary on contemporary social and political issues: the gentleman who adopts some of the manners of a jester. Horace does not wish to present himself as a buffoon, as he sees such a character as uneducated and vulgar. He wants to position himself as a gentleman commentator who does not shy away on the one hand from the humour and on the other from a sense of perspective. His style is not that of the professional jester of the comic stage, the *scurra*. Horace is in the *Sermones* not just simply a mixture of the seriousness of his political commentary with humour, but a mixture with a special kind of humour. Horace as a Cynic jester is the gentleman who can raise the touchiest issues hiding himself behind a façade of naivety and simpleness. By this he can also make opportunity to vent the opposite or controversial political opinion, without taking sides.

Horace wrote S.1 as material for discussion with Maecenas and his associates, whose friendship he hoped to secure. Hence, he pays attention in the present poem to the subject of understanding one's friends. He gives examples as to how friends' faults can also be understood positively, and thus friendships can be strengthened. In S.1.3.63-66, he presents a second self-parody, a character sketch of an intruder. The passage has an ironical disapproval of the facetious conduct of the jester, who suggests that he can afford almost anything, knowing that Maecenas will accept such behaviour, as masters of jesters do. The passage is also a sequel to S.1.3.29-34. Like the earlier passage (S.1.3.29-34), this one is not autobiographical, but a further

specifying of the way Horace intends to present his messages in the first book of *Sermones*. Horace does not depict himself in those two passages as either a clumsy provincial bumpkin or as a social menace, but he presents himself as a gentleman jester who takes the liberty to tell Maecenas whatever he thinks that the latter should hear. He also states that Maecenas knows how to handle those people. These lines also anticipate S.1.10.46-49 in which he says that he does not intend to become the successor to Lucilius.

Next, from line 76, the argument moves away from the single theme of tolerance of the faults of one's friends. Horace introduces the theme of balance (or the lack of it) in the execution of justice in society at large. The argument also moves gradually towards one with a philosophical (lines 76-98) and a historical (lines 99-124) angle. At first, Horace argues that the Stoic view that all sins are equal and deserve equal punishment is absurd. He gives examples of what he considers an excessive sanction for a minor misdemeanour. Horace appeals in lines 77-83 for reason (*ratio*) and balance (*ponderibus modulisque*) displaying in a subtle way his Epicurean disposition with the choice of words *ponderibus modulisque* (weights and measures): words associated with the Epicurean tendency to quantify and measure. By quoting the words *ponderibus modulisque*, he shows Maecenas that he holds the right philosophical convictions. Horace mentions more examples of offences among friends in order of increasing gravity, from harmless infringements of table manners to more serious delicts by friends such as theft or reneging on a legal pledge. He seizes the opportunity in lines 97-98 to demonstrate again that he is not a follower of the Stoics stating that their answer that all sins are nearly equal does not work in reality. Emotions, the moral sense of people, and custom are opposed to it. But, a link with his own Epicurean socio-political attitude appears when he concludes with the statement that justice and fairness are sisters.

Horace turns in lines 99-124 again to Epicureanism to expound his views on the history of civilization and the origin of justice and fairness in contemporary society. He dismisses again the Stoic doctrine. Horace argues that the system of justice is the crown of the development of a civilized society and that tolerance, balance and wisdom should be essential elements of such a system. This leads him to the question of the choice of men who should be the leaders in society. Horace places in this passage acceptance of or intolerance to friends' faults and also extremism in the execution of justice within the context of Stoicism and Epicureanism. Further, he connects his commentary with the emergence of new men within the political elite, who are driven by personal gain. What matters are not only Horace's statements about friendship, tolerance, fairness, or balance, but also the men who make those statements or the men to whom Horace refers. By exploring the social and intellectual standing of those men, he concludes that the wrong men, new rich and upstarts have gained too much influence. Horace introduces many individuals in this poem, who can be divided into two groups. The first group is that of his friends, whom the poet quotes consistently in a positive manner in this *sermo*. In other words, Horace's aristocratic friendships

are models of *amicitia*. The second group shows the opposite image with the names of the inconsistent singer Tigellius (line 4) and unreliable Hermogenes (line 129), shameless Maenius, a spendthrift from the past (line 21), the upstart Novius (also line 21), deranged Labeo, probably a Republican tribune of the plebs (line 82), Ruso, a moneylender and aspiring author (line 86), and Alfenus, most likely corrupt P. Alfenus Varus (line 130). It is worth noting that the discussion about how to judge one's friends is between people, who all – apart from Alfenus Varus – fit the category of nouveau riche or other upstarts. Further we meet the Stoic Chrysippus (line 127), who is gently mocked, and finally there is Crispinus (line 139), the Stoic babbler. They generally take the “wrong” view as to how to treat one's friends, and support Stoic ideas about the execution of justice.

Horace ridicules in S.1.3.124-142 the Stoic paradox that only the wise man (*sapiens*) was perfect and thus rich, free, beautiful and talented. He plays a very clever game in this passage. He does not only hold up to ridicule the paradox, but also censures the Stoics for the results of the paradox in the choice of leaders and thirdly he can, as an extra benefit, demonstrate to Maecenas, that they share the same philosophical framework thus subscribing to the same views on political matters. Horace plays in this passage three times upon a word to caricature the Stoic paradox. The first is *sutor* (cobbler) in lines 125 and 128, the second *modulator* in line 130, and the third is *tonsor* (barber) in line 132. The *sapiens* is caricatured by the poet in lines 124-128 as being an expert cobbler, and one may wonder why Horace chose the humble trades of cobbler, and in line 132 that of barber, for making his point; both trades were low in the social scale. Horace chose those because he wanted not only to express the absurdity of the potential of the opportunities for the wise man in the Stoic paradox, but he also wanted to play upon the words *sutor* and *tonsor*. The word *sutor*, generally translated as cobbler is derived from *suere*, to stitch or cobble. The latter word suggests patching-up something, working hastily and delivering shoddy work. In other words, Horace says that the Stoic's claim is absurd and that they make a mess of things: the Stoic view leads to the selection of the wrong people at high positions in public life (lines 128-133). What else do the Stoics mess up? The extreme Stoics, anti-Caesarians and followers of the Pompeian cause, stood in Octavian's way and obstructed the latter's progress towards peace and stability. Then, Horace uses the word *modulator* for Hermogenes. In the words of Freudenburg (1993, 116), Hermogenes of line 129 has a remarkable ability to “change keys” or “adjust” himself to the changing political winds. According to Freudenburg (1993, 114), the third word *tonsor* refers to P. Alfenus Varus, *consul suffectus* in 39 B.C. and jurisconsult. Paraphrasing Freudenburg the lines can be read as: Alfenus, even though he has sold his shop to become a lawyer, is still the same old *shearer* [that is, crook] that he always was. The references in S.1.3 to Hermogenes and Alfenus symbolize the many who tried to force their way into the social and political elite. The poet did not intend to make a philosophical statement about the wrong of the Stoic ideal that the wise man (*sapiens*) is perfect and talented. The three keywords, *sutor*, *modulator* and *tonsor*, all point in the same direction.

Horace had in mind to demonstrate that men like Hermogenes, who exemplifies unreliability, and Alfenus, who shows untrustworthiness and dishonesty, should not be welcome into the political and social elite, and are not deserving to hold office: Hermogenes who defected to Sextus, and Alfenus Varus who was “ripping off” the poor smallholders in Northern Italy. Horace emphasizes the moral and intellectual failure of the Stoic paradox once more by the pitiful picture in lines 133-139 when Horace depicts the Stoic philosopher on his way to have a bath on the cheap mobbed by a hostile crowd of men, with whom the poet does not wish to be associated. The escort of the wise man, alias king, is only Crispinus the Stoic babbler.

Although at one level S.1.3 concerns indeed the conduct among friends – specifically the judgment about the inconsistency and hypocrisy of one’s friends – the poem also contains a second point, that is how a message can be presented within a circle of friends, while at the same time preserving tolerance and dignity among the participants. Horace’s choice of participants and subjects in S.1.3 reveals the philosophical foundation of the poem: like he does in S.1.1 and S.1.2, he follows in the present *sermo* the Epicurean views and rejects Stoicism, the popular philosophy of those who supported the Republican cause. The Republicans and Pompeians adopted the widely held opinion at the time that the Triumvirs – and Octavian and his associates in particular – did not act from high moral principles at all but from *avaritia*, *ambitio* and *luxuria*, which were seen as the cause of Octavian’s hunger for power. In S.1.1-1.3, Horace shows his concern about the general growth of reprehensible urges like greed, unlimited ambition, and pursuit of luxury. In addition, Horace divides in S.1.1-1.3 his audiences in three distinct groups: the elite, the nouveau riche and the extreme Stoics. He singles out some of the aristocrats, new rich and other upstarts as unfitted for political office. Thus, the three *sermones* are political poems as they are in support of Octavian and his policies against the Republican adversaries. His circle of friends ought to set a good example by living according to the high-minded principles of the past. Horace closes S.1.3 with a few lines (139-140) about his own fortunate circumstances. He confirms that he felt accepted within Maecenas’ circle of civilised leaders.

Horace starts **S.1.4** with a discussion that seems to be a rejection of Lucilian satire, but that can also be read as Horace’s standards of good poetry: *brevitas* and *libertas*. He sees as standards of good poetry sharply worded thoughts and freedom of speech. The poets of Old Comedy possessed those attributes. Horace charts in those lines characteristics which apply to several genres of poetry, not only satire. Many of the points which he raises in S.1.4 return in S.1.10, where he adds a third attribute, *varietas* (variety of presentation). In S.1.4, he pays attention to the subject of freedom of speech and its connection with *παρρησία* (*parrhesia*) and the teaching on frank criticism by the Epicurean Philodemus in his treatise *Περὶ παρρησίας* (On Frank Criticism). Horace recognizes two sources of inspiration for his moral guidance: the notion of *parrhesia* and the traditional Roman moral values as handed down by previous generations, *mos maiorum*. In his opinion, *parrhesia* is relevant both in the

public and in the private domain. Horace reflects on frank criticism among friends; he follows the teaching by Philodemus (On Frank Criticism) in carrying into effect his criticism, and he sees *mos maiorum* as his moral guide of conduct among friends. The two go together. Horace accentuates the importance of freedom of speech in the public domain. He records in S.1.4 with approval that the poets of Old Comedy censured with great freedom of speech, and thus Horace stood up to the Pompeians, who claimed to be the defenders of Republican *libertas*. Horace assured that he, like his associates, was also fully committed to support freedom of speech.

Horace introduces in S.1.4 a new class of people for criticism, in addition to the classes he singled out for criticism in S.1.1 – S.1.3. He describes the behaviour of common people that appears to be the same as that which he saw in the upper layers of society in S.1.1 and S.1.2. In S.1.4, he extends the class of people deserving censure from the elite to all classes of Roman society. He seeks to convince Maecenas that he recognizes social evil in society at large. He does not exclude any section of Roman society from his scrutiny. Horace is specific about the mode of delivering critical poetry, firstly to friends, secondly to a group of men who are within the retinue of a patron, and thirdly to some members of the elite. He presents a catalogue of malice that cannot be tolerated among friends, who should frankly criticize each other when necessary. Horace repeats his view that there is no place for the many new rich who try to force themselves into holding high office and are not deserving such.

S.1.4 is seen by several scholars as defensive poetry. Horace's reflections on the style and content, such as *ingenium*, *ars*, *res*, *verba* and *metathesis*, are not primarily the result of his search for his poetic orientation, but are part of his discussion about his political orientation with Maecenas and his circle. His pronouncements about the satiric genre are markers for his political and social views intended to convince Maecenas that he holds the right political opinions and that he has the right social background. Horace, an unknown man from provincial Venusia, wants to demonstrate that he is a reliable member of the circle of Maecenas. Thus, he has to demonstrate that he is of good political stock, that upholds the traditional Roman values, and that he shook off the last vestiges of Republican leanings.

Horace went in lines 1-105 into his programme of writing critical commentary. After line 105, he changes to personal aspects, namely his education and his outlook upon life. He presents this in the form of part of "his autobiography," of which more is to come in the next *sermones*. In my view, this part of S.1.4 – and indeed the other putative autobiographical passages in the following poems – is predominantly poetic fiction. "His father" symbolizes the tradition in which Horace grew up. The role of "the father" in the narrative is that of a link between the generations symbolizing the continuity of the traditions. He describes in the same sequence as in S.1.1 – S.1.2 how he learned that he should avert the vices of S.1.1, jealousy, greed, ambition and extravagance, followed by the vices of S.1.2, sexual extremes. In this way S.1.4.107-115 is a summary of the first two *sermones*. He learned that he does not only want to be guided in moral matters by the teachings of philosophers, but also by following the

traditional Roman moral teachings handed down to him: the *mos maiorum* was of great importance to him. Horace finishes the poem with a confident statement that he and a number of his poet-friends within the circle of Maecenas have an important contribution to make to the debate about the major contemporary political and social issues.

It is unlikely that **S.1.5** was written as an exercise in emulating Lucilius' *Iter Siculum*. The *sermo* is the poet's next step in presenting himself as a worthy member of the group of men around Maecenas. In my view, it is also unlikely that S.1.5 is an autobiographical poem. The purpose and the dating of the "journey" are uncertain, and the lack of information about the context of the mission suggests that Horace never was a member of such a mission in reality. In addition, the authenticity of the "journey" is suspect, particularly on grounds of the differences in content and detail of Horace's description of several parts of the voyage and the route of the journey. The composition of the narrative shows a remarkable difference in detail and in extent of information about the places visited between on the one hand the first part of the "journey" from Rome to Apulia and on the other hand the part from Apulia to Brundisium. Descriptions of places such as Aricia, Pomptine marshes, Formiae, Caudium, and the activities and encounters of the party are full of particulars. However, the description of Apulia in part two is with respect to both the route and the places visited unclear. The report of the four towns of the last part, the 104-mile stretch from Rubi to Brundisium is very brief, and the most memorable matters on that section seem to be the weather and the condition of the road. I conclude that Horace's description of the part of the "journey" between Rome and Apulia is reasonably detailed because he made the journey between Venusia and Rome at several occasions; the stretch between Rubi and Brundisium he had never seen at all.

Horace pays special attention to Venusia – referred to as an *oppidulum* (small town) – and the Apulian region, although only by a brief allusion. He kept his description of the route of the Apulian part of the "journey" deliberately unclear, as he wanted to focus on the quality of his upbringing in Venusia through his metaphor of the quality of the bread. He refers to his milieu in the present *sermo* as he did in S.1.4 and will do so again in S.1.6. The milieu to which he referred is his own ancestry representing the link between the generations and symbolizing the continuity of the traditions. He grew up in a family having respect for the old Roman values.

His aversion of new rich and pretentious dignitaries in small towns is very evident. Examples are Aufidius Luscus, the chief official of Fundi, rich Mamurra in Formiae, and the *scurra* Sarmentus in Caudium. This is in great contrast with the appreciation he has of the leaders of the supposed party, Maecenas, Cocceius and Capito, whom he considers his equals, and the joy of being with his friends, Plotius, Varius and Virgil. On three occasions, he distances himself of provincial attitudes, namely the "praetor" Aufidius, the base humour of the show of Sarmentus and Cicirrus, and the miracle in Gnatia. Horace shows again a contrast with the low-minded provincials when he mentions Sinuessa in the region of Naples alluding to his own association and that of

Maecenas and his friends with Philodemus. He intends to be a worthy member of the circle of Maecenas assuring him that he does not want to associate with the nouveau riche and that he also left the provincial milieu behind. He upholds the traditional Roman values handed down to him. He wants Maecenas to know that on grounds of his descent, education and personal development he is well qualified to become a worthwhile and reliable associate of Maecenas. The manner in which he presents himself to Maecenas as a fictitious companion in a fictitious journey also illustrates his contentment with the reception by Maecenas and the members of his circle. This theme returns in S.1.9, which has much in common with S.1.5 in structure and theme.

In the first section of **S.1.6** (lines 1-44), Horace raises the subject of mobility between social classes. The opening of the poem recalls that of S.1.1 by addressing Maecenas. The poet introduces immediately in the first lines Maecenas' social background. Although the latter was not of Roman *nobilitas*, but of Etruscan, he fitted well in the top of Roman society; several scholars point out that Maecenas was socially not much above other upstarts who formed the majority of Octavian's supporters. They originated in the provinces: Maecenas in Arretium, Agrippa not known where he was born, but not in Rome and Octavian himself born in Latium. It is not unlikely that Maecenas overstated his social position by posing of nobler birth than he was. Horace saw his own social position as not very different from that of the "Etruscan prince." The poet pays Maecenas a compliment by stating that he did not forget his roots and reveals an enlightened view on social mobility. It is unlikely that Horace would have made the point that Maecenas and he are both upstarts if he had not irrefutable evidence from Maecenas' past. Having concluded that Maecenas and he are socially equivalents, Horace recognizes that Maecenas shoulders greater political responsibility than he. Most members of Maecenas' social rank have a prejudiced view of social mobility seeing the new men as a threat to their own traditional place in society. Horace resented indeed the men who exhibited an unrelenting ambition for office with the rewards belonging to it, but he accepted that men who aspired for office should be judged on their individual merits. Horace observes approvingly that Maecenas is generous in his judgement of peoples' worth.

Horace records the pros and cons of social mobility going back to the days of Servius Tullius. He describes the miserable quality of the process of determining the eligibility for political functions. He concludes that Maecenas and he should continue judging people on their own merits. Horace also states that he himself wants to stay out of practical politics, and he lets Maecenas know that his interest in political issues is not caused by political ambition.

Next, Horace pays attention to the endeavours of men of his own days to gain office. He endorses the view that the *nobiles* on grounds of inherited worth (*virtus*) through birth have a valid claim to be selected for high public office, provided that they are not disqualified by lack of individual worth. If they are disqualified, it is preferable to elect worthy free-born *homines novi* (new men) to unworthy aristocrats. Horace rejects again emphatically the pursuit of ambition often seen with men who

strive to gain high office and who seek to further their own, financial, interests. He gives some examples as to how people, for example a man called Tillius, can go wrong when they yield to the temptations of ambition. Tillius cannot be identified, but in view of the context of S.1.6 it is likely that he symbolizes an ambitious freedman's son, who had an erratic political career. The Tillius of S.1.6 may well be Horace's fiction, who was not modelled after a historical person. Horace made him an embodiment of political ambition leading to his ruination, with other attributes added, namely a man of humble descent or a freedman's son.

Horace closes the first section of S.1.6 with a discussion about the political careers of freedmen and freedmen's sons. He refers to the prejudices of the established political elite that the new men are not qualified to carry out their duties properly and to the resentment of free-born men at the promotion of ex-slaves or their sons to high public office. However, there is also much ill-feeling between freedmen's sons and freedmen, as the example of the freedman Novius shows. The social distinction between the two is that the latter was once a slave and that the former may be "free-born." A new class-consciousness had crept in, namely that the new generation of freedmen has come too near to "the old," the sons of freedmen of the previous generation. However, Horace shows the relativity of this: the freedman Novius will never match the social standing of the aristocracy. Horace makes a political point mentioning two aristocrats specifically, Paullus Aemilius Lepidus and Valerius Messalla Corvinus. Those men were at the time two of the few supporters of Octavian to be found within the old aristocracy. Most of them supported Marc Antony, or even worse, Sextus Pompey. Octavian needed the support of the Senate which traditionally was dominated by the *nobiles*. Hence, Maecenas, and with him Horace, supported the claims of the old aristocracy that birth was an important qualification for high office. Horace's view on social mobility and eligibility for high office is in short: give talent a fair chance, but the real work will go to the traditional upper class, as birth remains the determining factor. Horace also gives in this section his arguments to stay away from the political business, as a career in politics would not make him feel good.

In the second section, Horace changes into the personal mode. The section opens in line 45 with the famous words: *nunc at me redeo libertino patre natum* (now to return to myself, son of a freedman father). He refers to his past when he was a tribune in Brutus' army and fighting at the wrong side at Philippi. He recounts Maecenas' good judgement accepting within the circle around him men who shun improper ambition, those who do not pursue high political office motivated by *avaritia*, *ambitio* and *luxuria* (greediness, ambition and extravagance), as he saw with many of the new rich. After these opening lines, he reports the introduction to Maecenas by Virgil and Varius and the resultant brief first meeting with Maecenas, in which both were rather reticent. Horace because he felt embarrassed and Maecenas as this was his way. In my view, these lines are not simply autobiographical, but a combination of autobiography and poetic fiction. The point is that Horace does not present himself as a nouveau riche aspiring for the friendship of Maecenas. Both are depicted as recognizing the

cultivated manners of the other, and they would not need many words to understand each other. Contrary to the *nouveau riche*, Horace is embarrassed: presumably not by his social status, but by his association with Brutus' party in the past.

Horace uses three times the words *libertino patre natum* (a freedman's son): in S.1.6.6, 45, 46, and a slight modification in line 58: *non ego me claro natum patre* (that he was not the son of a famous father). The emphatic reiteration of this point tells us that he, a son of a freedman himself, endeavoured to advance and to be found acceptable to Maecenas and the circle around him. That is his way of social mobility. In my view, Horace's words about his putative humble origins do not mean that he, like Bion of Borysthenes, was telling Maecenas that the latter needed "a truth-telling philosopher" and that he, Horace, was such a man. Although Horace's occasional references to philosophical dogmas were basic to his ethical socio-political views, he did not promote himself as an adviser on philosophical doctrines.

