

## VERSE-TECHNIQUE AND MORAL EXTREMISM IN TWO SATIRES OF HORACE (*SERMONES* 2.3 AND 2.4)<sup>1</sup>

Horace begins his second book of satires by picturing himself caught between the extremes of two sets of critics, one group claiming that his poetry is too aggressive (*nimis acer*, 1), the other that it is insipid and lacklustre (*sine nervis*, 2). The charges are extreme and contradictory, so there is no way he can adjust his work to please one group without further antagonizing the other: the more straightforward he becomes in his criticisms, the more bitter and 'lawless' he will seem to group A. Further subtlety and indirectness will only draw further criticism from group B. He takes his problem to Trebatius, Rome's leading legal expert, expecting an easy solution, only to be told what his question made clear from the start: that the safest way to write satire in Rome is 'not at all': *quiescas* ('keep quiet', line 5). His question, as far as Trebatius is concerned, is irresolvable and best left unexplored.

'How does one write satire in Rome?' The question with which the book begins is not dropped as Trebatius advised, instead it is explored from various angles not only by Horace and Trebatius in the remaining 81 lines of 2.1, but by all of the poems that follow. It is the central quest of the book; experts continue to give advice, other Trebatiuses, who claim to 'know' and to have the insider's fix on what ails mankind. Each has a unique way of addressing these issues, his own method of 'doing satire', and no matter how muddled or ludicrous the answers of these various 'experts' may seem, they always return us to the central issue with which the book began. In this paper I will examine the advice of two such experts, Damasippus in *S.* 2.3 and Catius in 2.4, to show that issues of verse-technique are implicated in the poet's search for an acceptable satiric method. A close study of the verse-technique of these poems will demonstrate that their compositional effects are every bit as idiosyncratic and extreme as the moral views they insist on. The two are linked in such a way that, with the shift from Stoic diatribe in *S.* 2.3 to Epicurean didactic in 2.4,<sup>2</sup> one hears an equally

<sup>1</sup> Versions of this paper were delivered at a symposium on *ethopoia* at Case Western Reserve University and at the annual meetings of CAMWS and the Classical Association. I wish to thank those who offered helpful criticisms on those occasions. Special thanks go to Martin Helzlsouer for arranging and hosting the *ethopoia* symposium. Denis Feeney, Jim McKeown, and E. J. Kenney kindly