In S.1.6.69-71, the poet adds to his own self-praise referring to "his father's" role: *purus et insons/ (ut me collaudem) si et vivo carus amicis;/ causa fuit pater his* (if, to blow my own trumpet, I live a pure and innocent life and if I am cherished by my friends, this is because of my father). Next, the story about his father taking him from Venusia to Rome follows. Horace makes not only the point that his father was not rich, but also that he did not belong to the emerging class of provincial new rich. He refers to several aspects of his social and cultural background which should build up Maecenas' regard for him. He mentions in this short section his father's parsimony, his own departure from provincial Venusia, and his good education in Rome. The father was involved as he felt responsible for a good education, but did not want to be his son's one and only moral guardian. Horace said in S.1.4 that the traditional way of life is handed down to him by the Roman forefathers. The role of "the father" in the narrative is a link between the generations symbolizing the continuity of the traditions. Horace says both in S.1.4 and in the present lines of S.1.6 that the right way of life was handed down to him by good Romans in general, by his milieu in Venusia and that of the social elite (*equus atque senator*) in Rome during his time with his teacher Orbilius, fond of flogging. That is probably where he also picked up the right political ideas. In my view, parts of Horace's narrative about "his father" are poetic fiction. Some elements are indeed autobiographical, for example that he grew up in Venusia or nearby the place, his education in Rome with Orbilius, but the details of his "father's" role are most likely made-up in order to make his background suitable for his association with Maecenas: Horace, the man from provincial Venusia on the one hand holding the right traditional values, but on the other hand familiar with the sophistication of Rome. Yet, he succeeded in remaining uncorrupted, which is virtue's first credential. Thus, Horace connects in this *sermo* on the one hand the issue of social mobility, described by him in the first section of S.1.6, with on the other hand his moral credentials and the teaching by his milieu, described in the second section.

In the third section he considers his own prospects. Horace states right at the start that he does not foster political ambitions. He would not want to replace the naturalness and cultivation of his milieu by the insincere distinctions of high office. He wants to stay out of practical politics as he does not wish to lose control of his way of life, to lose his personal freedom. He mocks the life of the *nouveau riche* who aspires for political office and who shows off his wealth. Next, Horace gives an impression of a typical day in his life. It is all very prosaic and not so pretentious as the entertainments of the *nouveau riche*. But, he is grateful that he is not obliged to participate in the duty of paying morning calls to a patron. He enjoys his intellectual pursuits of reading and writing and discussing the output within the circle of Maecenas of his friends and associates. In my view, the passage about a typical day should not be read as autobiography, but as Horace's fiction in answer to the many examples in this *sermo* and in previous ones about the behaviour by many of the new men in politics and by the new rich. Further, the typical day is not a proof of his Epicureanism, although his Epicurean views made him aware that he needs the freedom to organize his life in his own way to be able to reflect and study. Cicero criticized the Epicureans severely for their selfishness and consequent tendency to avoid political life. He saw this as a serious threat to the survival of the state. Horace does not say that he aspires for being an outsider in Roman politics, but he seeks to participate in his own way as a commentator. If he is involved in politics from the sidelines, he needs his independence in order to be free to say what he must.

Horace closes S.1.6 expressing his gratitude that he is not the son of one of the established families, that would have deemed him to pursue a career in politics and probably finish as a senatorial candidate.

Horace changes the emphasis in **S.1.7** (and indeed in S.1.8 and S.1.9) compared to the previous six *sermones*. From S.1.7, he sounds confident that he will succeed in his efforts to find a place within the circle of Maecenas. He juxtaposes in S.1.7 the cultured milieu that he experiences after being admitted to Maecenas' circle and the crude and aggressive one of his past with Brutus, thus admitting in the present *sermo* openly his previous association with the Republican cause. This makes S.1.7 a poem with a special meaning. Horace chooses as his subjects for discussion strategic issues of military and foreign policy. He does this presumably in order to demonstrate that he also has a contribution to make in those fields and again to show that he supports the policies of Octavian and Maecenas. On the face of it, the subject-matter of S.1.7 seems to differ from that of the other poems in S.1, namely that it seems to be concerned with events from the past that have no bearing on contemporary political issues, let alone that the poem can be read as one of his credentials. However, the poem can be properly interpreted as one of those.

Horace goes some five to seven years back when he narrates an event that he claims took place after he had joined Brutus in 44 or 43 B.C., and before Philippi and the death of Brutus in 42 B.C. That does not mean that the story is an account of a real historic event; in my view, it is one of Horace's fictitious narratives. He describes a

probably fictitious court case that was held before Brutus as the presiding judge and concerns most likely a tax issue between Rupilius Rex, a tax official on the staff of Brutus, and the businessman Persius. Many like Rupilius were tax-gatherers who were known to line their own pockets with considerable amounts. Persius was presumably assessed by Rupilius for such an absurd amount that it pruned away his profits. The case finished with an angry verbal combat between the two in front of Brutus and an improper insinuation to the latter.

The scene reflects the lawless situation in Asia resulting from the unresolved Parthian issue. Firstly, the name of Persius may well be a functional reference by Horace to the continuing Parthian influence in Asia Minor. Secondly, the confrontation between the Lycian ally of Troy Glaucus (of *Iliad*.6) and the Greek Diomedes probably refers to the contemporary conflict between East and West, and the arrangement which the two men conclude can infer that Horace suggests that negotiations with the Parthians should start in order to solve the Parthian problem: a course that was followed by Octavian after 27 B.C. Thirdly, the final lines of the poem reinforce this interpretation. The lines are a personal attack on Brutus and this humiliating scene was the result of Brutus' incompetence: seen to be enjoying the sumptuous life of an Eastern court, but not commanding the respect that a Roman official deserves. Brutus was removed at Philippi in 42 B.C., but Horace reminds his audience in this poem six years later (in 38 – 36/35 B.C.) that it's the same old story over again of a Roman official who lives at the court in Alexandria and whose military and administrative achievements are minimal: Marc Antony's fiasco in Parthia and his submission to Cleopatra's ambitions of their own *imperium* in the East are a threat to Rome. Further, the enrichment by many officials still prevails in Asia, and nothing is done about it. Marc Antony ought to be relieved of his military and political responsibilities having mismanaged those.

The subject of **S.1.8** is also a major contemporary issue, like in the previous *sermo*. In the present poem it is the threat of magic, that had penetrated Rome's lower and upper classes. Horace describes the activities of the witch Canidia and her companion Sagana on the paupers' graveyard on the Esquiline, which will be transformed into beautiful gardens by Maecenas. Priapus has a principal part in the drama. He was originally a fertility god from Lampsacus, opposite Gallipoli. In addition to the god's traditional role as guardian of gardens and tombs and that as one expelling evil forces, like witches, Horace gave Priapus the new role as his spokesman, and that as a figure that alludes to Cleopatra and Antony (see below).

Horace fills half of the poem with the witches' horrible activities. He wants to impress upon us the terrible wickedness and dangers of black magic. Through the medium of Priapus, he depicts in those lines a scene that could be seen at many places in Rome and in Italy. Horace himself does not feature in the poem. The reason is that Horace never experienced such a *séance*, but that he retells what he learned from others: witnesses' tales of the customary forms of black art, such as necromancy and psychedelic experience, and tales of the core business of witches aimed at winning

over a reluctant lover for which the witches were handsomely paid. The psychedelic scene that Priapus just witnessed evokes his fear to such an extent that he no longer can control his bodily functions. The scene also radiates a sense of degeneration. Horace indicates that those meetings are out of place in modern civilized Rome, the centre of the world.

S.1.8 should be read together with *Epod.17*, in which Horace continues the story thus presenting significant indications about the meaning of S.1.8. *Epod.17* gives some clues with respect to the source and nature of Canidia's magic. Firstly, it can be deduced from the *epodos* that Canidia celebrated at the Esquiline Cotytto's festival, a deity of Thracian origin related to Artemis-Bendis, whose rites were secret licentious activities characterized by extreme wantonness. Secondly, although Horace wrote the *epodos* in the first person and although he seems obsessed by the power of Canidia's magic, he did not intend to intimate that he personally suffered by her magic. In general and also in particular in *Epod.17*, Horace does not necessarily relate real-life experiences using the first-person *persona*.

Several additional arguments can be found in the *epodos* against the views that Canidia exercised sexual control over Horace and that he personally revelled wantonly in the acts of free love. The characteristics, of which victims of Canidia are supposed to suffer according to *Epod.17*, are not apparent from Horace's work and way of life. Horace voices in *Epod.17* the generally felt concern caused by the widespread sorcery that appeared to still be ongoing in Rome as if the measures taken seem to had no effect. Horace himself is not a participant in those sexual games, and it is feasible that his Canidia stories are poetic fiction. Horace suffers by substitution the mental and physical torments of the victims of sorcery. This is not to say that the kind of sessions described did not take place in Rome. It is not unlikely that what we read is the result of hearsay, although it is feasible that such stories of degenerate sessions are the result of anti-Egyptian and anti-Eastern propaganda, and that the reality was much healthier.

In the last four lines of S.1.8, Priapus' loss of control of his bodily functions has a great surprise in store. The god lets off a fart which demonstrates the loss of control. Priapus' fart and the laughter not only symbolize Horace's contempt for witchcraft and witches, but also ridicule the witches and express his scorn for the many in Rome and Italy who keep their perpetrators in their profitable business.

Horace connects the events described in the poem with Cleopatra and Marc Antony by his choice for Priapus as narrator of the story and Canidia as the chief culprit. I interpret Priapus as a functional reference to Cleopatra and Marc Antony. Priapus, the mythical son of Dionysus and Aphrodite, played an important role in the cult of Dionysus in Hellenistic Egypt. Cleopatra had been introduced in Rome, when she joined Julius Caesar there in 46 B.C., as the queen of Egypt who was equal to Isis/Aphrodite. Antony let himself be applauded as the New Dionysus during his campaigns in Asia. When Antony ordered Cleopatra to meet him in Tarsus in 41 B.C. to discuss her contribution to the war effort, she made a magnificent entry on board of

her ship as Aphrodite/Venus, the ancestress of the Julian house whose statue was still in the temple of Venus Genetrix in Rome. An archaeological discovery significant for my interpretation of S.1.8 was made in Pompeii when a Hellenistic statue was found of Venus leaning on a statuette of Priapus. Thus, the figure of Priapus in S.1.8 was easily recognized by the readers of the poem as referring to Antony and Cleopatra.

The meeting in Tarsus was the start of a twelve-year relationship that lasted until their deaths in 30 B.C. In the winter of 41 B.C. Cleopatra brought Antony to her palace in Alexandria, where Antony indulged with enthusiasm in Cleopatra's favours. Increasingly Cleopatra took over control of political affairs. According to Plutarch, the territories in the East stood opposed to those in the West, and he leaves no doubt that Cleopatra was the leader. Horace also alludes in *Epod.17* to Eastern mythical sorcerers and sorceresses and to the festival of Thracian Cotytto at the Esquiline. Thus, in this *sermo* and in the last *epodos*, both written a few years before Actium, Horace writes about sorcery and alludes by means of Priapus to Cleopatra and Antony. Cleopatra held sway over Antony and many Romans through Eastern sorcery and magic. Horace shows in S.1.8 (and in *Epod.17*) that he considered sorcery and magic, that had penetrated Roman society more than was sound, to be dangerous for Rome. The connection with Cleopatra suggests the danger of all the dark Eastern forces which could demolish Roman values, not just by sorcery but also by possible military and political action by Cleopatra and Antony. In the event of a military action by the two, a substantial part of the Roman elite allied to the Egyptian queen and Antony would not be helpful. Added to this, at the time of writing of S.1.8 black magic was also associated with the followers of Sextus Pompey.

Finally, Horace raises in S.1.7 and S.1.8, apart from specific issues in each poem, in both the same strategic issues. Specifically, in S.1.8, Horace calls attention to the dangers of sorcery and magic not only for the mental and physical health of those who take part in it, but also for the growing Eastern influence sapping the fortitude of Rome. It is likely that he therefore also supported the formation by Maecenas of a sort of police force who could deal with the witches' activities. The strategic issues referred to in both poems are the threat from Parthia and Egypt, and the alliance between Cleopatra and Marc Antony. Horace alludes in both to the latter's submission to Cleopatra. In S.1.7 he implicitly reproaches Antony with his mismanagement of his military and political responsibilities, and in S.1.8 he condemns Antony's compliance with Cleopatra's aspirations to create her own *imperium* in the East. Horace transmits in both the message to Maecenas that he supports the political agenda of Octavian, that is that Marc Antony ought to be removed, and that he takes Octavian's side in the struggle for power against Antony.

Horace returns in **S.1.9** to the state of his relationships with Maecenas. The present poem has much in common with S.1.5. Both poems describe a journey, albeit that the one in S.1.5 from Rome to Brundisium is much longer than the stroll in Rome in S.1.9. The opening lines of the two poems are also similar. Further, both poems are concerned with meeting people, both strangers and friends. For example, in S.1.5

the meeting with pompous local dignitary Aufidius Luscus is recorded, and that with vulgar Sarmentus, with both of whom Horace does not want to be associated in any way. This is very similar to Horace's response to the impertinent fellow who dominates the scene in S.1.9. In my view, the morning stroll and the confrontation with the fellow are examples of Horace's poetic fiction, like the events of S.1.5.

The poem opens with a description of one of the pleasures of life when one is released from burdensome and pitiable ambition. Horace has the opportunity to be more pleasantly occupied. Then, Horace is roughly roused by a man whom he only knows by name, who wants to engage Horace in his own plans. It turns out that the fellow's objective is to become an associate of Maecenas and that he wants Horace to arrange this. The ambitious fellow argues his case in a very vulgar and aggressive manner and thus demonstrates that he would not be a suitable candidate. In spite of Horace's efforts to shake off the man, the fellow takes the chance to display his poetic and artistic qualities. The pushy fellow could not have done worse as he mentions the wrong qualities and people, such as his speed of writing and his abilities as a dancer and singer which are superior to those of Hermogenes.

Reading the poem from the perspective of one of his credentials for Maecenas, it is likely that Horace designed the poem in such a way as to let the fellow, an outsider, describe the circle of Maecenas as a group that is nothing more than an ordinary collection of men, who spend their time dancing and singing and are interested in nothing else. This gave the *persona* Horace, who speaks in the first-person, the opportunity to communicate to Maecenas that he feels that he belongs to a very different circle: one of high intellectual and artistic repute with higher standards than those of similar circles or of those in a patron/client arrangement. Through the medium of the pushy fellow as the "speaker" Horace pays Maecenas two compliments. The first is his observation that Maecenas is a man of good judgment and uses this most skilfully in choosing his friends. The second compliment is his praise of the mutual relations within the circle where each member has his own place.

The fellow continues his harassment when he tries to draw Horace into his legal problems. This leads eventually to Horace's rescue when the fellow and he happen to meet Horace's friend Aristius Fuscus. Horace stops for a chat with Aristius and attempts to involve his friend in his predicament with the fellow, but his friend refuses. Thus, at this point in the mini drama, we have three actors who in different ways are concerned with membership of the circle of Maecenas. The first one is Horace, whose position we know: appreciating that he was admitted to the circle and content with his achievements so far. The second actor is the anonymous fellow who is keen to advance his career by being admitted, but whom Horace does not see as a suitable candidate. He is not and never will be one of them, although Horace does not explicitly states this. The poet gives us some indications with respect to the fictitious social position of the fellow, who praised particularly the quarters of the city and the whole of Rome, presumably referring to Octavian's refurbishing programme. If we look at the key characteristics of the fellow, namely his ambition, envy, and common

behaviour, I suggest that the fellow is a nouveau riche businessman known for his very shady methods in his ventures. Although he showed himself off as a scholar, poet, and singer of sorts, I conjecture that it is more likely that he, in view of his appreciation of Octavian's building programme, symbolizes one of the many who got rich in real estate. The third actor is Aristius Fuscus, although in a very different role. He is not a member of Maecenas' circle. I conjecture that the reason why Aristius refuses to help Horace in his predicament with the pushy fellow is that Aristius symbolizes the position of the man who takes exception to the exclusive character of the group and thus does not want to be involved. A second option is that Aristius symbolizes the man who previously was refused membership.

Horace depicts himself in S.1.9 as a full member of Maecenas' circle expressing his appreciation of the way the circle is organised by Maecenas. The poem shows his pride at being recognised as somebody close to Maecenas, albeit by a pushy nouveau riche. He also feels perfectly capable to assess whether somebody fits as an associate. The pushy nouveau riche clearly does not meet the criteria. Without the help of Aristius he managed to get out of the predicament with the fellow. He is sure that Maecenas would go along with his judgement that such a man would not fit. Further, Horace makes the point that he has developed into an accomplished poet as he is saved from the nuisance of the fellow by Apollo, the god of poetry.

The final poem, **S.1.10**, has in most manuscripts an introduction of eight lines that was not written by Horace. If one accepts that the identifications of Cato (as Valerius Cato) and the *grammaticorum equitum doctissimus* (as Orbilius) are feasible, the unidentified author of the fragment conveys the following view. Lucilius' verses are faulty indeed and what Horace wrote in S.1.10 about those faults (of style) has the approval of the civilized commentator Cato, who is a far subtler adjudicator of the poets of old than for example Orbilius.

In S.1.10 proper Horace himself speaks again starting with a short résumé of S.1.4.1-13. Horace criticizes not only Lucilius' style of composing his verses in S.1.10.1-3 (like he did in S.1.4), but he also testifies in S.1.10.3-4 to the fact that he had praised earlier Lucilius for his satiric power. Horace reduces his praise of Lucilius in the following long passage, S.1.10.5-39. His line of argument is that if he were to condone a particular fault in Lucilius' poetry, he could just as well allow the same in any other poet's work. The key characteristic for his choice of any other poet is that the latter shows a fault which he also identified with Lucilius. His first target among past and recent poets is Decimus Laberius (106-43 B.C.), followed by Licinius Calvus (82-47 B.C.) and Catullus (84-54 B.C.), Pitholaus of Rhodes (first century B.C. – after 45 B.C.), and M. Furius Bibaculus of Cremona (born ab. 100 B.C., lived to a great age). He introduces two other features to his choice of the other poets. Firstly, all poets whom Horace censures in S.1.10.5-39 are known to have written lampoons against Julius Caesar, which suggests that Horace makes a political statement in favour of Julius Caesar and Octavian. In addition, he connects with his views on Lucilius' and the other poets' style his commentary on several other contemporary political issues.

Horace also states in this passage his view on the attributes of good poetry. He sees as standards of good poetry sharply worded thoughts (*brevitas*) and variety of presentation (*varietas*). The poets of Old Comedy possessed those. This can be understood in a limited sense, namely that Horace sketches the stylistic qualities for satire, but it looks to me that Horace charts in those lines attributes which apply to several genres of poetry, in some of which he is already actively engaged. Horace also refers back to the opening lines of the fourth *sermo* (S.1.4.1-5) when he uses the same words (*comoedia prisca viris*) in both S.1.10.16 and in S.1.4.2. Thus, he reminds us in S.1.10 of a third quality in which the poets of Old Comedy set an example: censuring people and groups freely with *libertas* (freedom of speech).

His first target for criticism is Laberius, who wrote in an invective style, which Horace condemned in his and Lucilius' poetry. Next, Horace sneers at Hermogenes and an anonymous aper, who do not meet his standards. The identity of Hermogenes gave rise to much scholarly discussion; therefore, I discuss at this point the issue of the identity c.q. identities of Tigellius and Hermogenes in S.1. I conclude that the dead Tigellius of S.1.2 and S.1.3.4 is Marcus Tigellius Hermogenes, whom Porphyrio describes in his commentary on S.1.2.1-3, namely the musician of Julius Caesar's household. He died presumably in 40 or 39 B.C. The other man is the living Hermogenes of S.1.3.128-133, S.1.4, S.1.9 and S.1.10, who was also a Sardinian and who defected in 38 or 37 B.C. to Sextus Pompey. In order to differentiate clearly between the two, when I write Tigellius I refer to the dead man of S.1.2 and when I write Hermogenes I refer to the living man. The defection of Hermogenes to Sextus made him the target of Horace's criticism. The aper of Calvus and Catullus cannot be identified, but refers most likely to somebody whose knowledge of poetry does not go beyond the two poets. Both Calvus and Catullus wrote anti-Caesarian lampoons. Horace expresses a wish to keep his distance of the four men, because at least Calvus and Catullus had a history of disturbed relations with the Caesarian faction caused by their anti-Caesarian invectives in the past. Horace may have had still a second reason not to commit himself too much concerning Catullus, as it is likely that he knew of Maecenas' sympathy for Catullus' poetry.

Next, a long passage follows in lines 20-35 in which he speaks up for linguistic purity, condemning the mixing of Greek and Latin in both poetry and prose. Although good poetry relies to a high degree on variety, Horace criticizes Lucilius, who was in his opinion too unrestrained with his Grecisms. He makes a functional reference to the unknown Pitholeon, who should likely be identified with the wit M. Otacilius Pitholaus, who also lampooned Julius Caesar. Horace states tongue-in-cheek that it is no wonder that Pitholaus mixed Latin and Greek because he came for study to Rhodes. Horace felt very strongly about resisting the penetrating Greek cultural influence, and he felt that the Latin language and Roman culture needed to be protected. The guardian of Roman values, Quirinus himself, ordered him to write Latin verse. It is feasible that Horace – as in the case of Laberius, Calvus and Catullus – is also antipathetic of Pitholaus on grounds of his history of lampooning Julius Caesar. This

is followed by a plea to preserve good standards of Latin in prose. Horace uses the example of the legal profession to make his case.

The last victim of Horace's criticism on past and recent poets and literary modes is *turgidus Alpinus* (the inflated man of the Alps). Porphyrio identifies *turgidus Alpinus* as M. Furius Bibaculus of Cremona. Horace did not rate his epic highly. He put it quite plainly that he condemned his style: his sarcastic *turgidus* (inflated, pompous) and *iugulat Memnona* (he murders Memnon). The latter qualification recalls S.1.4.59-62, when Horace raises the subject of metathesis and asserts that rearranging verses is like murdering the poet. *Turgidus Alpinus* rearranged perhaps an existing epic about Memnon and did not care that he created inadmissible changes to the meaning of the Memnon story. Furius Bibaculus also wrote invectives against both Caesars, which according to Tacitus were still read: "yet even the deified Julius himself and also the deified Augustus tolerated them and left them in peace." Contrary to the pompous *Alpinus*, Horace pretends in the next lines that he only writes trivial poetry for his own pleasure.

After his critical review of a number of past poets, Horace turns to his contemporary colleagues to begin with his friend Gaius Fundanius, a comic poet of the New Comedy, who also belonged to the circle of Maecenas. Horace suggests that Fundanius and he are partners in writing with a light touch. Next, he addresses C. Asinius Pollio (76 B.C. – A.D.4), a military man, consul in 40 B.C., and retired from politics soon afterwards. He was a convinced Republican and a supporter of Julius Caesar. Horace lauds Pollio as the living master of tragedy. The following in this line-up of famous poets is L. Varius Rufus (ab.70 – ab.15 B.C.), poet in the epic genre, who with Virgil introduced Horace to Maecenas and to whom Horace refers as one of his friends. His later tragedy *Thyestes* was enacted in 29 B.C. at the games after Actium. Virgil is then praised for his *Eclogae*, pastoral poetry with commentary on Octavian's land confiscations in Northern Italy after Philippi. Horace says about Virgil that "the Muses relishing the countryside have granted to Virgil tenderness and elegance." Horace demonstrates his approval of Virgil's way of showing his compassion with the suffering smallholders by means of the very refined images and imaginative allusions in the *Eclogae*. After Virgil, it is the turn of P. Terentius Varro of Atax, who wrote an epic called *Bellum Sequanicum* about Julius Caesar's campaign against Ariovistus and two didactic poems, a geographical (*Chorographia*) and an agricultural (*Epimenides*). Only a few fragments of those works have survived. Whether he also wrote *Satires* is a vexed question: there are no extant satires. Although the testimonies by Propertius and Ovid lead me to the conclusion that Varro wrote elegiac rather than satiric poetry, S.1.10.46-49 suggests that Varro wrote indeed satires. As these appear to be completely lost, the question remains probably unresolved. Horace obviously did not rate Varro of Atax's achievements in satiric poetry highly. He makes a very important statement in S.1.10.46-49: he could do better in writing satire than Varro, although not as well as its inventor Lucilius. However, he does not presume to take the crown of satirical poetry from Lucilius. He does not want to be the inheritor of the inventor of satire, but

he bows out of satiric poetry. If Horace was ever the leading satirist after Lucilius who set the new standards for the genre, particularly in S.1.4 and S.1.10, it is peculiar that he never wrote any satire, neither in S.1 and S.2 nor in any other work.

In connection with Horace's statement that he does not intend to be a writer of satire, it is useful to briefly summarize Horace's position with respect to his ideas about standards of good poetry. In my view, Horace does not define in S.1.10 his position with respect to satiric writing, but he defines his position with respect to style and content of his poetry in general. As he intends to write his future political commentary in different genres, he cannot afford to restrict his views on his poetic orientation to one genre only. I also noted in my discussion of S.1.3.29-34 that Horace considers in those lines his future style of delivering critical commentary in general. S.1.3.29-34 anticipated S.1.10.46-49 in which he says that he does not intend to become the successor to Lucilius.

Then, Horace works his previous criticism of Lucilius out further in the long passage that follows, S.1.10.50-71, and also places the criticism within the context of Lucilius' days. In addition, he finds some mitigations for Lucilius' harsh style. He raises a new point, and the mere mention of the point shows that he tones down the criticism of Lucilius that he expressed in S.1.4. Horace looks more favourably on Lucilius when he goes deeply into the latter's poetry allowing for the political context of Lucilius' age. He asks whether Lucilius' lack of finish was caused by "his own nature or by the harshness of his subject matter?" I interpret the harshness of the subject matter as referring to the contemporary political situation when Lucilius wrote his satires. The question that Horace raises is whether the serious political issues of some hundred years ago and Lucilius' censure of those involved did not require an unpolished response: such reply was precisely what the malicious individuals of the past were deserving and what they understood. Horace recognized that the political context in which Lucilius worked was not all that dissimilar to that of his own age, that Lucilius' commentary on political and social issues was not dissimilar to his own ambition of becoming a political commentator, and that Lucilius kept his independence. In the final lines of this passage, S.1.10.64-71, Horace imagines how Lucilius would polish his style, if he were one of his contemporaries. Lucilius' personal qualities do not only meet Horace's standards, but he is also much more polished than expected. The traditional originators of new verse showed generally less refinement as they had not been immersed in the works of their Greek predecessors. Lucilius, however, was different. Lucilius is highly praised when Horace says that, if Lucilius were still alive, he could meet his standards of good poetry. Horace's opinion of Lucilius the literary man has developed in S.1 from one of rejection towards one of a fair degree of acceptance. Further, he expressed his respect for the political Lucilius. The acceptance of Lucilius was also a clever political statement towards the adversaries of Octavian, because it could at least reduce the power of the Republicans' claim that Horace attacked the value of freedom of speech, if not remove this claim altogether.

In the final passage Horace gets very specific about the men with whom he wants to be associated. Wedged between a few poets he does not want to know, he presents a long list of colleague poets and some members of the political elite. The four men with whom he does not want to mix, Pantilius, Demetrius, Fannius and Hermogenes, have in common that they were all critical of Horace's poetry and of his political connection, although their criticism was presumably tinged with jealousy. The four are most certainly no candidates for admission to the circle of Maecenas. He is not impressed by their attacks as long as he sees that men like Fuscus, Plotius, Varius, Maecenas, Virgil, Pollio, Messalla and others like his verses. These men and many more whom he discreetly does not mention, are his fellow intellectuals and friends. They are literary men, scholars and orators, and men in high public office and patrons of the arts. It looks that he attained his end. Horace saved a final sneer for Demetrius and Hermogenes wishing them good luck with their trivial pursuits. Horace has done with them: they better "get lost."

The final line of S.1.10 and of the book "Go, boy, and quickly add these lines to my little book" refers to the whole poem reflecting Horace's relief that writing S.1 delivered the result: he had been admitted to Maecenas' circle and the book should be distributed amongst the circle as soon as possible.

I will present in the following section 3.3 Horace's political views as far as those become apparent from S.1. I will add to those a discussion of his political commentary in poems in the other genres he wrote simultaneously with S.1.

3.3 The First Book of *Sermones*: Horace's Credentials and His Political Commentary

I mentioned in the introduction to this chapter my hypothesis that Horace wrote the ten poems of S.1 as credentials for Maecenas in order to convince him that he would be a trustworthy associate after his improper affiliation with Brutus. Although Horace's main purpose writing the book is his self-presentation, he intertwines through his self-presentation his political commentary. Three subject-matters are relevant for the support of my conclusions. Firstly, Horace's reflections on his poetic orientation and his views on standards of good poetry: are those literary statements, or are those part of his efforts to win over Maecenas? I argue that his views on standards of good poetry are primarily part of his discussion with Maecenas about his political orientation. But, it is also clear, that those literary views are genuinely held by Horace and are well reasoned by him. Secondly, Horace reports in S.1 in several *sermones* about the progress of his efforts to become a member of Maecenas' circle and about his position within the group. I consider those statements important evidence in support of my hypothesis that S.1 is a collection of poems which were intended as material for a discussion with Maecenas about his worth as an associate. Thirdly, the political issues which Horace raises in S.1 can be interpreted within the context of his self-

presentation on two levels, that is that he intends to demonstrate that he has views on contemporary political issues which are worth listening to and further that his opinions are in keeping with those of Maecenas and Octavian.

Firstly, Horace's reflections on his poetic orientation and his views on standards of good poetry are subject-matters supporting my hypothesis that S.1 is a compilation of his credentials. Horace's statements about style and characteristics of good poetry were primarily meant to convince Maecenas that he can write critical poetry in a manner which is acceptable to him. Horace chose a style of delivering his critical poetry that was inspired by his adherence to the Epicurean persuasion (S.1.3, S.1.4, and S.1.5), which also was the philosophical inspiration of Maecenas, and of a number of his poet friends, Plotius, Varius and Virgil. Horace's faithfulness to the Epicurean maxims for poetry as put into words by Philodemus of Gadara is apparent from his choice of the standards of good poetry, namely *brevitas* and *libertas* and his rejection of metathesis (S.1.4). The Epicurean maxims stem from their conviction that harmony, balance and unity are essential values. The maxims are in short the unity of *ingenium* and *ars*, *res* and *verba*, and the issue of the impossibility of metathesis: precepts which Horace's choice of standards reflects. Horace added in S.1.10 a third characteristic of good poetry, namely *varietas*. Thus, Horace's criticism of Lucilian satire is the result of his views on standards of good poetry: sharply worded thoughts and freedom of speech as taught by Philodemus, and variety. He does not reject the content of Lucilius' poetry, but his style (S.1.4 and S.1.10), although he toned down in S.1.10 his previous criticism of Lucilius' style in S.1.4 when he allowed for the political context of Lucilius' writing. In this way, he expressed his respect for the political Lucilius. The acceptance of Lucilius was also a clever political statement towards the adversaries of Octavian, reducing the power of the Republicans' claim that Horace attacked the value of freedom of speech.

Horace made already immediately after the opening of S.1 (S.1.1-22) an implicit statement about his moral guidance. He says that he is convinced that the people who feel wronged refuse to act according to either philosophical tenets or to the old veracities of the traditional Roman values. Those people are to blame for rejecting the old Roman values, as a return to those values might contribute to greater political and social stability. The old Roman values are one of the foundations of his outlook upon life in addition to his Epicurean persuasion. He returns to this theme (S.1.4 and S.1.6), but he also affirms (S.1.5 and S.1.6) that holding the right traditional values does not mean that he is a naïve provincial bumpkin unfamiliar with the sophistication of Rome.

Horace, an unknown man from provincial Venusia, wants to demonstrate that he will be a reliable member of the circle of Maecenas. His reflections on style and content (S.1.1-4 and S.1.10) are not the result of his search for his poetic orientation, but are part of his discussion with Maecenas about his political orientation. For example, in the first four *sermones* he intertwines through his discussion of poetic style his views on the behaviour of several social classes in Rome, among others the

aristocracy (S.1.2), the common people (S.1.4) and the new rich – the latter in all but one *sermones*. He wants to show to Maecenas firstly that he can identify the evils of specific sections of Roman society and secondly that he recognizes the groups with which he does not associate on grounds of – in Horace's view – their objectionable behaviour and improper political allegiance. And as a further example, Horace wants to show that his choice for the Epicurean persuasion is part of the right political choice against the Stoic belief generally held by the Pompeians and other adversaries of Octavian. He ridicules the Stoic paradox as absurd that leads to choosing the wrong men for public office (S.1.3). His views on style and content of good poetry do not imply that he intends to become a satirist (S.1.3 and S.1.10.46-49), but rather that he intends to write in several genres about, among other matters, political issues in a responsible manner acceptable to Maecenas and Octavian: a gentleman political commentator (S.1.3). Horace is also clear about what he does not want to achieve: he is grateful that he is not the son of one of the established families, that would have deemed him to pursue a career in politics (S.1.6). He does not say that he aspires for being an outsider in Roman politics, but he seeks to participate in his own way as a commentator.

The second subject is that of Horace's report in S.1 about the progress of his efforts to become accepted by Maecenas. He records at several places that he feels comfortable in the company of his friends. His first testimony is in S.1.3.139-140 where he writes about his own fortunate circumstances: his dear friends will forgive him if he makes a mistake. He felt accepted within a circle of real friends. This theme returns in S.1.5, where he voices his joy when meeting with his special friends Plotius, Varius and Virgil – all three members of the circle of Maecenas – during his fictitious journey to Brundisium. Horace expresses most clearly how much he holds his friends in affection in the final passage of S.1.10 when he praises his friends and fellow intellectuals within Maecenas' circle or those whom he met through his association with the latter. They are the literary men, scholars and orators, and men in high public office and patrons of the arts who like his verses. He closes S.1 with relief that writing the *sermones* delivered the result.

This feeling of being accepted goes together with giving expression to an increased confidence as a member of the circle. He writes in the third *sermo* rather unassertively about his friends, who will forgive him if he makes a mistake, but he is confident about his position within the group in the possibly fictitious seventh and ninth *sermones*. Although Horace still reports in S.1.6.56-57 that he felt embarrassed when he came into Maecenas' presence for the first time – possibly due to his previous association with Brutus' party – he writes in S.1.7 candidly about an experience in the company of Brutus, fictitious or not. From S.1.7 onwards, he sounds confident that he will succeed in his efforts to become an associate of Maecenas. In S.1.9 he behaves as a full-fledged member of Maecenas' circle expressing his appreciation of the way the circle is organised by Maecenas: one of high intellectual and artistic repute with standards higher than those in a patron/client arrangement. He is proud at being recognised as

somebody close to Maecenas, albeit by a possibly imagined pushy nouveau riche. He also feels perfectly capable of assessing independently whether somebody fits as an associate. For a nouveau riche there is no place as a member of the circle.

His focus on his correct pedigree is another characteristic of Horace's efforts to make himself acceptable to Maecenas. He wants Maecenas to know that on grounds of his descent, education and personal development he is well qualified to become a worthwhile and reliable associate of Maecenas. He introduces this subject in S.1.4 after line 103 where he brings up his education and his outlook upon life. He recounts the role of "his father," which symbolizes the continuity of the old traditions with which he grew up. This is also apparent from S.1.5, where Horace pays special attention to Venusia and the quality of his upbringing in the provincial town again referring to his milieu symbolizing the continuity of the traditions. He grew up in a family having respect for the old Roman values. But, he also makes sure that he distances himself of provincial attitudes at three places in S.1.5. The theme of the continuity of the traditions and the symbolic role of "his father" returns in S.1.6, where he tells of his departure from Venusia and his good education in Rome. The right way of life and the right political ideas were handed down to him by the good Romans in his milieu in Venusia and by that of the social elite (*equus atque senator*) in Rome during his time with his teacher Orbilius.

The third subject, that of the political issues which Horace raises in S.1, can also be interpreted as part of his self-presentation. He intends to demonstrate to Maecenas that his views on contemporary political issues are worth listening to and further that his opinions are in keeping with those of Maecenas and of Octavian. I will summarize in this section his political convictions and I will also include those he discussed in his other work that he wrote in the period of 38 – 30 B.C., in *Sermones* book 2, the *Epodi* and some of the *Carmina*. I will explain below my reasons for extending the period to 30 B.C.

Horace's fundamental concern was the undecided political situation which resulted in regular changes of the balance of power leading to uncertain and fragile arrangements with respect to the administration of the state, and to the continuing struggle for power. He made a stand against the Republicans and Pompeians (S.1.1, S.1.3, S.1.6) and he took the side of Octavian in the conflict against Sextus Pompey and Marc Antony (S.1.2, S.1.7, S.1.8). The uncertainty encouraged many new men to make a push for gaining public office with the intent to further their own, financial, interests. The established political elite was much prejudiced against the new men, whom they saw as not qualified to carry out their duties properly. Only few supporters of Octavian could be found within the old aristocracy (S.1.6). Most of them supported Marc Antony, or even worse, Sextus Pompey. Because Octavian needed the support of the Senate which traditionally was dominated by the *nobiles*, Maecenas, and with him Horace, supported the claims of the old aristocracy that birth was an important qualification for high office. The new men were gaining much influence and became accepted by many of the social and political elite. They belonged often to the increasing number

of freedmen (*libertini*) and their sons, or were military men. Horace was not opposed to social mobility (S.1.6), but he resented the new men who exhibited an unrelenting ambition for public office. He accepted that men who aspired for office should be judged on their individual merits.

Many new men also succeeded in becoming rich, of whom many used their wealth to attempt to buy political office. Horace condemned in every *sermo* of the first book – except in S.1.8 where he only briefly mentions a spendthrift nouveau riche, who finished up in the gutter – greed (*avaritia*), ambition (*ambitio*) and extravagance (*luxuria*), which he observes in all layers of society, from the common people (S.1.4) to the upper classes (S.1.2). He saw those vices as a threat to the traditional structure of Roman society. The number of new rich grew particularly amongst the *negotiatores* – the bankers, moneylenders, merchants and manufacturers in the provinces and in Italy – and amongst the military and the freedmen. Military men made their fortune in the areas where they settled after completing their time of service, or enriched themselves by the sale of booty they stole in the wars overseas or confiscated in the proscriptions (S.1.2). Others extracted as tax officials large amounts of money from local businessmen in the provinces (S.1.7). Horace condemned the lifestyle of the new rich, who showed their wealth in extravagant (particularly luxurious building) enterprises, not only in the *Sermones*, but also in a number of the *Carmina*. Horace relates the building of luxurious villas not only at the end of S.1.2 (section 2.2.1), but also in *Carm.*2.15 and *Carm.*2.18 (notes 289, 291).

In a number of places (S.1.2, S.1.4, S.1.7 and S.1.8) Horace expresses his opinion about the activities of Marc Antony or of Cleopatra and those of the two together. He was concerned about the conflict with Parthia, which Antony did not resolve (S.1.7), and the alliance between Cleopatra and Marc Antony (S.1.7, S.1.8) with the consequential strategic threat from both Parthia and Egypt. He implicitly reproached Antony with his mismanagement of his military and political responsibilities (S.1.7), and with his compliance with Cleopatra's aspirations to create her own *imperium* in the East. Horace saw the urgent necessity of strong leadership, and supported the political agenda of Octavian, that is that Marc Antony ought to be removed, and that he took Octavian's side in the struggle for power against Antony (S.1.8). He was not only apprehensive of the strategic and military danger coming from Egypt, but also of the cultural threat from the East. He attached much importance to the *mos maiorum* (S.1.1, S.1.4, S.1.6) and the Roman way of life and he saw Greek and Eastern cultural customs and practices which spread over many layers of Roman society as a danger for the preservation of Roman values. Horace was particularly worried about black magic denouncing the practices in several poems (S.1.8, *Epod.*3, *Epod.*5 and *Epod.*17). He voiced the generally felt concern caused by widespread sorcery despite the measures taken and connected the sorcery with Cleopatra, who was admired by a substantial part of the Roman elite. This would not be helpful in the event of a military action by Antony and the Egyptian queen. Added to this, Horace subscribed to the concern about witchcraft felt for reasons of local Roman policy. The leadership's unease was

not only about the “traditional” black magic and the crime it attracted, but also about the resulting sexual debaucheries. Horace called attention to the dangers of sorcery and magic not only for the mental and physical health of those who take part in it, but also for the growing Eastern influence sapping the fortitude of Rome.

Horace also felt strongly that the Roman culture and Latin language needed to be protected, and that the penetrating Greek cultural influence should be resisted (S.1.10). He speaks up for linguistic purity condemning the mixing of Greek and Latin in both poetry and prose.

Horace gave his opinion upon freedom of speech (*libertas*) at several occasions (S.1.4 and S.1.10). He considered freedom of speech an important privilege for himself and all Roman free-born men seeing *libertas* as the consequence of one's responsibility to express one's opinion and not as the aspiration to interfere with the liberty of others. He made his statements about *libertas* at the time of great political changes in Rome, with the risk that the ruling classes discontinued the right of free speech. His assertion was a political stand against the Republicans and the Pompeians, who had adopted the position of being the defenders of free speech. Thus, Horace, the associate of Maecenas, and a follower of Philodemus and the Epicurean school, touched with a discussion of freedom of speech upon a very sensitive political issue.

When Horace wrote S.1, he also raised political issues in several other genres: the second book of *Sermones* (S.2), the *Epodi* (*Epod.*) and the *Carmina* (*Carm.*). In this section I will briefly examine his poems which contain political commentary in the three genres written in the period from 38 B.C. until 30 B.C. I have extended the period from 35 B.C. to 30 B.C. on the following grounds. We saw already that Horace wrote S.1 at a time of great political uncertainty. This changed in 30 B.C. when after Actium Octavian took Alexandria, and Cleopatra and Marc Antony died. I suppose that the political content in Horace's poems written during the period between 38 and 30 B.C. rests on the same political views as those which he held during his writing of S.1. My assumption is that the political context did not change sufficiently between 35 and 30 B.C. from that in the previous three years for Horace to change his views. In addition to *Epod.*3, *Epod.*5, *Epod.*17, *Carm.*2.15, and *Carm.*2.18, which I discussed above, I will consider the following poems which contain political commentary and were most likely written before 30 B.C.: S.2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8 (written between 35 and 30 B.C.), *Epod.*2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 16 (written between 39 and 30 B.C.), and *Carm.* 1.7, 1.14, 1.35, 1.37 and 1.38 (written between 35 and 30 B.C.).³⁴² Some of the poems of

342 For S.2, see Mayer (2005); Muecke (1993; 2007). For *Epod.*, see Watson (2003). For *Carm.*1 and *Carm.*2, see Nisbet & Hubbard (2001, 2004). I did not select *Carm.*1.15 for two reasons. The dating is uncertain and Nisbet & Hubbard (2001, 188-191) make a convincing case that the *carmen* does not allude to Antony and Cleopatra, but that “rather, the genesis of the poem is a literary one, the desire to emulate the Greek lyricists in their rehandling of literary topics.” For S.2, *Epod.*, and *Carm.*, see Seager (1993, 23 – 29).

*Carm.*1 and *Carm.*2, the whole of *Carm.*3 and *Carm.*4, and the *Epistulae* were written after 30 B.C.³⁴³

Horace's concern about the never-ending civil war, the continuing struggle for power, and the Sicilian war against Sextus Pompey is apparent from *Epod.*7, 9, 13 and 16. In *Epod.*7, he criticizes Marc Antony, Sextus Pompey and Octavian for the ongoing war and power struggle. In *Epod.*9, Horace focuses on the battle at Actium; he is critical of Octavian's military qualities. He expresses in *Epod.*13 his sorrow that the war is still continuing and that some of his friends may not return. In *Epod.*16 he gives vent to his frustration at the renewal of the war suggesting abandoning Rome and Italy forever and go to rich isles to rebuild society with himself as a moral guide.³⁴⁴ If the dating of 34 B.C. for *Carm.*1.14 ("may calmer times arrive") is right, it is feasible that the poem expresses his disappointment about the situation after the defeat of Sextus Pompey, when he thought that there was hope of a better future.³⁴⁵ In *Carm.*1.35, probably written in 34 B.C. when Octavian planned an invasion of Britannia, Horace strongly denounces war: this time not only civil war, but also the outrage of war in foreign lands. There is a mood of pacifism, which suits the feeling of war fatigue, but not that of patriotism after Actium. Horace prays in the poem for the well-being of Octavian and his legions, who would be better employed against the Massagetae, a threat from the East that was so poorly handled by Antony (*S.*1.7).³⁴⁶ In *Carm.*1.7, Horace writes approvingly about Plancus, a senior statesman and general, who in 32-30 B.C. changed sides from the Antonian camp to that of Octavian. The *carmen* is a welcome to an important new ally showing to many that the fortunes of Antony and Cleopatra are collapsing. Horace's apprehension of Marc Antony's and Cleopatra's aspirations to create their own *imperium* in *S.*1 turns into relief after the death of the queen described in *Carm.*1.37 ("the Cleopatra Ode"). The poem demonstrates his concern about the threat during the whole decade of the thirties. In *Carm.*1.38, Horace condemns Oriental luxury, like he did in *S.*1, as he considered Eastern cultural customs and practices which spread over many layers of Roman society as a danger for the Roman values.

The issue of the new men who also succeeded in becoming new rich, which is very dominant in *S.*1, also returns in the other genres. Horace shows in *S.*2.6 the

343 For the dating of *S.*2 and *Epod.*, see Nisbet (2007, 9-12), of *Epod.*, see Watson (2003, 1-4), of *Carm.*, see Nisbet & Hubbard (2001, xxviii-xxx); Nisbet (2007, 12-14). For the dating of *Carm.*2.18, see note 290. For the dating of the books of *Epistulae* and *Ars Poetica*, see Bather & Stocks (2016b, 3-4); Ferri (2007); Lowrie (2007, 85-86); Mayer (1994, 1-52); Nisbet (2007, 14-15).

344 For *Epod.* 7 and 16, conform Nisbet (2007, 9): "two impressive political poems, *Epodes* 7 and 16, expressing horror at the renewal of civil war. [...] Both epodes allude to the Parthian menace."

345 For the dating of *S.*1.14 following the defeat of Sextus Pompey, see Nisbet & Hubbard (2001, 180-181). Although some scholars consider the dating of *Carm.*1.14 as soon after Actium likely, Nisbet (2007, 13) states: *S.*1.14 "best suits the period before Actium."

346 For *Carm.*1.35, see Nisbet & Hubbard (2001, 386-388).

contrast between on the one hand the Epicurean view of living a satisfied life with little in the countryside and on the other the pursuit of unlimited profits, that he saw in the hustle of city-life. In S.2.8, where Maecenas is the guest of honour at a dinner party arranged by a nouveau riche, Horace shows that mixing the old elite and the new rich is a danger to a healthy society. Horace exposes in *Epod.2* the cynical attitude of one of the representatives of the Roman nouveau riche, who above all are interested in the commercial possibilities of large scale farming and not at all in the traditional agriculture.³⁴⁷ The *epodos* mirrors the opening lines of S.1.4, in which he alludes to individuals in high office appropriating property, and carrying out other criminal action. It was the time of the expropriations and confiscations when the most fertile land was given to the veterans and of the structural changes in the agricultural sector, where the farming estates, the *latifundia*, were established at the cost of the traditional farmers with the help of capital of the new rich and the old elite. The expropriation of farmland after Philippi is also alluded to in S.2.2, where the Apulian farmer Ofellus lost his farm, but continued to work on his old property as a farmhand. Ofellus has succeeded in accepting his reduced circumstances without losing his independence of mind and is an example of good plain living as taught by the Epicureans.³⁴⁸ The new rich are also the subject of his message in *Epod.4*. A parvenu shows off his new wealth. The former slave was an officer in the navy of Sextus Pompey. The class of the new rich is not to be trusted as they do erode the old Roman values. Horace lays his trust in the members of the old established families to bring back order and justice. *Epod.4* reminds us particularly of S.1.6 with the discussion about social mobility, the political careers of freedmen or freedmen's sons, and the prejudices of the established political elite.³⁴⁹

Horace condemned in all but one *sermones* of S.1 extreme behaviour which he saw in the vices of greed (*avaritia*), ambition (*ambitio*) and extravagance (*luxuria*). He exposed those evils again in S.2.3 giving many examples, which he observed in all layers of Roman society. Horace, who expressed elsewhere his own ideas of finding a golden mean in behaviour (S.1.3), distanced himself from the rigid Stoic dogmas about the origin of the vices, namely that those are forms of madness. He refers to another Stoic dogma in S.2.7, that is that every fool is a slave implying that if both master and slave are ruled by their desires, they have no control over their own destiny and they are no different. The poet's answer, in addition to that of the golden mean in behaviour, is that control is the result of freedom. The discussion in S.2.7 also touches on his observation elsewhere that extreme behaviour is found in classes

347 For *Epod.2*, see Cipriani (1980); Watson (2003, 75-86). For S.2.6, see Muecke (1993, 193-196); For S.2.8, see Muecke (1993, 227-229).

348 For S.2.2 and S.2.3, see Mayer (2005, 154-155); For S.2.2, see Muecke (1993, 114-116). For S.2.3, see Muecke (1993, 130-131).

349 For *Epod.4*, see Watson (2003, 145-152).

which are at the opposite ends of the societal scale, masters and slaves. The theme of extreme behaviour also emerges in *Epod.*8 and 12, where he criticizes the sexual moral, particularly of the cultured, sexually liberated women of the Roman elite. Horace may intend that his contemporary reader detects in the women of both *Epodi* either Cleopatra's domination of Antony, sexually and politically, or the (putative?) attempts of Fulvia to ensnare Octavian. There are no independent indications that those *Epodi* originated as a result of sexual approaches by Fulvia, which was suggested by Octavian's epigram of 41 B.C. at the time of the Perusian war. Thus, both *Epodi* can contain allusions to topical political issues. In Horace's view, Octavian was right to resist her – if the advances took place at all.³⁵⁰

The first *sermo* of book 2 has a political message concealed under the literary and legal discussion. Horace drew a respected lawyer, Trebatius, into the conversation and thus there could not be any doubt about the validity of his legal pronouncements. At the end Octavian is introduced to state that there is freedom to write or speak provided this is within the limits of good manners and this is not slander. In addition, Horace is positive about Lucilius in S.2.1.³⁵¹ Horace gave his opinion of freedom of speech (*libertas*) in this poem, like he did in S.1.4 and S.1.10. His view expressed in S.2.1 was again a political stand against the Republicans and the Pompeians, who had adopted the position of being the defenders of free speech.

I also chose a few poems (S.2.5, S.2.6, *Epod.*1, *Carm.*1.17 and *Carm.*1.20), which belong to the category of poems describing his self-presentation and his efforts to make himself acceptable to Maecenas, but also contain political commentary although not often recognized. For example, *Epod.*1 (36 B.C. or 31 B.C.), which Horace places against the background of the preparations for a decisive naval battle, Naulochus or

350 For S.2.7, see Muecke (1993, 212-214). For *Epod.*8, see Watson (2003, 287-293). For *Epod.*12, see Watson (2003, 382-391). The possible allusion to Cleopatra acc. to Watson (2003, 293): "It is possible that the *vetula* [old woman of *Epod.*8] is the poet's sneering caricature of the type of well-born, cultured, sexually liberated woman who came to prominence in the late Republic; [...] (One suspects that Horace intended contemporary readers to detect in her disquieting resemblances to another dominating female, the Cleopatra of *Epod.*9.11-16.)." The epigram of six lines by Octavian against Fulvia was quoted by Martial in MART.11.20; this reads as follows: *Caesaris Augusti lascivos, livide, versus/sex lege, qui tristis verba Latina legis:/ "quod futuit Glaphyran Antonius, hanc mihi poenam/ Fulvia constituit, se quoque uti futuam./ Fulviam ego ut futuam? quid si me Manius oret/ pedicem, faciam? non puto, si sapiam./ 'aut futue, aut pugnemus' ait. quid quod mihi vita/ carior est ipsa mentula? signa canant!"/ absolvis lepidos nimirum, Auguste, libellos./ qui scis Romana simplicitate loqui.* (Malignant one, you who read Latin words with a sour face, read six wanton verses of Caesar Augustus: "Because Antony fucks Glaphyra, Fulvia determined to use the same punishment for me by making me fuck her in turn. I fuck Fulvia? What if Manius begged me to sodomize him, would I do it? I think not, if I were in my right mind. 'Either fuck me or let us fight,' she says. Ah, but my cock is dearer to me than life itself. Let the trumpets sound." Augustus, you surely absolve my witty little books, knowing how to speak with Roman candor).

351 For S.2.1, see Muecke (1993, 99-101).

Actium. He spells out his *amicitia* for Maecenas narrating his closeness to the major political events and his support for Maecenas. He remains independent as he does not expect any rewards for his support. In *S.2.5*, Horace explores the evil of inheritance-hunting both as a reprehensible social circumstance resulting from a perversion of standards by greed and as an exploitation of genuine *amicitia* by a “friend.” Horace condemns inheritance-hunting as a social threat because he sees this as a result of erosion of the old values. He rejects the exploitation of *amicitia* because he is gratified by his association with Maecenas which he sees as one of true *amicitia*. In *Carm.1.17* (probably 33-31 B.C.), Horace describes the beauty and peace of his Sabine farm. He voices in the poem his happiness and gratitude having received the estate. *Carm.1.20* (probably 31-30 B.C.) expresses Horace’s pride and gratitude for becoming Maecenas’ associate. The poem is about an invitation to Maecenas to come and drink wine which Horace had stored away on the day that Maecenas returned to public life after a dangerous illness.³⁵² The two *Carmina* are reminiscent of *S.1.5* and *S.1.9*, where Horace expressed his pride that he had been recognized as one of Maecenas’ associates. Horace wants it to be known that he has become close to Maecenas. In *S.2.6*, he recognises the pleasures of living at the Sabine estate allowing him to enjoy the way of life he really likes. He also condemns however in this sermo the unlimited hunting of profits by the urban new rich.

In summary, we see that Horace addressed in *Sermones* book 2, *Epodi* and those *Carmina* which he wrote between 38 and 30 B.C. the same political issues as he did in *Sermones* book 1, and that he expressed the same opinions as in *S.1*.

3.4 Virgil's *Eclogae* and Horace's *Sermones* Book 1 Compared

In this section, I will compare Virgil's *Eclogae* with the first book of *Sermones*. Both books were written in broadly the same period: the *Ecl.* most likely between 42 B.C. and 35 B.C., *S.1* between 38 B.C. and 35 B.C.³⁵³ I conclude in Weeda (2015) that Virgil shows

³⁵² For *S.2.5*, see Muecke (1993, 177-180). For *S.2.6*, see Muecke (1993, 193-196). I do not include *Carm.2.13* and *2.17* which have a link with *Carm.1.20*. Horace describes in *2.13* his narrow escape from death as a falling tree on his Sabine estate lands on his head. Horace addresses Maecenas in *2.17* saying that their fates are linked. He expresses his gratitude that Maecenas has survived his serious illness (*Carm.1.20*) and he connects Maecenas’ recovery to his own lucky escape from the falling tree (*Carm.2.13*). Acc. to Nisbet & Hubbard (2004, 201) *Carm.2.13* probably “belongs to 25 B.C.,” Nisbet & Hubbard (2004, 272) do not give a dating for *Carm. 2.17* other than stating that the ode was written some years before *Carm.1.20*. In my view, the datings of *Carm.2.13* and *2.17* are too uncertain for the poems to be included in the period (38-30 B.C.) that I chose for examination.

³⁵³ The view of Virgil's *Eclogae* as pastoral poetry with political commentary is a recapitulation of Weeda (2015, 54-84, esp. 54-58 and 83-84) and of Weeda & van der Poel (2016); see also note 4. For Virgil writing about political issues, see also Dominik (2009). For an extensive list of scholarly

his concern with major contemporary political matters in each of the ten *eclogae*, which are true bucolic poems, presenting a pastoral world where nature and man can be in harmony and where poetry can possess healing power worth more than political power or status. But Virgil also showed other, more sinister aspects: his pastoral world was threatened or had already disappeared, not through mismanagement or indifference of the farmers, but through forces from outside. Seven *eclogae* which concern directly the expropriations are *Ecl.*1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10. Virgil refers especially to the expropriations and the expulsions in the Mantua region in *Ecl.*1, 6, 9 and 10.³⁵⁴ Four poems contain a description of the indifference of and the exploitation by the new owners (in *Ecl.*5, 7, 8 and 9). In addition, the threat to the pastoral life (in *Ecl.*2, 3 and 9) and the destruction of rural communities (in *Ecl.*6, 8 and 9) are also described. He introduces in *Ecl.*4 his view of the preferred constitutional arrangements when the war is over, that is a hereditary form of non-elected political authority and one-man rule. Virgil wrote from his personal knowledge, referring not just to an unnamed general threat, land confiscations somewhere in Italy, but to very specific events in his own region, near Mantua. Presumably, he tapped into his own observations – and those of people he knew – of the land expropriations and its effects, using these for portraying the political and social state of affairs in Italy. In my view, Virgil did not express real personal experiences in the *Eclogae*, but used his personal knowledge and experience in order to expose the social and political situation caused by the decline of the rural order. Virgil did not describe historical events precisely, but adapted these using them as functional references.³⁵⁵ Bowersock (1971, 76) argues that “the scholia [Servius, Donatus and others] are worthless evidence for details of the land commission, and so is Virgil. That can only redound to the poet’s credit. He has caught a mood, an atmosphere in his poems.” However, Virgil certainly introduced historical individuals. I suggest that Varus, Pollio and Gallus represent a special kind of historical allegories symbolizing the involvement of high-ranking officials without exactly specifying who was involved where. Thus, Virgil showed the gravity of the

literature about the *Ecl.*, see Weeda (2015, 54 note 65). For the dating of the *Ecl.*, see Weeda (2015, 60 note 76): “The year 42 is derived from the assumption that *Ecl.*2 and 3 were probably the earliest and were written before *Ecl.*9, which was written in 41 or 40 B.C. The year 35 B.C. results from the reference to Octavian in *Ecl.*8.6-13. See also Clausen (2003,xxii-xxiii); Perutelli (1995, 28-31).” For the dating of the individual *Eclogae*, see Weeda (2015, 59-83). For the dating of *Ecl.*10, see Weeda & van der Poel (2016, 9 note 17).

354 For example, Virgil refers to the expropriations in the Mantua region and the involvement of well-known men in *Ecl.*1, 6, 9 and 10. In particular, he mentions: Alfenus Varus (*Ecl.*6.6-12 and *Ecl.*9.26-29) and Gallus (*Ecl.*6.64 and *Ecl.*10.1-10, 22-23, 72-73) and indirectly even Octavian (*Ecl.*1.42-43). Conform Jenkyns (1998, 171): Virgil was “concerned for the distresses of his fellow countrymen, the Mantuans – so much is explicit – and to that extent personal experience enters into his allusions to the confiscations.”

355 Scholars are divided w.r.t the question in which *eclogae* autobiography can be found. For an overview of the relevant scholarly literature, see Weeda (2015, 55-56 note 68).

situation. A number of passages can also be interpreted as referring to events affecting people who the poet knew well, such as *Ecl.*1 (Tityrus' attempt to extract a promise that his farm would not be confiscated in line 42), or *Ecl.*9.10 (Menalcas having won a reprieve for the family farm or other farms). There is also evidence, which has so far been neglected, that Virgil referred to the new reality of the social and economic relations in the countryside through his choice of names of *personae*. Examples are the impertinent Thyrsis, in *Ecl.*7.33-34, used to refer to new arrogant landowners, or Mopsus in *Ecl.*5 and 8 to refer to the new-comer soldiers, who replaced or exploited the traditional farming population. Further, the river *Rhenus* in *Ecl.*10 refers to the Reno (near Mantua), which Lycoris saw when she left Gallus, symbolising Gallus' loneliness as a result of the misfortunes of war.³⁵⁶

I dwelt intentionally upon the subject of Virgil's possible personal knowledge of and concern for the victims of the land confiscations as this may explain the nature of his political commentary in the *Eclogae*. Virgil was very concerned about the disappearance of farming and small holdings in Italy. In his poetry he voiced not only his concern and compassion with the suffering farmers, but he also pointed out political responsibilities. Virgil did not hold back in naming or in alluding to the men whom he held responsible. I read less praise of Octavian and his associates in the *Eclogae* than for example Nauta argues.³⁵⁷ Zetzel (2006, 50), in an essay about Horace's *Sermones*, writes that Virgil "does indeed deal with substantial problems and with the realities of Roman and Italian life in the Triumviral age." However, I do not concur with his (2006, 50) conclusion that "it might be argued (as I [Zetzel] think Horace does argue), that to veil the moral and social issues under the mask of pastoral, to emphasize poetics rather than politics, to construct a smooth, elegant, and artificial world and diction [as Virgil does] is not the best way to write or to live in Rome of the mid-30s." This is not supported by the results of my (Weeda, 2015, 54-84, esp. 84) study, in which I concluded that Virgil was critical of, among others, Octavian for their roles in the land expropriations in *Ecl.*1, 6, 7, 8 and 9. At the time of writing the *Eclogae* it was perhaps not the best time to show his criticism too openly. Virgil is an elegant poet indeed, who, through his allusions in virtually every *ecloga*, presents his critical political messages in a pastoral wrapping, thus subtly shrouding his viewpoint.

356 For Tityrus as a poetic *persona*, and not as representing Virgil, see Boucher (1966, 17). For Menalcas and a reprieve of farms in the Mantuan area in *Ecl.*9.7-10: *Certe equidem audieram, qua se subducere colles/ incipiunt [...] omnia carminibus uestrum seruasse Menalcan* (indeed I certainly heard that from where the hills begin to slope down gradually [...] your Menalcas saved them all with his songs). See also Weeda (2015, 73). For the river *Rhenus* in *Ecl.*10, see Weeda and van der Poel (2016).

357 Nauta (2006, 301-332) states that Octavian is praised in *Ecl.*1 (2006, 305-310) and in *Ecl.*8 (2006, 310-316), and "other nobles" (Pollio, Varus and Gallus) in *Ecl.*3, 6, 9 and 10 (2006, 310-316). See for my arguments, Weeda (2015, 59-83).

According to Dominik (2009, 117-122), Virgil wrote not only about “green politics,” such as “rural exploitation” (2009, 117), and the “destruction [of the landscape], often as the result of politico-military force and the shameless consumption of the civilized world” (2009, 119), but he also pointed out that “disintegration of the *locus amoenus* in the *Eclogae* is afforded political import not just by its manifest association to the intrusion of the urban superstructure, but especially by the personal tragedies of its inhabitants” (2009, 122). I argue that Virgil went further than that as he delivered political statements about the destruction of rural communities, originating in what he saw as the fundamental destruction of the way of life of the crofters and the substantial change, even loss of, traditional rural values.

So far, I have given in section 3.3 a comprehensive account of Horace's views on topical political issues as recorded in both S.1 and in other contemporary poems in several different genres, and I have given in the present section 3.4 a brief account of Virgil's in the *Eclogae*. I intend to compare the views of both poets in this final part of section 3.4 that is also the closure of the book. As it so happened that Horace expressed his opinion about Virgil's *Eclogae* in S.1.10.44-45, it is proper to begin with recalling the latter passage.³⁵⁸ Horace writes: *molle atque facetum/ Vergilio adnuerunt gaudentes rure Camenae* (the Muses relishing the countryside have granted to Virgil tenderness and elegance). Horace praises Virgil's way of showing his compassion with the farmers after Octavian's land confiscations in Northern Italy after Philippi. Zetzel (2006, 45-52) explored the differences between Horace's *Liber sermonum* and Virgil's *Liber bucolicon* (*Eclogae*) within the literary frame pointing out not only the differences in style and the poetic tradition of both authors, but also the possibility of Horace responding in some poems of S.1 to Virgil's *Eclogae*.³⁵⁹ Yet, Zetzel (2006, 47) states also that “what is important about these writers [the models of Virgil and Horace] is not, at least in Horace's explanation, how they wrote, but what they wrote: poetry of substance, social criticism, philosophical speculation, moral commentary.” I will look at “what Horace and Virgil wrote” about social, moral and political issues and intend to identify the differences.

Virgil focused in the *Eclogae* on the issues of the social and economic changes that took place in the rural communities of Italy which he saw in serious decline, and on the human suffering resulting from the never-ending civil war and the struggle for power between different factions. As he harboured great love for “old Italy,” the land of farmers, Virgil was embittered and very concerned about the way the traditional

358 For the details of my reading of S.1.10.44-45, see the discussion of the relevant passage in S.1.10 in section 2.2.5, where I also explained my renderings of *molle* (tenderness) and *facetum* (elegance).

359 For the comparison of S.1 and *Ecl.*, see also van Rooy (1973). I concur with Zetzel (2006, 46) that van Rooy's efforts to find parallels between each sermo and the corresponding *ecloga* are rather far-fetched. Horace's objective writing S.1 differed so much from Virgil's objective writing *Ecl.* that one can hardly expect any convergence.

social structures were being destroyed, and the way smallholders were being expelled from their farms. Virgil had personal knowledge of lawlessness, which he regarded as being a result of the long period of civil war, for which he held the leaders of the different factions responsible. Thus, we see that in the *Eclogae* he censures the poor conditions that befell the rural population caused by the expropriations, namely the threat to the rural communities and the indifference of and the exploitation by the new owners.

Horace, on the other hand, addressed in S.1 a much larger group of different political issues, in particular those relating to questions of international relations and military strategy, the management of the affairs of state, the rise of ambitious new men in high offices, general issues of moral values and behaviour of all layers of the Roman society, but especially of the new rich, and the threat from the East to Roman culture. We saw in section 3.3 several examples, which I will briefly recapitulate. Concerning the international affairs, Horace expressed at a number of places his opinion about the activities of Marc Antony and Cleopatra. He was concerned about Antony's lack of progress in the conflict with Parthia, and the alliance between Cleopatra and Marc Antony to create their own *imperium* in the East. Generally speaking, Horace was in the 30s B.C. much more critical of Cleopatra than Virgil was later in the *Aeneis*. On balance, Virgil's opinion of her was positive, particularly as appears from his modelling of Dido on Cleopatra and from the manner in which he portrayed Dido as queen being testament of his appreciation of Cleopatra's qualities.³⁶⁰ Horace saw the urgent necessity of strong leadership in Rome. With respect to the management of the public affairs and the new men who got involved, he made a stand against the Republicans and Pompeians and he took the side of Octavian in the conflict against Sextus Pompey and Marc Antony. He criticized the *nouveau riche* who tried to gain public office with the intent to further his own interests. He condemned the moral values of all layers of society in all but one *sermones* of the first book: greed (*avaritia*), ambition (*ambitio*) and extravagance (*luxuria*), which he observed in all layers of society, from the common people to the upper classes. He saw those vices as a threat to the traditional structure of Roman society. Another threat to Roman values and culture came also from the East. He attached much importance to the *mos maiorum* and the Roman way of life and he saw Greek and Eastern cultural customs and practices which spread over many layers of Roman society as a danger. Horace was particularly worried about black magic denouncing the practices in several poems.

Horace's approach to the political situation and the manner in which he expressed his opinions is that of the intellectual, while Virgil shows his sympathy for and consideration of his fellow human beings. This may be due to the different perspectives from which the two poets wrote. Virgil wrote the *Eclogae* from the

360 For a more comprehensive discussion of Virgil's opinion of Cleopatra, see Weeda (2015, 133-137; 146-148).

perspective of denouncing the serious events in Northern Italy where the independent smallholders were turned into poor tenants, if not slaves. Horace, however, wrote S.1 from that of self-presentation making himself acceptable to Maecenas and indirectly to Octavian. He presented political views through which he could expect to find favour with Maecenas. Thus, Horace wrote about strategic and general political issues which were the subjects of attention for Maecenas and his associates.

Appendix

Iter Brundisium

I divide the “journey” into three parts: (1) Rome to Trivicum, (2) the route between Trivicum and Rubi “which cannot be worked out from the text” (Gowers, 2012, 206), and (3) from Rubi to Brundisium.

Part (1)

Day 1:	Rome to Aricia	Staying night in Aricia
16 miles	line 1	(Gowers, 2012, 187)
Day 2:	Aricia to Forum Appi to Anxur	Overnight by boat through canal of the Pomptine marshes
27 + 16 + 3 = 46 miles	lines 3, 26	(Gowers, 2012, 188, 190, 192)
Day 3:	Boat arrives at 10:00 hr. at Feronia (lines 23/24)/Anxur where Maecenas, Cocceius and Fonteius Capito join party	lines 27/28
26 miles	Anxur to Fundi to Formiae	Staying night in Formiae
	lines 34/37	(Gowers, 2012, 195)
Day 4	Formiae to Sinuessa to Pons Campanus	
At Sinuessa Virgil, Plotius, Varus join party		Staying night in Pons Campanus
24 miles	lines 40, 45	(Gowers, 2012, 197)
Day 5	Pons Campanus to Capua	Probably staying night in Capua
Approx. 17 miles	lines 45, 47	

Approximate distance Rome – Capua: 16 + 46 + 26 + 24 + 17 = 129 miles

Day 6	Capua to Caudium	Staying night in Caudium (at Cocceius)
At supper the contest of Sarmentus and Messius Cicirrus (lines 51-70)		
21 miles	lines 50, 51	(Gowers, 2012, 199)
Day 7	Caudium to Beneventum	Probably staying night in Beneventum
In Beneventum kitchen fire (lines 71-76)		
11 miles	line 71	(Gowers, 2012, 204)
Day 8	Beneventum to Trivicum	Staying night in Trivicum
Sees the familiar hills of Apulia (lines 77-79). In Trivicum assignation with a girl, who does not turn up (lines 82-85)		
25 miles	line 79	(Gowers, 2012, 205-207)
<u>Or</u>		
Day 7 or 8	Caudium to Trivicum	Staying night in Trivicum
36 miles	line 71	(Gowers, 2012, 204)

Approximate distance Rome – Capua: 129 miles

Approximate distance Capua – Trivicum: $21 + 11 + 25$ or $21 + 36 = 57$ miles

Part (1) of the journey. Approximate distance Rome – Trivicum: $129 + 57 = 186$ miles

Part (2)

After Trivicum the party changes from Via Appia to Rubi on the Via Minucia (later Via Traiana), the road to Barium and eventually Brundisium. “The route between Trivicum and Rubi *cannot* be worked out from the text” (Gowers, 2012, 206), but went through Horace’s home territory around Venusia

Day 8 or 9	Trivicum to unknown town	Staying night in unknown town; distance recorded
------------	--------------------------	---

Unknown little town has the best bread to be had (lines 88-90)

24 miles	line 86	(Gowers, 2012, 208)
----------	---------	---------------------

Day 9 or 10	Unknown town to Canusium	Text does not tell whether party stayed the night at Canusium.
-------------	--------------------------	---

Approx. 35 miles	line 91	(Gowers, 2012, 209)
------------------	---------	---------------------

Acc. to Gowers (2012, 209) the distance Beneventum to Canusium is 84 miles

In Canusium, Varius leaves the party (line 93)

Day 10 or 11	Canusium to Rubi	Staying the night at Rubi; distance not recorded, although <i>iter longum</i> (lines 94-95)
--------------	------------------	--

Approx. 30 miles	line 94	(Gowers, 2012, 201)
------------------	---------	---------------------

Part (2) of the journey. Approximate distance Trivicum – Rubi: $24 + 35 + 30 = 89$ miles

Part (3)

Day 11 or 12	Rubi to Barium	Overnight stay not recorded (Gowers, 2012, 211)
--------------	----------------	--

Approx. 23 miles	line 97	
------------------	---------	--

Day 12 or 13	Barium to Gnatia	Overnight stay not recorded (Gowers, 2012, 211)
--------------	------------------	--

Approx. 37 miles	line 97	
------------------	---------	--

Lack of watersprings, and the miracle of the blazing wood in Gnatia

Day 13 or 14 b	Gnatia to Brundisium	
----------------	----------------------	--

Approx. 44 miles	line 104	(Gowers, 2012, 212-214)
------------------	----------	-------------------------

Part (3) of the journey. Approximate distance Rubi – Brundisium: $23 + 37 + 44 = 104$ miles

Approximate distance Rome to Brundisium: $186 + 89 + 104 = 379$ miles (560 kilometres).

Bibliography

- Albrecht von, M. (1997). *Geschichte der römischen Literatur, Band I, II*. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Anderson, W.S. (1955/1956). "Poetic Fiction" – Horace. *Serm.* 1.5. *The Classical Weekly*, 49, 57-59.
- Anderson, W.S. (1962/1963). The Roman Socrates: Horace and his Satires. In J.P. Sullivan (Ed.), *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Vol. II: Satire* (pp.1-37). London: Routledge & Keagan Paul.
- Anderson, W.S. (1982). *Essays on Roman Satire*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Anderson, W.S. (2010). Horace's Friendship: Adaptation of a Circular Argument. In G. Davis (Ed.), *A Companion to Horace* (pp. 34-52). Chichester, U.K. & Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Armstrong, D. (1986). *Horatius Eques et Scriba*: Satires 1.6 and 2.7. *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 116, 255-288.
- Armstrong, D. (1989). *Horace*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Armstrong, D. (1995). The Impossibility of Metathesis: Philodemus and Lucretius on Form and Content in Poetry. In D. Obbink (Ed.), *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace* (pp. 210-232). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Armstrong, D. (2010). The Biographical and Social Foundations of Horace's Poetic Voice. In G. Davis (Ed.), *A Companion to Horace* (pp.7-33). Chichester, U.K. & Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Barchiesi, A. (2001). Horace and Iambos: The Poet as Literary Historian. In A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni & A. Barchiesi (Eds.), *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire* (pp. 141-164). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Barchiesi, A. (2005). Learned Eyes: Poets, Viewers, Image Makers. In K. Galinsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to The Age of Augustus* (pp. 281-305). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barchiesi, A. & Cucchiarelli, A. (2005). Satire and the Poet: The Body as Self-Referential Symbol. In K. Freudenburg (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire* (pp. 207-223). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bartels, C. (1973). Die neunte Epode des Horaz als Symptomisches Gedicht. *Hermes*, 101, 282-313.
- Bather, P. & Stocks, C. (Eds.) (2016a). *Horace's Epodes: Contexts, Intertexts, and Reception*. E-book Oxford Scholarship Online. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bather, P. & Stocks, C. (2016b). Introduction. In P. Bather & C. Stocks (Eds.), *Horace's Epodes: Contexts, Intertexts, and Reception* (pp. 1-30). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bentley, R. (1711). *Q. Horatius Flaccus*. Cambridge.
- Blois de, L. & Spek van der, R.J. (2001). *Een kennismaking met de oude wereld*. Bussum: Coutinho.
- Blume, H-D. (2015). Cytheris. In H. Cancik & H. Schneider (Eds.), *Brill's New Pauly. Antiquity volumes*. <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-pauly/cytheris-e627180> (accessed on January 6, 2015). Leiden: Brill.
- Boatwright, M.T., Gargola, D.J. & Talbert, R.J.A. (2004). *The Romans: From Village to Empire. A History of Ancient Rome from Earliest Times to Constantine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bond, R. (2009). Horace's Political Journey. In W.J. Dominik, J. Garthwaite & P.A. Roche (Eds.), *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome* (pp.133-152). Leiden: Brill.
- Boucher, J.P. (1966). *Caius Cornelius Gallus*. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres."
- Boulanger, A. & Wuilleumier, P. (Eds.) (1959). *Cicéron Discours, Tome XIX, Philippiques I à IV*, Budé. Paris, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres."
- Bowditch, P. Lowell (2001). *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Bowditch, P. Lowell (2010). Horace and Imperial Patronage. In G. Davis (Ed.), *A Companion to Horace* (pp. 53-74). Chichester, U.K., & Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Bowersock, G.W. (1971). A Date in the Eighth Eclogue. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 75, 73-80.
- Bowra, C.M. (1961). *Greek Lyric Poetry, from Alcman to Simonides*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Boyd, B. W. (Ed.) (2002). *Brill's Companion to Ovid*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bradshaw, A. (1989). Horace in Sabinis. In C. Deroux (Ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History V* (pp. 160-186). Brussels: Latomus.
- Bradshaw, A. (2006). Horace's Birthday and Deathday. In A.J. Woodman & D.C. Feeney (Eds.), *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace* (pp.1-16). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Braund, S. M. (Ed.) (1989). *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Brink, C.O. (Ed.) (1982a). *Horace on Poetry; Epistles book II, The Letters to Augustus and Florus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brink, C.O. (1982b). Horace's Literary Epistles and Their Chronology: Augustanism in the Augustan Poets. In C.O. Brink (Ed.), *Horace on Poetry; Epistles book II, The Letters to Augustus and Florus* (pp. 523-577). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brink, C.O. (1987). Horatian Notes IV: Despised Readings in the Manuscripts of Satires Book I. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 33, 16-27.
- Brower, R.A. (Ed.) (1959). *On Translation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; also available as E-book through De Gruyter.
- Brown, P.M. (2007). *Horace, Satires I*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips.
- Brunt, P.A. (1971). *Italian Manpower: 225 B.C. – A.D. 14*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Brunt, P.A. (2004a). *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brunt, P.A. (2004b). *Amicitia in the Late Roman Republic*. In P.A. Brunt, *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays* (pp. 351-381). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brunt, P.A. (2004c). *Clientela*. In P.A. Brunt, *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays* (pp. 382-442). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buchheit, V. (1968). Homerparodie und Literaturkritik in Horazens Satiren I.7 und I.9. *Gymnasium*, 75, 519-555.
- Burkert, W. (1998). *Creation of the Sacred: Tracks of Biology in Early Religions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Butler, H.E. (Ed.) (1977). *Quintilian: The Institutio Oratoria, Vol.2 (Loeb)*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cairns, F. (1992). The Power of Implication: Horace's Invitation to Maecenas (Odes 1.20). In A.J. Woodman & J.C.F. Powell (Eds.), *Author and Audience in Latin Literature* (pp. 84-109). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, A.Y. (1970). *Horace: A New Interpretation*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press (originally published 1924. London: Methuen).
- Campbell, D.A. (2002). *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.
- Cancik, H. & Schneider H. (Eds.) (2015). *Brill's New Pauly. Antiquity Volumes*. Leiden: Brill.
- Carrubba, R.W. (1969). *The Epodes of Horace. A Study in Poetic Arrangement*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- Cavarzere, A., Aloni, A. & Barchiesi, A. (Eds.) (2001). *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Cipriani, G. (1980). *Letteratura Georgica e Investimento Fondiario alla Fine del 1° Sec.a.C. Orazio, Epod.2*. Bari: Adriatica Editrice.
- Claes, P. (1988). *Echo's Echo's: De kunst van de allusie*. Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij.

- Clausen, W. (2003). *A Commentary on Virgil Eclogues*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cloud, J.D. (1989). Satirists and the Law. In S.M. Braund (Ed.), *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome* (pp.49-67). Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Coffey, M. (1976). *Roman Satire*. London: Methuen and Co.
- Connors, C. (2005). Epic Allusion in Roman Satire. In K. Freudenberg (Ed.), *A Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire* (pp. 123-145). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Conte, G.B. (1986). *The Rhetoric of Imitation, Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Translated by C. Segal. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Corbett, P. (1986). *The Scurra*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- Cornford, F.M. (1968). *The Origin of Attic Comedy*. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith.
- Costa, C.D.N. (Ed.) (1973). *Horace*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Courtney, E. (1994). Horace and the Pest. *The Classical Journal*, 90.1, 1-8.
- Courtney, E. (Ed.) (2003). *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crook, J.A. (1997). Review of Galinsky, K. (1996). *Augustan Culture; An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 87, 287-288.
- Cucchiarelli, A. (2001). *La Satira e il Poeta. Orazio tra Epodi e Sermones*. Pisa: Giardini.
- Cucchiarelli, A. (2002). *Iter satiricum. Le Voyage à Brindes et la Satire d'Horace*. *Latomus*, 61, 842-851.
- Davis, G. (1991). *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Davis, G. (Ed.) (2010a). *A Companion to Horace*. Chichester, U.K. & Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Davis, G. (2010b). Defining a Lyric Ethos: Archilochus *lyricus* and Horatian *melos*. In G. Davis (Ed.), *A Companion to Horace* (pp. 105-127). Chichester, U.K., & Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Deißmann – Merten, M. (1975). Valerius. In K. Ziegler & W. Sontheimer (Eds.), *Der Kleine Pauly, Lexikon der Antike Vol. V* (p.1106). Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag.
- Deremetz, A. (1995). *Le Miroir des Muses: Poétiques de la Réflexivité à Rome (Racines & Modèles)*. Villeneuve d'Ascq (France): Presses Universitaires du Septentrion.
- Dettmer, H. (1983). *Horace: A Study in Structure*. Hildesheim, NY: Olms/Weidmann.
- Dickie, M.W. (1981). The Disavowal of *Invidia* in Roman Iamb and Satire. *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar*, 3, 183-208.
- Dominik, W.J., Garthwaite, J. & Roche, P.A. (Eds.) (2009). *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome*. Leiden: Brill.
- Dominik, W. J. (2009). Virgil's Geopolitics. In W.J. Dominik, J.Garthwaite & P. A. Roche (Eds.), *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome* (pp. 111-132). Leiden: Brill.
- Dover, K.J. (1972). *Aristophanic Comedy*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- DuQuesnay, I.M. Le M. (1984). Horace and Maecenas; The Propaganda Value of *Sermones* 1. In A.J. Woodman & D.A. West (Eds.), *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus* (pp. 19-58). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DuQuesnay, I.M. Le M. (2009). Horace, *Odes* 4.5: *Pro Reditu Imperatoris Caesaris Divi Filii Augusti*. In M. Lowrie (Ed.), *Horace: Odes and Epodes* (pp. 271- 336). (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Earl, D.C. (1961). *The Political Thought of Sallust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eitrem, S. (1942). La Théurgie chez les Néoplatoniciens et dans les Papyrus Magiques. *Symbolae Osloenses*, xxii, 49-79.
- Étienne – Duplessis, M. (Ed.) (2013). *Appien, Histoire Romaine, Tome XII; Guerres Civiles Livre V*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Fantham, E. (1972). *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Fantham, E., Foley, H.P., Kampen, N.B., Pomeroy, S.B. & Shapiro, H.A. (1994). *Women in the Classical World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Fantuzzi, M., & Papanghelis, T. (Eds.) (2006). *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral*. Leiden: Brill.
- Farrell, J. (2005). Periods: The Augustan Period: 40 BC – AD 14. In S.J. Harrison (Ed.), *A Companion to Latin Literature* (pp. 55-57). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Feeney, D.C. (2009a). *Una cum scriptore meo*. Poetry, Principate, and the Traditions of Literary History in the Epistle to Augustus. In K. Freudenberg (Ed.), *Horace: Satires and Epistles* (pp. 360-385). (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies). Oxford: Oxford University Press. Originally in A.J Woodman & D.C. Feeney (Eds.) (2006), *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace* (pp.172-187). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Feeney, D.C. (2009b). Becoming an Authority: Horace on his Own Reception. In L.B. Houghton & M. Wyke, M. (Eds.), *Perceptions of Horace: A Roman Poet and his Readers*. (pp. 16-38). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferri, R. (2007). The Epistles. In S.J. Harrison (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace* (pp.121-131). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferriss – Hill, J.L. (2014). *Roman Satire and the Old Comic Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fiske, G.C. (1966). *Lucilius and Horace: A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation* (reprint of ed. 1920). Hildesheim: Olms.
- Fitzgerald, W. (2009). Power and Impotence in Horace's *Epodes*. In M. Lowrie (Ed.), *Horace: Odes and Epodes* (pp. 141-159). (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Folkerts, M. (1972). Orbilius. In K. Ziegler & W. Sontheimer (Eds.), *Der Kleine Pauly, Lexikon der Antike* Vol. IV (p. 329). Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag.
- Fowler, D. (2000). *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fraenkel, E. (2002). *Horace*. (first ed. 1957). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Frank, T. (1925). Horace's Description of a Scene in Lucilius. *The American Journal of Philology*, 46.1, 72-74.
- Fränkel, H. (1962). *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*. Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Freudenberg, K. (1993). *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Freudenberg, K. (2001). *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Freudenberg, K. (Ed.) (2005a). *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Freudenberg, K. (2005b). Introduction: Roman Satire. In K. Freudenberg (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire* (pp. 1-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Freudenberg, K. (Ed.) (2009). *Horace: Satires and Epistles*. (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Freudenberg, K. (2010). *Horatius Anceps: Persona and Self-revelation in Satire and Song*. In G. Davis (Ed.), *A Companion to Horace* (pp. 271-290). Chichester, U.K., & Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Freyburger, M-L. & Roddaz, J-M. (Eds.) (1994). *Dion Cassius: Histoire Romaine, Livres 48 et 49*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Frischer, B., Crawford, J. & De Simone, M. (Eds.) (2006). *The Horace's Villa Project, 1997-2003, Vol. 1: Report on New Fieldwork and Research*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Frischer, B. (2010). The Roman Site Identified as Horace's Villa at Licenza, Italy. In G. Davis (Ed.), *A Companion to Horace* (pp. 75-90). Chichester, U.K., & Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Gagliardi, D. (1971). *Orazio e la Tradizione Neoterica*. Naples: Libreria Scientifica Editrice.
- Galinsky, K. (1996). *Augustan Culture; An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Galinsky, K. (Ed.) (2005). *The Cambridge Companion to The Age of Augustus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goelzer, H. (Ed.) (1959). *Tacite. Annales Livres IV – XII* (Budé). Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres."
- Gold, B.K. (Ed.) (1982). *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Gold, B.K. (1987). *Literary Patronage in Greece and Rome*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Gold, B.K. (1992). Openings in Horace's *Satires* and *Odes*: Poet, Patron and Audience. In F.M. Dunn & T. Cole (Eds.), *Beginnings in Classical Literature* (pp.161-185). Yale Classical Studies XXIX. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gold, B.K. (Ed.) (2012a). *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gold, B.K. (2012b). "Patronage and the Elegists: Social Reality or Literary Construction?" In B.K. Gold (Ed.), *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy* (pp. 303-317). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Goukowsky, P. & Hinard, F. (Eds.) (2008). *Appien, Histoire Romaine, Tome VIII, Livre XIII, Guerres Civiles Livre I*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Gow, A.S.F. (1986). *Theocritus*. Edited with a Translation and Commentary, vol. I. Text, vol. II. Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gow, J. (1901). The Frog of Horace, *Satires* I.5. *The Classical Review*, 1901.2, 117.
- Gowers, E. (2003). Fragments of Autobiography in Horace, *Satires* I. *Classical Antiquity*, 22.1, 55-91.
- Gowers, E. (2005). The Restless Companion: Horace, *Satires* 1 and 2. In K. Freudenburg (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire* (pp. 48-61). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gowers, E. (2009). Horace, *Satires* 1.5: An Inconsequential Journey. Repr. of 1993 paper in K. Freudenburg (Ed.), *Horace: Satires and Epistles* (pp. 156-180). (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gowers, E. (2012). *Horace: Satires Book I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graver, M. (1998). The Manhandling of Maecenas: Senecan Abstractions of Masculinity. *The American Journal of Philology*, 119.4, 607-632.
- Griffin, J. (1984). Augustus and the Poets: "*Caesar qui cogere posset*." In F. Millar & E. Segal (Eds.), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects* (pp.189-218). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Griffin, J. (1993). Horace in the Thirties. In N. Rudd (Ed.), *Horace 2000: A Celebration: Essays for the Bimillennium* (pp. 1-22). London: Duckworth.
- Griffin, J. (2004). *Latin Poets and Roman Life*. London: Duckworth.
- Griffin, J. (2005). Augustan Poetry and Augustanism. In K. Galinsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to The Age of Augustus* (pp. 306-320). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gundel, H.G. (1964). C. Asinius Pollio. In K. Ziegler & W. Sontheimer (Eds.), *Der Kleine Pauly, Lexikon der Antike Vol. I* (pp. 638-639). Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag.
- Gundel, H.G. (1967). Furius. In K. Ziegler & W. Sontheimer (Eds.), *Der Kleine Pauly, Lexikon der Antike Vol. II* (p. 645). Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag.
- Gundel, H.G. (1972a). Petillius. In K. Ziegler & W. Sontheimer (Eds.), *Der Kleine Pauly, Lexikon der Antike Vol. IV* (p. 669). Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag.
- Gundel, H.G. (1972b). Sarmenus. In K. Ziegler & W. Sontheimer (Eds.), *Der Kleine Pauly, Lexikon der Antike Vol. IV* (p. 1558). Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag.
- Gurval, R. A. (1998). *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Hallett, J.P. (1981). *Pepedi/diffissa nate ficus*: Priapic Revenge in Horace's *Satires* 1.8. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 124, 341-347.
- Hanchey, D. (2013). Cicero, Exchange, and the Epicureans. *Phoenix*, 67.1.2, 119-134.
- Hanslik, R. (1969). M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus. In K. Ziegler & W. Sontheimer (Eds.), *Der Kleine Pauly, Lexikon der Antike Vol. III* (pp. 1244-1245). Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag.

- Hardie, P. (1997). Closure in Latin Epic. In D.H. Roberts, F.M. Dunn & D.P. Fowler (Eds.), *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature* (pp. 139-162). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hardie, P. & Moore, H. (Eds.) (2015). *Classical Literary Careers and their Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harrison E.L. (1965). Horace's Tribute to His Father. *Classical Philology*, 60.2, 111-114.
- Harrison, S.J. (1989). Two Notes on Horace, Epodes (10,16). *The Classical Quarterly*, 39, 271-274.
- Harrison, S.J. (Ed.) (1995). *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Harrison, S.J. (Ed.) (2005). *A Companion to Latin Literature*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Harrison, S.J. (Ed.) (2007a). *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harrison, S.J. (2007b). *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harrison, S.J. (2007c). Horatian Self-Representations. In S.J. Harrison (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace* (pp. 22-35). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harrison, S. (2015). There and Back Again: Horace's Poetic Career. In P. Hardie & H. Moore (Eds.), *Classical Literary Careers and their Reception* (pp. 39-58). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hekster, O. (2009). *Romeinse Keizers: De Macht van het Imago*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.
- Henderson, J. (1987). Suck it and See: Horace, *Epode* 8. In M. Whitby, P. Hardie & Mary Whitby (Eds.), *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble* (pp. 105-118). Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.
- Henderson (1987) = Henderson (1999, 93-113).
- Henderson, J. (1993). Be Alert (Your Country Needs Lerts): Horace, Satires 1.9. In *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 39, 67-93. Henderson (1993) = Henderson (1999, 202-227).
- Henderson, J. (1994). On Getting Rid of Kings: Horace, *Satire* 1.7. *The Classical Quarterly*, 44.1, 146-170.
- Henderson, J. (1999). *Writing Down Rome: Satire, Comedy, and Other Offences in Latin Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hendrickson, G.L. (1900). Horace, Sermon 1.4: A Protest and a Programme. *The American Journal of Philology*, 21.2, 121-142.
- Hermes, J. (1980). C. Cornelius Gallus und Vergil. Das Problem der Umarbeitung des vierten Georgica-Buches. Dissertation at Westfälischen Wilhelm-Universität zu Münster.
- Hertz, N. (1985). Medusa's Head: Male Hysteria under Political Pressure. In N. Hertz. *The End of the Line: Essays on Psychoanalysis and the Sublime* (pp.160-193). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Heyworth, S.J. (1988). Horace's Second Epode. *The American Journal of Philology*, 109.1, 71-85.
- Heyworth, S.J. (1993). Horace's Ibis: On the Titles, Unity and Contents of the Epodes. *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*, 7, 85-96.
- Heyworth, S.J. (2001). Catullian Iambics, Catullian *Iambi*. In A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni & A. Barchiesi (Eds.), *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire* (pp. 117-140). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hicks, R.D. (1959) *Diogenes Laertius, Lives of Eminent Philosophers, Books I-V, Vol. I (Loeb)*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hierche, H. (1974). *Les Épodes d'Horace: Art et Signification*. Brussels: Latomus.
- Hinard, F. (1985). *Les Proscriptions de la Rome Républicaine*. Rome: École Française de Rome.
- Hinds, S. (1998). *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holder, A. & Keller, O. (1894). *Scholia antiqua in Q. Horatium Flaccum*, vol. I: Porphyrio. Leipzig: Teubner.

- Hooley, D. (2003). Review of Cucchiarelli, A. (2001). *La Satira e il poeta. Orazio tra Epodi e Sermones*. Pisa: Giardini. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2003.04.14.
- Hopkins, K. (1987). *Conquerors and Slaves*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hornblower, S. & Spawford, A. (2003). *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Horsfall, N. (1981). Some Problems of Titulature in Roman Literary History. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 28.4, 103-114.
- Horsfall, N.M. (Ed.) (1995). *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*. Leiden: Brill.
- Houghton, L.B. & Wyke, M. (Eds.) (2009). *Perceptions of Horace: A Roman Poet and his Readers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunter, R.L. (1985). Horace on Friendship and Free Speech. *Hermes*, 113, 480-490.
- Ihm, M. & Roth, C.L. (Eds.) (1907/1908). *C. Svetoni Tranquilli Opera*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Ihm, M. (Ed.) (1923). *C. Svetoni Tranquilli Opera* Vol. I, De Vita Caesarum Libri VIII. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Indelli, G. (1988). *Filodemo: L'Ira*. La Scuola di Epicuro 5. Naples: Bibliopolis.
- Isaac, B.H. (2004). *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Janko, R. (1991). *Philodemus, On Poems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkyns, R. (1998). *Virgil's Experience: Nature and History: Times, Names, and Places*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jensen, C. C. (1906). *Philodemi Peri Oikonomias Qui Dicitur Libellus* (1906). Leipzig: Teubner/Kessinger Legacy Reprints.
- Johnson, T.S. (2012). Horace's Iambic Criticism: Casting Blame (*Iambikê Poiêsis*). Leiden: Mnemosyne Supplements vol. 334, Brill.
- Kaster, R.A. (Ed.) (1995). *C. Suetonius Tranquillus: De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Keane, C. (2006). Figuring Genre in Roman satire. *American Classical Studies*, vol 50. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Keith, A. (2002). Sources and Genres in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. In B.W. Boyd (Ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ovid* (pp. 235-269). Leiden: Brill.
- Kemp, J. (2009). Irony and *Aequabilitas*: Horace, *Satires* 1.3. Dictynna [on line] 6 | 2009, published on line 26 Nov. 2010, downloaded 23 Sept. 2015. URL:<http://dictynna.revues.org/286>.
- Kemp, J. (2010). Flattery and Frankness in Horace and Philodemus. *Greece and Rome, Second Series* 57.1, 65-76.
- Kemp, J. (2016). Fools Rush in: Sex, 'The Mean' and Epicureanism in Horace, *Satires* 1.2. *The Cambridge Classical Journal* 62, 130-146.
- Kierdorf, W. & Müller, C. (2015). Volumnia. In H. Cancik & H. Schneider (Eds.), *Brill's New Pauly. Antiquity volumes*. <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-pauly/volumnia-e12207340> (accessed on January 6, 2015). Leiden: Brill.
- Kiessling, A. (later Heinze, R.) (Eds.) (1958). *Q. Horatius Flaccus, Oden und Epoden*. (first ed. 1884). Berlin: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Kiessling, A. (later Heinze, R.) (Eds.) (1959). *Q. Horatius Flaccus, Satiren*. (first ed. 1886). Berlin: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Kindstrand, J.F. (Ed.) (1976). *Bion of Borysthenes: A Collection of the Fragments with Introduction and Commentary*. Uppsala: The University, Almqvist & Wiksell Int.
- Knorr, O. (2005). Three Orators and a Flawed Argument (Hor. Sat. 1.10.27-30). *The Classical Journal*, 100.4, 393-400.
- Konstan, D. (1997). *Friendship in the Classical World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Konstan, D., Clay, D., Glad, C.E., Thom, J.C. & Ware, J. (2007). *Philodemus: On Frank Criticism*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

- Kraggerud, E. (1984). Horaz und Actium: Studien zu den politischen Epoden. Symbolae Osloenses. fasc. supplet. 26. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Labate, M. (2009). Horatian *Sermo* and Genres of Literature. In K. Freudenburg (Ed.), Horace: *Satires and Epistles* (pp.102-121). (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leach, E.W. (1971). Horace's *Pater Optimus* and Terence's Demea: Autobiographical Fiction and Comedy in *Sermo* 1.4. The American Journal of Philology, 92, 616-632.
- Lefèvre, E. (1993). Horaz, Dichter im augusteischen Rom. Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck.
- Lemaire, N.E. (1819). *P. Vergilius Maro qualem omni parte illustratum tertio publicavit* Chr. Gottlob Heyne *cui Servium partier integrum et variorum notas cum suis subjunxit*, Volumen Tertium. Paris: N.E. Lemaire
- Lewis, C.T. & Short, C. (1955). A Latin Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. (1979). Continuity and Change in Roman Religion. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lindsay, W.M. (1903). *Nonii Marcelli De compendiosa doctrina libros XX*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Lowrie, M. (2007). Orientations: Horace and Augustus. In S.J. Harrison (Ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Horace (pp. 77-89). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lowrie, M. (2009a). Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lowrie, M. (Ed.) (2009b). Horace: *Odes and Epodes*. (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1995). Horace: Behind the Public Poetry. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- MacKay, L.A. (1942). Notes on Horace. Classical Philology, 37.1, 79-81.
- Mankin, D. (1995). Horace: Epodes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mankin, D. (2010). Horatian Lyric: Literary Contexts. The Epodes: Genre, Themes, and Arrangement. In G. Davis (Ed.), A Companion to Horace (pp. 93-104). Chichester, U.K., & Malden MA: Blackwell.
- Manning, C.E. (1970). Canidia in the *Epodes* of Horace. Mnemosyne, 4th series, 23.4, 393-401.
- Manuwald, G. (Ed.) (2007). Cicero, Philippics 3-9. Vol.2: Commentary. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Marouzeau, J. (1936). Horace Assembleur des Mots. Emerita, 4, 1-10.
- Martindale, C.A. (1993). Introduction. In C.A. Martindale & D. Hopkins (Eds.), Horace Made New: Horatian Influences on British Writing from the Renaissance to the Twentieth Century (pp. 1-26). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martindale, C. A. (Ed.) (2000a). The Cambridge Companion to Virgil. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martindale, C. A. (2000b). Introduction: 'The Classic of all Europe' In C. A. Martindale (Ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Virgil (pp.1-18). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martindale, C. A. (2000c). Green Politics: The *Eclogues*. In C.A. Martindale (Ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Virgil (pp.107-124). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maurenbrecher, B. (Ed.) (1891-1893). *C. Sallusti Crispi, Historiarum reliquiae*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Mayer, R. (2005). Sleeping with the Enemy: Satire and Philosophy. In K. Freudenburg (Ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire (pp. 146-159). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, R.G. (1989). Friendship in the Satirists. In S.H. Braund (Ed.), Satire and Society in Ancient Rome (pp. 5-21). Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Mayer, R.G. (1994). Horace Epistles Book I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, R.G. (1995). Horace's *Moyen de Parvenir*. In S.J. Harrison (Ed.), *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration* (pp. 279-295). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mayhoff, C. (Ed.) (1967). *C. Plini Secvndi Natvralis Historiae*, Vol. II, Libri VII – XV. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Mazurek, T. (1997). Self-Parody and the Law in Horace's "Satires" 1.9. The Classical Journal, 93.1, 1-17.

- McGann, M.J.M. (1973). The Three Worlds of Horace's *Satires*. In C.D.N. Costa (Ed.), Horace (pp.59-93). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Meijer, F. (2017). *Via Appia*: Met Horatius langs de koningin der wegen. Amsterdam : Polak & van Gennep.
- Meyer, G. (1874). *Pomponii Porphyronis Commentarii in Q. Horatium Flaccum*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Michels, A.K. (1944). ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑ and the Satire of Horace. *Classical Philology*, 39.3, 173-177.
- Miller, J.F. (2009). Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moles, J. (2006). Poetry, Philosophy, Politics and Play: *Epistles* 1. In A.J. Woodman & D.C. Feeney (Eds.), *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace* (pp.141-157). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moles, J. (2007). Philosophy and Ethics. In S.J. Harrison (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace* (pp.165-180). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mols, S.T.A.M. (2006). Fragments of Wall Painting from 'Horace's Villa'. In B. Frischer, J. Crawford & M. De Simone (Eds.), *The Horace's Villa Project, 1997-2003, Vol. 1; Report on New Fieldwork and Research* (pp. 267-272). Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Mommsen, T. & Henzen, W. (1883). *Inscriptiones Latinae antiquissimae ad C. Caesaris mortem*. Digital edition at: http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/arachne/index.php?view%5blayout%5d=buch_item&searc...
- Mommsen, T., Dessau, H. & Hirschfeld, O. (Eds.) (1863 -). *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin: Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities.
- Morgan, L. (2005). Genres: Satire. In S.J. Harrison (Ed.), *A Companion to Latin Literature* (pp. 174-188). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Muecke, F. (1993). *Horace: Satires II*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips.
- Muecke, F. (2005). Rome's first "Satirists": Themes and Genre in Ennius and Lucilius. In K. Freudenburg (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire* (pp. 33 – 47). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muecke, F. (2007). Poetic Genres: The *Satires*. In S.J. Harrison (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace* (pp. 105-120). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Müller, L. (1882). *Q. Horati Flacci Carmina*: Oden und Epoden des Horaz. Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Buchhandlung.
- Münzer, F. (1942). S.v. "Tillius" In A.F. von Pauly, G. Wissowa, et al. (Eds.). (1894-1997). *Pauly's Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Band VI.A,1 (p.1037). Stuttgart: Metzler and Munich: Druckermüller.
- Musurillo, H.A. (1955). Horace's Journey to Brundisium: Fact or Fiction? *The Classical Weekly*, 48.12,159-162.
- Musurillo, H.A. (1964). Horace and the Bore. *The Character Dramaticus of Sat.1.9*. *The Classical Bulletin*, 40.5, 65-68.
- Mynors, R.A.B. (Ed.) (1969). *P. Vergili Maronis: Opera*. (OCT). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nadeau, Y. (2004). *Safe and Subsidized. Vergil and Horace Sing Augustus*. Brussels: Éditions Latomus.
- Naerebout, F.G. & Singor, H.W. (2004). *De Oudheid: Grieken en Romeinen in de context van de wereldgeschiedenis*. Amsterdam: Ambo.
- Nauta, R.R. (2006). Panegyric in Virgil's *Bucolics*. In M. Fantuzzi & T. Papanghelis (Eds.), *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral* (pp. 301-332). Leiden: Brill.
- Nelis, D.P. (2001). *Vergil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Leeds: Francis Cairns.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. (1984). *Horace's Epodes and History*. In A.J. Woodman & D.A. West (Eds.), *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus* (pp. 1-18). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. & Harrison S.J. (Eds.) (1995) *Collected Papers on Latin Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Nisbet, R.G.M. (1995). The Survivors: Old-Style Literary Men in the Triumviral Period. In R.G.M. Nisbet & S.J. Harrison (Eds.), *Collected Papers on Latin Literature* (pp. 390-413). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. & Hubbard, M. (2001). *A Commentary on Horace Odes, book I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. & Hubbard, M. (2004). *A Commentary on Horace Odes, book II*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. (2006). A Wine-Jar for Messalla: *Carmina* 3.21. In A.J. Woodman & D.C. Feeney (Eds.), *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace* (pp. 80-92). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. (2007). Orientations: Horace: Life and Chronology. In S.J. Harrison (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace* (pp. 7-21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. & Rudd, N. (2007). *A Commentary on Horace Odes, Book III*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oberhelman, S. & Armstrong, D. (1995). Satire as Poetry and the Impossibility of Metathesis in Horace's *Satires*. In D. Obbink (Ed.), *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace* (pp. 233-254). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Oliensis, E.S. (1991). Canidia, Canicula, and the Decorum of Horace's *Epodes*. *Arethusa*, 24, 107-138. Oliensis (1991) = Oliensis (1998, 68-90) = Oliensis (2009a).
- Oliensis, E. S. (1998). *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oliensis, E.S. (2007). Poetic Themes: Erotics and Gender. In S.J. Harrison (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace* (pp. 221-234). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oliensis, E.S. (2009a). Canidia, Canicula, and the Decorum of Horace's *Epodes*. In M. Lowrie (Ed.), *Horace: Odes and Epodes* (pp. 160-187). (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oliensis, E.S. (2009b). Fashioning Men: The Art of Self-Fashioning in the *Ars Poetica*. In K. Freudenburg (Ed.), *Horace: Satires and Epistles* (pp. 451-479). (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Page, T.A. (1962). *The Aeneid of Virgil, books VII-XII*. London: MacMillan.
- Palmer, A. (1885). *Q. Horati Flacci Sermones: The Satires of Horace*. London: MacMillan.
- Parker, A. R. (1986). *Comic Theory in the Satires of Horace*. Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Patterson, A.M. (1987). *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valéry*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Pauly von, A. F., & Wissowa G., et al., (Eds) (1894-1997). *Pauly's Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Stuttgart: Metzler and Munich: Druckenmüller.
- Pelling, C.B.R. (1996). "The Triumviral Period". In *The Cambridge Ancient History X*, 2nd ed. (pp. 1-69). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perutelli, A. (1995). *Bucolics*. In N.M. Horsfall (Ed.), *A Companion to the Study of Virgil* (pp. 27-62). Leiden: Brill.
- Plüss, T. (1904). *Das Jambenbuch des Horaz: Im Lichte der eigenen und unserer Zeit*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- P. Porfyrio (2012). *Pomponi Porfyriionis Commentum in Horatium Flaccum*. Nabu Press.
- Pouilloux, J., Kontoleon N.M. & Scherer A., et al. (1964). *Archiloque: Sept Exposés et Discussions, à Vandoeuvres-Genève, 26 août -- 3 septembre 1963. Entretiens sur L'Antiquité Classique, Tome X*. Geneva: Fondation Hardt.
- Putnam, M.C.J. (1986). *Artifices of Eternity. Horace's Fourth Book of Odes*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Putnam, M.C.J. (1995). Pastoral Satire. *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics, Third Series*, 3.2/3, 303-316.

- Putnam, M.C.J. (2006). *Poetic Interplay: Catullus and Horace*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Quinn, K. (1959). *The Catullan Revolution*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Quinn, K.P. (1963). *Latin Explorations: Critical Studies in Roman Literature*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Quinn, K.P. (1979). *Texts and Contexts: The Roman Writers and their Audience*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Quinn, K.P. (1982). The Poet and His Audience in the Augustan Age. In H. Temporini & W. Haase (Eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (pp. II.30.1, 75-180). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Raaflaub, K.A. & Toher, M. (Eds.) (1993). *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rackham, H. (1916). Notes on Horace. *The Classical Review*, 30, 223-224.
- Radermacher, L. (1935). *Sulcius acer et Caprius*. *Wiener Studien*, 53, 80-84.
- Reinhardt, U. & Sallman, K.G. (1974). *Musa locosa: Arbeiten über Humor und Witz, Komik und Komödie der Antike: Andreas Thierfelder zum siebzigsten Geburtstag am 15. Juni 1973*. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Reitzenstein, R. (1925). Das Römische in Cicero und Horaz. *Neue Wege zur Antike II; Altphilologischer Ferienkurs Göttingen vom 1. bis 4. Juli 1925* (pp. 3-41). Leipzig: Teubner.
- Reynolds, L.D. (Ed.) (1991). *C. Sallvsti Crispi, Catilina, Iugvrtha, Historiarvm Fragmenta Selecta, Appendix Sallvstiana*. (OCT). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Richlin, A. (1992). *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, D.H., Dunn, F.M. & Fowler, D.P. (Eds.) (1997). *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rooy van, C.A. (1966). *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory*. Leiden: Brill.
- Rooy van, C.A. (1971). Arrangement and Structure of Satires in Horace, *Sermones*, Book I: Satire 7 as Related to Satires 10 and 8. *Acta Classica*, 14, 67-90.
- Rooy van, C.A. (1972). Arrangement and Structure of Satires in Horace, *Sermones*, Book I: Satires 9 and 10. *Acta Classica*, 15, 37-52.
- Rooy van, C.A. (1973). 'Imitatio' of Vergil, *Eclogues* in Horace, *Satires* Book 1. *Acta Classica*, 16, 69-88.
- Rosati, G. (1999). Form in Motion: Weaving the Text in the *Metamorphoses*. In S. Hinds, A. Barchiesi, & P. R. Hardie (Eds.), *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on Ovid's Metamorphoses and its Reception* (pp. 240-253). (Cambridge Philological Society Suppl. 23). Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.
- Rosati, G. (2002). Narrative Techniques and Narrative Structures in the *Metamorphoses*. In B.W. Boyd (Ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ovid* (pp. 271-304). Leiden: Brill.
- Ross Taylor, L. (1925). Horace's Equestrian Career. *The American Journal of Philology*, 46.2, 161-170.
- Rostagni, A. (Ed.) (1944). *Svetonio de Poetis e biografi minori*. Turin: Chiantore.
- Rudd, N. (1955a). Had Horace Been Criticized? A Study of Serm., I, 4. *The American Journal of Philology*, 76.2, 165-175.
- Rudd, N. (1955b). The Poet's Defence (1). *The Classical Quarterly*, 2, Vol. 5.3/4, 142-148.
- Rudd, N. (1956). Horace and Fannius. A Discussion of Two Passages in Horace, "Serm." 1.4. *Hermathena*, 87, 49-60.
- Rudd, N. (1966). *The Satires of Horace. A Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rudd, N. (Ed.) (1976). *Lines of Enquiry: Studies in Latin Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rudd, N. (Ed.) (1993a). *Horace 2000: A Celebration: Essays for the Bimillennium*. London: Duckworth.

- Rudd, N. (1993b). Horace as a Moralist. In N. Rudd (Ed.), *Horace 2000: A Celebration: Essays for the Bimillennium* (pp. 64-88). London: Duckworth.
- Rudd, N. (2007 = 1966). *The Satires of Horace*. London: Duckworth, Bristol Classical Press.
- Rudd, W.J.N. (1957). *Libertas and facetus: With Special Reference to Horace Serm.1,4 and 1,10*. *Mnemosyne*, 10.4, 319-336.
- Ruikes sma, P.W. (1966). *Samenzweringen en intriges tegen Octavianus Augustus Princeps*. Dissertation Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. Maastricht: "Ernest van Aelst."
- Rushton Fairclough, H. (Ed.) (1999). *Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica* (Loeb). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Russell, D.A. (Ed.) (2001). *Quintilian: The Orator's Education, books 6 – 8* (Loeb). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sallmann, K. (1974). Die seltsame Reise nach Brundisium. Aufbau und Deutung der Horazsatire 1,5. In U. Reinhardt & K. Sallmann (Eds.), *Musa locosa: Arbeiten über Humor und Witz Komik und Komödie der Antike* (pp. 179-206). Hildesheim: Olms.
- Schäfer, C. (2006). *Kleopatra*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Schlegel, C. M. (2000). Horace and his Fathers: Satires 1.4 and 1.6. *The American Journal of Philology*, 121.1, 93-119.
- Schlegel, C. M. (2005). *Satire and the Threat of Speech: Horace's Satires, Book 1*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Schlegel, C. M. (2010). Horace and the Satirist's Mask: Shadowboxing with Lucilius. In G. Davis (Ed.), *A Companion to Horace* (pp. 253-270). Chichester, U.K., & Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Schmidt, P.L. (1969). Kytheris. In K. Ziegler & W. Sontheimer (Eds.), *Der Kleine Pauly, Lexikon der Antike, Vol.III* (p. 423). Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag.
- Schmidt, P.L. (1975a). Varius. In K. Ziegler & W. Sontheimer (Eds.), *Der Kleine Pauly, Lexikon der Antike, Vol.V* (pp. 1130-1131). Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag.
- Schmidt, P.L. (1975b). P. Terrentius Varro Atacinus. In K. Ziegler & W. Sontheimer (Eds.), *Der Kleine Pauly, Lexikon der Antike, Vol.V* (p. 1140). Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag.
- Schrijvers, P.H. (1973). Comment Terminer une Ode? *Mnemosyne*, 26.2, 140-159.
- Schrijvers, P.H. (2003). *Horatius: Verzamelde Gedichten*. Groningen: Historische Uitgeverij.
- Schuster, M. (Ed.) (1914). *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Scullard, H.H. (1967). *The Etruscan Cities and Rome*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (1982). *Profile of Horace*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (Ed.) (1987). *M. Tulli Ciceronis, Epistulae ad Atticum, Vol. II*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Seager, R. (1993). Horace and Augustus: Poetry and Policy. In N. Rudd (Ed.), *Horace 2000: A Celebration: Essays for the Bimillennium* (pp. 23-40). London: Duckworth.
- Simpson, C.J. (1996). Two Small Thoughts on 'Cilnius Maecenas'. *Arachnion* 2.1 At: <http://www.cisi.unito.it/arachne/num4/simpson.html>
- Smith, B.H. (1968). *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Sullivan, J.P. (Ed.) (1962/63) *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Vol. II: Satire*. London: Routledge & Keagan Paul.
- Syme, R (2002). *The Roman Revolution*. (first ed.1939). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Talbert, R.J.A. (Ed.) (2000). *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tarrant, R.J. (2000). Poetry and Power: Virgil's Poetry in Contemporary Context. In C.A. Martindale (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (pp.169-187). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Temporini, H. & Haase, W. (Eds.) (1972 -). *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Thilo, G. (Ed.) (1887). *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii Bucolica et Georgica Commentarii*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Thomas, R.F. (1982). Catullus and the Polemics of Poetic Reference (Poem 64.1-18). *The American Journal of Philology*, 103.2, 144-164.
- Thomas, R.F. (1986). Virgil's Georgics and the Art of Reference. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 90, 171-198.
- Toher, H. (2005). Tillius and Horace. *The Classical Quarterly*, 55.1, 183-189.
- Treggiari, S. (1969). *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Tupet, A-M. (2009). *La Magie dans la Poésie Latine: Des Origines à la Fin du Règne d'Auguste*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Turpin, W. (2009). The Epicurean Parasite: Horace, *Satires* 1.1-3. In K. Freudenburg (Ed.), *Horace: Satires and Epistles* (pp.122-137). (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Uden, J. (2007). Impersonating Priapus. *The American Journal of Philology*, 128.1, 1-26.
- Uden, J. (2010). The Vanishing Gardens of Priapus. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 105, 189-219.
- Ullman, B.L. (1915). Horace, Catullus and Tigellius. *Classical Philology*, 10.3, 270-296.
- Ullman, B.L. (1917). Horace on the Nature of Satire. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 48, 111-132.
- Vooijes, C.J. & Krevelen, van D.A. (1934-1941). *Lexicon Philodemeum*, 2 Vols. Purmerend: Muuses, Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (2005). *Augustan Rome*. London: Bristol Classical Press, Duckworth.
- Warmington, E.H. (1967). Lucilius. In E.H. Warmington (Ed.), *Remains of Old Latin III* (Loeb). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Watson, L.C. (2003). *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Watson, L.C. (2007). Poetic Genres: The *Epodes*: Horace's Archilochus? In S.J. Harrison (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace* (pp. 93-104). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weeda, L. (2010). *The Augustan Poets: Their Master's Voices? A Study of the Political Views of Vergilius, Horatius and Propertius*. Dissertation at Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. Dissertation at: (<http://repository.uibn.ru.nl/handle/2066/85997>)
- Weeda, L. & van der Poel, M.G.M. (2014). Vergil and the Batavians (*Aeneid* 8.727). *Mnemosyne*, 67.4.588-612.
- Weeda, L. (2015). Vergil's Political Commentary in the *Eclogues*, *Georgics* and *Aeneid*. Warsaw/Berlin: De Gruyter Open.
- Weeda, L. & van der Poel, M.G.M. (2016). Vergil and Gallus: Political Commentary in the Tenth *Eclogue*. *Invigilata Lucernis*, 38, 187-210.
- Weeda, L. (in progress). Horace's Political Commentary in the Thirties: *Sermones* book 2 and *Epodi*.
- Welch, T.S. (2001). *Est locus uni cuique suus*: City and Status in Horace's *Satires* 1.8 and 1.9. *Classical Antiquity*, 20.1, 165-192.
- West, M.L. (Ed.) (1971). *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*, Vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- West, M.L. (1974). *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Wheeler, S. M. (2002). Ovid's Metamorphoses and Universal History. In D.S. Levene and D. P. Nelis (Eds.), *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography* (pp. 163-189). (Mnemosyne Supplement 224). Leiden: Brill.
- White, P. (1978). Amicitia and the Profession of Poetry in Early Imperial Rome. *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 68, 74-92.

- White, P. (1982). Positions for Poets in Early Imperial Rome. In B.K. Gold (Ed.), *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* (pp. 50-66). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- White, P. (1993). *Promised Verse. Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- White, P. (2005). Poets in the New Milieu: Realigning. In K. Galinsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to The Age of Augustus* (pp. 321-339). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, P. (2007). Poetic Themes: Friendship, Patronage and Horatian Sociopoetics. In S.J. Harrison (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace* (pp. 195-206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wickham, E.C. (1957). *Q. Horati Flacci, Opera*. (OCT). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wili, W. (1965). *Horaz und die augusteische Kultur*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Wilke, C. (1914). *Philodemi De Ira liber*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Wilkinson, L.P. (1966). Virgil and the Evictions. *Hermes*, 94.3, 320-324.
- Wilkinson, L.P. (1997). *The Georgics of Virgil: A Critical Survey*. (first ed. 1969, Cambridge University Press). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Williams, G. (1968). *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Williams, G. (1993). Did Maecenas “Fall from Favor”? Augustan Literary Patronage. In K.A. Raaflaub & M. Toher (Eds.), *Between Republic and Empire. Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate* (pp. 258-275). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Williams, G. (1995). *Libertino Patre Natus: True or False?* In S.J. Harrison (Ed.), *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration* (pp. 296-313). Oxford: Clarendon Press. Reprinted in K. Freudenburg (Ed.) (2009). *Horace: Satires and Epistles* (pp. 138-155). (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Winterbottom, M. (Ed.) (1970). *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae libri duodecim*. (OCT). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wiseman, T.P. (1971). *New Men in the Roman Senate, 139 B.C. – A.D.14*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wiseman, T.P. (1988). *Catullus and his World: A Reappraisal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiseman, T.P. (2004). *The Myths of Rome*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Wistrand, E. (1958). Horace’s Ninth Epode and its Historical Background. *Göteborg: Göteborg Universitets Årsskrift*, vol. 64:9.
- Wistrand, E. (1964). Archilochus and Horace. In J. Pouilloux, N.M. Kontoleon & A. Scherer et al., *Archiloque: Sept Exposés et Discussions, à Vandoeuvres-Genève, 26 août -- 3 septembre 1963. Entretiens sur l’antiquité classique, Tome X* (pp. 257-287). Geneva: Fondation Hardt.
- Woodman A.J. & Feeney, D.C. (Eds.) (2006). *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Woodman, A.J. & West, D.A. (Eds.) (1984). *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yavetz, Z. (1993). The Personality of Augustus: Reflections on Syme’s *Roman Revolution*. In K.A. Raaflaub & M. Toher (Eds.), *Between Republic and Empire. Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate* (pp. 21-41). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Yona, S. (2015). Some Epicurean Aspects of Horace’s Upbringing in *Satires* 1.4. *Classical Philology*, 110.3, 227-251.
- Zanker, P. (2010). *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. (original title *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder*. (1987). Munich: Beck. translated by A. Shapiro). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

- Zetzel, J.E.G. (1980). Horace's *Liber Sermonum*: The Structure of Ambiguity. *Arethusa*, 13, 59-77.
Reprinted as: Zetzel, J.E.G. & Guttman, D.M.E. (2009). In K. Freudenburg (Ed.), *Horace: Satires and Epistles* (pp.17-41). (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zetzel, J.E.G. (2006). Dreaming about Quirinus: Horace's *Satires* and the Development of Augustan Poetry. In A.J. Woodman & D.C. Feeney (Eds.), *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace* (pp. 38-52). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ziegler, K. & Sontheimer, W. (Eds.) (1964-1975). *Der Kleine Pauly, Lexikon der Antike*, Vols. I-V. Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag.

Index

- Actium 169
- Aemilius Paullus Lepidus 150, 243
- Albius 117
- Amicitia 23, 26, 31, 89, 162, 238
- amicitia and patronage 26, 162
 - clientela 26
 - general
 - in HOR.Carm.2.6.24 23
 - in HOR.Carm.3.8.13 23
 - in HOR.Ep.1.9.5 23
 - in HOR.S.1.10.85-87 23
- Horace and Maecenas 23
- in HOR.Carm.1.1.1-2 24, 27
 - in HOR.Carm.1.20.1-5 27
 - in HOR.Carm.3.16.29-30 27
 - in HOR.Carm.3.29.25-26, 32-34 27
 - in HOR.Carm.4.11.18-20 28
 - in HOR.S.1.5.40-42 28
 - in HOR.S.1.6.45-64 22
 - in HOR.S.1.6.119-121 27
 - in SUET.Vita Horati.2.2 28
- Appius Claudius Pulcher 145
- censor, 50 B.C., removed all sons of freedman from Senate 145
- Aristius Fuscus 125, 190, 199
- friend in S.01.10, Carm.01.22, Ep.01.10 201
 - meeting Horace and the fellow in S.01.09 199
 - symbolizes in S.01.09 men who take exception to exclusive character of circle around Maecenas 202
- Audiences of the poet
- classification of Gold 43
 - Horace recites his writings within his circle of friends 109, 111
 - Horace's preferred audience 99
 - performance on stage
 - Horace dismissive of performance on stage 100
 - in HOR.Ars.212-213 100
 - in HOR.Ep.1.19.41-44 100
 - in HOR.Ep.2.1.156-218 100
 - in HOR.S.1.10.39 and 73-74 99
- Aufidius Luscus
- alludes in S.01.05.034-036 to Venusia 131
 - chief official of Fundi in S.01.05.034 131
- Aufidus
- river near Venusia 52, 60
 - in S.01.01.058, Carm.03.30.10, Carm.04.09.02, Carm.04.14.25 52
- Baius 117
- Bion of Borysthenes 154, 244
- Brutus 2, 170, 204
- Horace's past with Brutus is finished 170, 204
 - in S.01.07 170
 - in S.01.09 204
- Caelius and Birrus
- criminals in S.01.04, probably supporters of Sextus Pompey 110
- Callimachus 37, 91
- Calvus 208, 211, 250
- Canidia 179
- in Epod.17 182
 - in S.01.08, S.02.01, S.02.08, Epod.3, 5, 17 182
- Carmen deductum 49
- Carrhae 167
- Cato, P. Valerius 205, 250
- in S.01.10fr. 205, 250
- Catullus 24, 37, 208, 211, 212, 250, 251
- and Horace 37, 212, 251
 - and Maecenas 37, 212, 251
- Chrysippus 89, 238
- Civil wars
- from 88 B.C. - 30 B.C. 169
 - public order affected, collapse of economy, food supply endangered 169
- Cleopatra
- alliance with Marc Antony in S.01.07 167
 - alliance with Marc Antony in S.01.08 188
 - functional model for Dido 4
 - many of the Roman upper classes captivated by Cleopatra and Egyptian culture 182
 - political and territorial aspirations 168
- Cocceius Nerva 133, 139
- member of the party in S.01.05 129
- Cotyto 183
- deity of Thracian origin related to Artemis-Bendis 183
- Crispinus 56, 88, 89, 98, 108, 110, 238, 239
- in S.01.01, 01.03, 01.04 49, 88, 98, 108, 239
- Cupiennius 71
- an admirer of licentious matrons in S.01.02 64
- Cytheris 65, 227
- Dating of poems
- Horace
 - Carmina
 - before 30 B.C. 221

- Epodi
38-30 B.C. 6, 122, 221
- Sermones
S.01 1, 32, 33, 123, 263
S.02 32, 122
- Virgil
Eclogae
42-35 B.C. 7, 125, 263
Ecl.10 58
- Demetrius
girls' tutor in S.01.10 230, 254
- Donatus
evidence re. land commission unreliable 87, 264
- Ennius 34
- Esquiline
old burial ground for the poor, turned into gardens by Maecenas 176, 178
- Fabius
in S.01.01 48
in S.01.02 70
Pompeian and Stoic 48
- Fannius 49, 99, 108, 110, 212
in S.01.04, 01.10 49, 99, 108, 228
- Fannius, C.
adherent of Sextus Pompey 108, 212
- Freedom of speech, *libertas* 93, 95
parrhesia 93, 239
parrhesia, in public and private domain 95, 240
- Fufidius, a miserly moneylender 62, 71
- Functional frame 11
definition of functional model 3, 12
functional model 12
opening PIND.Ol.2 for HOR.Carm.01.12 13
functional objective 12
- Horace
functional reference
in S.01.01 53, 59, 60, 232, 233
in S.01.02 66, 71, 118, 235
in S.01.03 76, 77, 80, 83, 85, 88, 236, 237, 238
in S.01.04 40, 93, 102, 109, 112, 115, 117, 118, 119, 240
in S.01.05 135, 136
in S.01.06 155, 156, 162, 244
in S.01.07 171, 172, 246
in S.01.08 187, 246, 247
persona 42
use of first-person persona for engagement in fictitious events 17, 127, 191, 197
in Epod.17 180
use of persona as functional reference 15, 184
risk of studying text from functional point of view 4
single reference and functional frame 12
study of S.01 within the functional frame 34
- Fundanius, Gaius 218, 252
- Furius Bibaculus 206, 208, 216, 250, 252
in S.01.10fr. 206
is likely the *turgidus Alpinus* in S.01.10.36 216, 252
- Gallus, C. Cornelius 24
in Ecl.09 mediates between Varus and family of Virgil? 87, 264
- Gifts 29
- Horace
Sabine estate 30
Independence of Horace 41
- Heliodorus
allusion to *Thaumata Italica* in S.01.05 128
- Hermogenes 62, 85, 210, 228, 234, 238, 251
defection to Sextus Pompey 211, 228, 251
differs from Tigellius
in S.01.03.129, S.01.04.072, S.01.09.25, S.01.10 62, 85, 210, 228, 234, 238, 251
girls' tutor in S.01.10 230, 254
- Horace
"father" in S.01.06 156, 244
biography 17, 152
his own social mobility, associate of Maecenas 152, 243
joined Brutus in 44/43 B.C. 152, 167, 243, 245
left Venusia and went to Rome for his education 19, 119, 155, 244
son of a freedman 152, 153, 244
tribune in Brutus' army 152
was educated by Orbilius 19, 119, 155, 244
friendship for Maecenas. *See Amicitia*
his main objective writing S.01 5, 48, 254
life 14
autobiography as functional reference 16, 121, 156, 244
the work by Horace's "father" for his education 118, 121, 155, 240, 244
autobiography in his poetry 6, 14
introduction to Maecenas in S.01.06 152, 153, 243
S.01.05, S.01.07, S.01.09 are not autobiography 126, 170, 191, 204, 249

- S.01.06.045-048 is part of Horace's autobiography 152
- his arguments for lack of interest in holding political office 145, 159, 160, 165
- Philippi with Brutus 20, 33, 46
- prefers a free and simple life in the city 161
- scriba 22
- social position 25
- in S.02.07.53-54 25
- was perhaps of Sabellian origin 194
- list of critical poems 30
- Epodi contain seven poems critical of contemporary socio-political issues 36, 122
- S.02 contains two poems critical of contemporary socio-political issues 122
- moral views
- commentary on sexual scandals in Roman high society in S.01.02.047-072 64, 235
- concerned about erosion of moral standards 57
- his use of the notion of parrhesia (libertas) in S.01.04 121
- inspiration for moral guidance *mos maiorum* in S.01.01 and S.01.04 40, 95, 112, 119, 241
- man must live in harmony with nature 52
- Marsaeus
- lover of mime actress 64
- reference to Marc Antony and Cytheris 65, 118, 235
- moral guidance in the concern for his friends is based on parrhesia and Roman values 95, 112, 116, 239, 240
- moral vices as mentioned in S.01.04
- envy and extreme ambition (S.01.01) 117, 240
- immoderation in sexual relationships (S.01.02) 117, 240
- philosophy not sole moral guide 40, 50, 88, 95, 112, 119, 241
- preferred ways of sexual gratification in S.01.02.028-134 63, 235
- rejects pursuit of ambition for high office by men who seek their own interests 146
- Roman values are also Horace's moral guides 40, 50, 88, 95, 112, 119, 232, 241, 255
- significance of individual worth for high office 146
- philosophical beliefs
- Epicureanism
- adheres to Epicureanism 14, 68
- in S.01.02 64, 68, 69, 88
- in S.01.03 82, 88, 237, 239
- in S.01.03.078 81, 164, 237
- in S.01.04 106, 107, 116, 119
- in S.01.06 88
- Stoicism
- does not adhere to Stoicism 48, 50, 80, 82, 84, 88, 97, 107, 237, 238, 239
- poetic orientation
- Horace and Greek iambus 36, 91, 212
- Horace does not intend to be writer of satire 4, 98, 124, 158, 221, 253
- Horace never addresses in S.01 wrong-doers directly 4
- Horace's reflections on style part of discussion with Maecenas about political orientation 91
- intends to deliver his commentary in several genres 77, 92, 209, 221, 236, 239, 251, 253
- Lucilius 34, 40
- critical of Lucilius 94, 95, 96, 97, 207, 213, 222, 223, 225, 226, 250, 251, 253
- Horace saw traditional invective as counterproductive getting political views across 40, 42, 46, 95, 98, 239
- last lines of S.01.08 are not aimed at Lucilius 187
- Lucilius as Horace's predecessor 39, 124, 221, 253
- satire
- Horace places in S.01.04.001-002 satire within tradition of Old Attic Comedy 91, 92, 239
- search for poetic orientation was not the focus of S.01 33
- standards of good poetry 91, 97, 239
- adjusts his style to his audience 98
- brevitas, varietas, libertas* 97, 209, 221, 251, 253, 255
- Epicurean maxims result in unity of *ingenium, ars, res and verba*, and rejection of *metathesis* 106
- libertas* 92, 239
- linguistic purity 221, 253
- rejects in S.01.04 anticompositional style of Atticists 97, 107

- rejects mixing of Greek and Latin in poetry and oratory 213, 251
- right content (*res*) and style(*verba*) 105
- right word-order, rejects metathesis 105, 107, 209, 217, 240, 251, 252, 255
- someone who lacks *ingenium* and *ars* cannot be a true poet 105
- political commentary 8, 31, 231
 - did not write propaganda for Octavian 75
 - distinguishes four groups 34, 101
 - friends, elite, *nouveau riche*, populace 34, 101, 240
 - distinguishes four groups in S.01.01-S.01.06 51, 101, 240
 - gentleman commentator 76, 91, 113, 133, 165
 - rejects role of comic *scurra* 78, 113, 133, 236
 - scholarly views 35
- political views 5
 - in *Carmina*
 - critical of luxurious building by new rich in *Carm.*02.15, 02.18, 03.24 73
 - summary of *Carmina* before 30 B.C. 259
 - in *Epodi* 6
 - Epod.*17 183, 247
 - summary 259
- in S.01
 - condemnation of *avaritia*, *ambitio*, *luxuria* of the political elite and new rich in S.01.01-S.01.04 109
 - condemnation of expropriations 61, 234
 - critical of *nouveau riche* in each *sermo* of S.01, except in S.01.08 5, 54, 233
 - interrelation between Horace's political views and his philosophical beliefs 88, 239
 - libertas*, freedom of speech 93, 95, 240
 - preservation of traditional social structures 88
 - S.01.01 44, 51, 53, 57, 59, 60, 61, 109, 152, 232, 233, 234, 243, 257
 - S.01.02 70, 72, 234, 235, 236, 257
 - S.01.03 80, 83, 84, 236, 237, 238, 257
 - S.01.04 93, 94, 97, 101, 109, 110, 112, 118, 122, 239, 240, 257
 - S.01.05 132, 136, 241
 - S.01.06 141, 143, 144, 146, 149, 150, 151, 152, 155, 242, 243, 244, 257
 - S.01.07 166, 167, 168, 171, 172, 175, 176, 189, 190, 245, 246, 248, 257
 - S.01.08 166, 182, 183, 188, 189, 190, 245, 246, 247, 248, 257
 - S.01.09 204, 248
 - S.01.10 208, 212, 214, 217, 225, 226, 227, 250, 251, 253, 254, 257
- in S.02 6
 - summary 259
- relationship with Octavian 61
 - critical of Octavian 61
- Sabine estate 29
 - gift of estate and independence 41
 - in *Carm.*01.20 29, 161
 - in *Carm.*02.18 29, 161
 - in *Carm.*03.08 29, 161
 - in *Ep.*01.14 29, 161
 - in S.02.06 29, 161
- Sermones
 - name of *Sermones* 32
 - form of poetic conversation 42
 - name most appropriate to a civilized discussion 42
- S.01
 - "father" 118, 121, 240
 - audience of S.01 acc. to the classification of Gold 43
 - autobiography 6
 - credentials for Maecenas 2, 5, 14, 42, 45, 46, 73, 81, 88, 93, 103, 119, 123, 131, 133, 140, 153, 158, 169, 170, 194, 196, 212, 222, 237, 240, 244, 249, 254, 255, 256
 - first book of *Sermones* is not satiric poetry 221, 253
 - frank criticism among friends, *parrhesia* 116
 - general introduction 32
 - introduction to discussion of individual poems 46
 - new rich 54, 55, 60, 204
 - political statements are meant to show political reliability 73, 88, 103, 240, 255
 - preparatory for future role 1, 33, 35, 46, 145, 222
 - presentation 125, 126, 139, 241, 242, 257
 - S.01 263, 266, 267
 - S.01.01 36, 44, 45, 56, 57, 58, 109, 117, 152, 232, 240
 - S.01.02 70, 73, 117, 234, 240
 - S.01.03 73, 75, 77, 84, 89, 90, 112, 122, 236, 238, 239

- S.01.04 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99,
101, 103, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 111,
112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 120, 121, 122, 123,
124, 125, 239, 240, 241, 255
- S.01.05 126, 127, 128, 130, 131, 134, 136,
137, 138, 139, 140, 241, 269, 270
- S.01.06 45, 119, 141, 142, 143, 144, 147,
148, 149, 150, 152, 155, 156, 157, 158,
159, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 242,
243, 244, 245
- S.01.07 166, 167, 170, 171, 172, 174, 175,
189, 245
- S.01.08 166, 176, 177, 179, 181, 182, 183,
184, 186, 187, 189, 246, 247
- S.01.09 190, 191, 192, 193, 196, 197, 199,
200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 248, 249, 250
- S.01.10 37, 103, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211,
212, 213, 217, 218, 221, 222, 223, 225, 226,
227, 229, 230, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254
- S.01.10fr. 206, 250
speaking through persona 14, 42, 45
style 255
use of functional reference in S.01 46
- iambic poetry 36, 212
Ancient Greek iambus 36, 212
- Independence of the poets 30, 166, 202, 245
propaganda by members of the circle around
Maecenas 202
- INDEX LOCORUM
- APPIAN
Bellum civile
App.BC.01.228-229 195
App.BC.05.132 178
- ARCHILOCHUS
fragment 5 21
- CASSIUS DIO
Roman History.49.16.2 189
Roman History.49.43.1 178
Roman History.49.43.5 178
- CICERO
Att.01.16.15 24
Att.10.10.5 66
Fam.07.24.01 210
Fam.12.16.03 117
Fam.13.09.02 171
Phil.02.24.58 66
Phil.02.25.61 66
Phil.02.25.62 67
Phil.02.26-27 67
Phil.02.27.66 67
- Phil.02.27.67 67
Phil.02.28.69 67
Sest.93 202
- DONATUS
Commentarii Vergiliani (in Eclogas) 13 86
- HORACE
Ars Poetica
Ars.079 37
Ars.212-213 100, 227
- Carmen Saeculare
Saec. 25
- Carmina
Carm.01.01.01-02 24, 27
Carm.01.03.01-08 22
Carm.01.07 260
Carm.01.12 13
Carm.01.14 260
Carm.01.17 263
Carm.01.20 29, 161
Carm.01.20.01-05 27
Carm.01.24 22
Carm.01.35 260
Carm.01.37 260
Carm.01.38 260
Carm.02.01 218
Carm.02.06.24 23
Carm.02.07 170
Carm.02.07.01-02 20
Carm.02.07.09-12 21
Carm.02.09 29
Carm.02.13 15
Carm.02.15 72, 152, 202, 258
Carm.02.17.03-04 27
Carm.02.18 29, 54, 72, 117, 152, 161, 202,
258
Carm.02.18.20-26 72, 117
Carm.03.01 54
Carm.03.01.25-26 73
Carm.03.08 15, 29, 161
Carm.03.08.13 23
Carm.03.16.29-30 27
Carm.03.24 73
Carm.03.29.25-26 27
Carm.03.29.32-34 27
Carm.03.30.10 52
Carm.04.09.02 52
Carm.04.11.18-20 28
Carm.04.14.25 52
- Epistulae
Ep.01 30

- Ep.01.09.05 23
 Ep.01.10.11 135
 Ep.01.14 29, 161
 Ep.01.18.001-009 94
 Ep.01.19 100, 218
 Ep.01.19.23-25 37
 Ep.01.19.41-44 100, 227
 Ep.01.20.17-18 227
 Ep.01.20.19-22 19
 Ep.01.20.24 19
 Ep.02.01 100
 Ep.02.01.069-071 20, 156, 206
 Ep.02.01.123 135
 Ep.02.01.156-218 100
 Ep.02.01.214 100, 218
 Ep.02.01.245-250 22
 Ep.02.02.041-043 20
 Ep.02.02.047-049 21
 Ep.02.02.051-052 26
 Ep.02.02.055-057 26
 Ep.02.02.055-065 39
- Epodi
- Epod.01 262
 Epod.02 261
 Epod.03 258
 Epod.04 261
 Epod.05 258
 Epod.05.001-010 182
 Epod.06.11-14 37
 Epod.07 260
 Epod.08 262
 Epod.12 262
 Epod.13 260
 Epod.14.09-10 20
 Epod.17 182, 188, 258
 Epod.17.15-18 184
 Epod.17.27-52 184
 Epod.17.47-48 184
 Epod.17.53-81 184, 186
 Epod.17.56-59 183
 Epod.17.58 184
 Epod.17.81 184
- Sermones
- S.01.01 47, 257, 258
 S.01.01.001-022 47
 S.01.01.015-022 95, 255
 S.01.01.023-027 78
 S.01.01.023-107 50
 S.01.01.047 135
 S.01.01.054-058 60
 S.01.01.074 135
 S.01.01.108-121 55
 S.01.01.119 39
 S.01.01.120 39, 49
 S.01.02 61, 152, 256, 257, 258
 S.01.02.001-003 211
 S.01.02.001-011 61
 S.01.02.012-027 62
 S.01.02.027 113
 S.01.02.028-134 63
 S.01.02.055-059 118
 S.01.02.111-134 88
 S.01.03 73, 255, 256, 257, 261
 S.01.03.001-013 211
 S.01.03.001-024 73
 S.01.03.003-004 61
 S.01.03.019-020 155
 S.01.03.025-075 76, 112
 S.01.03.029-034 113, 222
 S.01.03.031-032 166
 S.01.03.038-048 89
 S.01.03.052-053 1
 S.01.03.076-098 80
 S.01.03.078 164
 S.01.03.096-098 48, 88
 S.01.03.099-124 82, 119
 S.01.03.124-128 48
 S.01.03.124-142 84
 S.01.03.128-133 61
 S.01.03.139-140 1, 170, 256
 S.01.04 90, 255, 258, 259, 261, 262
 S.01.04.001-002 226
 S.01.04.001-005 207, 209
 S.01.04.001-013 207
 S.01.04.001-062 5, 91
 S.01.04.003-005 221
 S.01.04.005 224, 226
 S.01.04.006-007 226
 S.01.04.006-013 223, 224
 S.01.04.007-008 207
 S.01.04.008 214, 219
 S.01.04.009-010 193
 S.01.04.017-018 124
 S.01.04.021 228
 S.01.04.022-023 45
 S.01.04.028 117
 S.01.04.038-062 209
 S.01.04.039-044 44
 S.01.04.041-042 44
 S.01.04.056-062 44

- S.01.04.059-062 217
S.01.04.063-143 107
S.01.04.071-074 99
S.01.04.073-074 163
S.01.04.078-085 40
S.01.04.081-085 94, 95
S.01.04.089 95
S.01.04.090 95, 225
S.01.04.091-093 103
S.01.04.092 63
S.01.04.093-100 215
S.01.04.093-103 95
S.01.04.103 257
S.01.04.103-133 155
S.01.04.105-129 19
S.01.04.115-119 95
S.01.04.129 155
S.01.04.130-131 155
S.01.04.132-133 1
S.01.04.133-137 25
S.01.05 16, 126, 255, 257, 263
S.01.05.001 190
S.01.05.001-076 128
S.01.05.027-029 139
S.01.05.027-033 137
S.01.05.034-036 140, 190, 201
S.01.05.039-044 1, 22, 219
S.01.05.040 193
S.01.05.040-042 28
S.01.05.042 165
S.01.05.048-049 22
S.01.05.051-070 190
S.01.05.077-078 19
S.01.05.077-095 134
S.01.05.089-091 195
S.01.05.096-104 136
S.01.05.097-103 131
S.01.06 140, 255, 257, 258, 261
S.01.06.001 45
S.01.06.001-044 140
S.01.06.005-008 196
S.01.06.006 6, 18
S.01.06.017-018 160
S.01.06.020-022 160
S.01.06.022 165
S.01.06.045 6
S.01.06.045-046 18, 133
S.01.06.045-064 22
S.01.06.045-084 151
S.01.06.046 6
S.01.06.048 20, 142
S.01.06.051-052 143, 196
S.01.06.054-055 22, 165
S.01.06.055 193, 219
S.01.06.056-057 256
S.01.06.063-064 143
S.01.06.069-071 244
S.01.06.071-075 18, 53, 60
S.01.06.071-078 136
S.01.06.076-078 19
S.01.06.076-080 206
S.01.06.078-080 124
S.01.06.085-131 158
S.01.06.097-111 143
S.01.06.107 148
S.01.06.111-128 88
S.01.06.119-121 27
S.01.06.122-123 190, 218
S.01.06.128-129 190
S.01.07 169, 256, 258
S.01.07.01-21 169
S.01.07.01-35 166
S.01.07.22 187
S.01.07.22-35 173
S.01.07.33-35 187
S.01.08 176, 257, 258
S.01.08.01-50 176
S.01.09 190, 256, 263
S.01.09.01-60 190
S.01.09.23 219
S.01.09.29-34 16, 135
S.01.09.44-45 154
S.01.09.48-53 1, 79
S.01.09.51-70 201
S.01.09.60-74 190
S.01.09.60-78 199
S.01.09.72-73 115
S.01.10 91, 204, 255, 259, 262
S.01.10.01-71 204
S.01.10.01fr. 45
S.01.10.01fr.-08fr. 205
S.01.10.09-10 97
S.01.10.17-19 62
S.01.10.39 99
S.01.10.44-45 22, 266
S.01.10.46-49 77, 256
S.01.10.48-49 39
S.01.10.56-71 96
S.01.10.67-71 95
S.01.10.72-92 227

- S.01.10.73-74 99
 S.01.10.81 22
 S.01.10.81-88 163
 S.01.10.81-90 1, 89, 125
 S.01.10.85-87 23
 S.01.10fr. 205
 S.02 122
 S.02.01 262
 S.02.02 261
 S.02.02.017 135
 S.02.03 261
 S.02.05 263
 S.02.05.041 216
 S.02.06 29, 161, 260, 263
 S.02.06.001 165
 S.02.07 261
 S.02.07.053-054 25
 S.02.08 261
 S.02.08.18 55
- IUVENALIS
- JUV.5.3 133
- LUCILIUS
- LUCIL.744 63
- MARTIAL
- Epigrammata
- MART.11.20 262
- OVID
- Metamorphoses
- Met.8.350 3
- Tristia
- Tr.02.421-422 220
- Tr.02.439-440 220
- PINDAR
- Odes
- Ol.02 13
- PLINY
- Naturalis Historia
- Nat.07.178 189
- Nat.08.55 66
- Nat.09.119-121 188
- Nat.18.249 174
- PLUTARCH
- Ant.09.04 67
- Ant.25.01-02 188
- Ant.28 188
- Ant.29 188
- Ant.60.01 188
- Ant.61.03-62.01 188
- PORPHYRIO
- Commentarii in Q.Horatium Flaccum
- at S.01.02.001-003 62
- at S.01.03.001 210
- at S.01.04.093-094 114
- at S.01.06.121 162
- at S.01.10.36 216
- at S.02.05.041 216
- introduction to S.01.05 126
- PROPERTIUS
- Elegiae
- PROP.02.34.85-86 220
- QUINTILIAN
- Institutio Oratoria
- Inst.06.3.19-20 219
- Inst.08.6.17 216
- Inst.10.1.65-66 91
- Inst.10.1.93 34
- Inst.10.1.94 34, 224
- Inst.10.1.96 216
- SALLUST
- Bellum Catilinae
- Cat.10.02-05 57
- SENECA MAIOR
- Con.4.2 100
- SERVIUS
- in Vergilium Commentarius
- Serv.A.03.20, 04.58 162
- Serv.Ecl.09.10 86
- SUETONIUS
- de Grammaticis
- Gram.2 206
- Vita Horati 18, 21, 31
- Vita Horati.02.02 28
- Vita Vergili
- Vita Vergili.19 86
- TACITUS
- Annales
- Ann.04.34 217
- VIRGIL
- Eclogae
- Ecl.01.42 265
- Ecl.01.42-43 87, 264
- Ecl.05 265
- Ecl.06 9
- Ecl.06.06-12 87, 264
- Ecl.06.64 87, 264
- Ecl.07.33-34 265
- Ecl.08 265

- Ecl.08.026 3
 Ecl.09.10 265
 Ecl.09.26-29 86, 87, 264
 Ecl.10 3, 39, 56, 265
 Ecl.10.01-10 87, 264
 Ecl.10.22-23 87, 264
 Ecl.10.70 49
 Ecl.10.70-77 58
 Ecl.10.72-73 87, 264
 Ecl.10.77 49
- Laberius 208, 250
 Laevinus 143, 151
 social mobility 143
 Land expropriations
 in Mantua region 264
 Literary frame 10
 literary model
 Apollonius' Medea literary model for Dido
 acc. to Nelis 11
 literary objective and literary continuity 2, 10
 risk of studying text from literary point of
 view 4
 Lucilius 24, 34, 95, 224, 253
 Horace acknowledges in S.01.10 that Lucilius
 could have met his standards of good
 poetry 226, 253
 Horace's partial rehabilitation of Lucilius
 reduces political claims of Republicans
 226, 253
 life 224
 Lucilius the literary and the political man 226,
 253
 political context in which Lucilius worked
 224, 253
 shortcomings of Lucilius' poetry in S.01.04 95
 style
 invective style 98, 240
 stood in tradition of Old Comedy 98, 240
 was fostered by Stoics and Pompeians as the
 defender of Republican *libertas* 94, 226
- Maecenas 23, 41
 ancestry 141, 242
 in S.01.06.001-006 141
 likely equestrian 142
 originated from a Lydian family 141
 Horace felt accepted by Maecenas 89, 134,
 140, 190, 229, 254
 Horace joined circle in 39-38 B.C. 22, 46
 he came into the company of at least two
 poets who wrote political commentary,
 Virgil and Varius 125
 Horace makes in the last lines of S.01.04 a
 confident statement that he can make
 a contribution to debate about political
 issues 125, 241
 Horace refutes in S.01.09.43-60 the pushy
 fellow's wrong picture of the circle 193,
 196, 249
 Maecenas and Catullus 37
 Maecenas' good judgement selecting men
 who shun improper ambition pursuing
 high office 152, 243
 Maecenas' powers of discernment in S.01.06
 143, 152, 154, 243
 Patronage of Horace? 30
 possible reference in S.01.09.54-60 to
 exclusive character of circle 199, 202
- Maenius 89, 238
- Magic
 dangers of black magic 179
 had penetrated Roman upper classes 177
 Horace's views on witchcraft in S.01.08 182,
 186
- Maltinus 71
 an effeminate in S.01.02 63
- Mantua
 land expropriations 264
- Marc Antony 66, 118
 affair with Cytheris 66, 118
 Cicero's account of this in Phil.02 66
 alliance with Cleopatra in S.01.07 167, 246
 alliance with Cleopatra in S.01.08 188
 Horace blames Antony's unabashed behaviour
 in S.01.02 67, 118
 lack of leadership in Parthian campaign in
 S.01.07 167
- Marsaeus 64, 118, 235
- Marsyas 162
 duties of patronage 162, 245
- Medea 11
- Messalla Corvinus, Valerius 23, 29, 150, 215,
 243
- Naevius 53
- Neotericism 38
- New classes in Roman society
 Horace critical of new rich 53
 rise of the freedmen 72
 rise of the nouveau riche 71
- Nomentanus 53, 178
- Novius 76, 89, 149, 151, 238, 243

- son of a freedman 149, 243
- Octavian 74, 89
 powers of control 74
 proclaimed himself as defender of mos
 maiorum 112
- Octavius Musa 125
- Old Attic Comedy
 in S.01.04 91, 239
 komodoumenoi 92
- Orbilius 19, 119, 155, 206, 244, 250
 in S.01.10fr. 206, 250
- Parrhesia 93, 116
 Horace's use of the notion of parrhesia in
 S.01.04 121
 part of Horace's moral guidance in the concern
 for his friends 116
- Patronage or amicitia 23
 gift 29
 independence of the poets 30
- Persius of Clazomenae 171
 arrogant charge at Brutus 171
- Petillius Capitolinus 114, 215
- Philippi 168
- Philodemus 1, 69, 82, 106, 116, 132
 Neapolitan circle 106
 On Frank Criticism 116
- Pitholaus, M.Otacilius of Rhodes 208, 213, 250,
 251
- Pitholeon
 is most likely Pitholaus of Rhodes 213, 251
- Plotius Tucca 125, 132, 190
- Poets
 as commentators 31
 earning potential 25
 Virgil and Horace relatively rich 25
 personal opinion 29
- Pollio, C. Asinius 23, 125, 218, 252, 264
- Pomponius
 sympathizer with Sextus 108
- Porphyrio
 at S.01.02.001-003 refers to Marcus Tigellius
 Hermogenes 61
- Priapus 176
 fertility god, image of Roman sexual humour
 177
 functional reference in S.01.08 to Cleopatra
 and Antony 187, 246, 247
 Hellenistic statue of Venus leaning on a
 statuette of Priapus 188, 248
 must chase away witches 178
- mythical son of Dionysus and Aphrodite 187
 retells a witches' séance that Horace never
 experienced himself 180, 246
- References 7, 8
 allusive reference 11
 Conte's "the letter" and "the sense" 13
 functional frame 11
 indirect reference 11
 single reference, *See* Functional frame
 Thomas' model of classification 8
- Reno
 is Rhenus 4
- Rhenus
 river in Northern Italy (Reno)
 in Ecl.10 river crossed by Lycoris 60, 265
- Rufillus and Gargonius 71, 113
 types walking the streets of Rome 63
- Rupilius Rex 171
 one of Brutus' tax-gatherers 174
- Ruso, a moneylender 81
- Sallust 57, 64
 affair with Fausta, Sulla's daughter 64
- Sarmentus
 scurra, eques, parasite 133
- Servius
 evidence re. land commission unreliable 87,
 264
- Servius Tullius 143
 social mobility 143
- Sextus Pompey 168, 189
- Sulcius and Caprius 108, 110
 belonged to the Pompeian party and were
 Stoics 108, 110
 contemporary satirists 108
 probably known for lampooning profiteering
 by men in Octavian's party 110
 their identity 110
- Tarpa, Maecius 217
- Theocritus
 literary model for Virgil's Eclogae
 names in Eclogae taken from Idylls 3
- Tigellius 71, 73, 75, 210, 234, 236, 251
- Tigellius, Sardinian
 singer
 in S.01.02 and S.01.03.004 61, 74, 210,
 234, 236, 251
 symbol of faults of patronage system 61, 234
- Tillius 146, 159, 243
 ambition for public office 146, 243
 embodiment of political ambition 159, 161

- identity in S.01.06 146, 243
 - is likely fictitious 148, 243
- Tityrus
 - Tityrus in Ecl.01 does not represent Virgil 265
- Ummidius 53, 55
- Valgius Rufus 125
- Varius Rufus, L. 125, 132, 136, 190, 193, 219, 252
- Varro Atacinus, P. Terentius 220, 252
 - Horace did not rate his satiric poetry highly 221, 252
 - wrote presumably elegiac rather than satiric poetry on grounds of Propertius' and Ovid's testimonies 220, 252
- Varro, M. Terentius
 - author of satiric poetry 221
- Varus, Alfenus
 - in Ecl.09 involved in land expropriations in Mantua area 86, 238, 264
- Venusia 18, 53, 123, 135
 - had not remained loyal to Rome in the Social War 18, 123, 136
- Virgil 125, 132, 190, 219, 252
 - Aeneis
 - political content 3
 - Eclogae
 - political content 3
 - referring to personal knowledge 264
 - political views 7
 - Eclogae
 - concerned about the destruction of rural communities 219, 252, 266
 - concerned about the disappearance of farming 265
 - deal with substantial problems 264, 265
 - in Ecl.08 land has been appropriated and given to soldiers (outsiders) 3
 - in Ecl.10 Virgil refers to the destruction of his own environment 4, 264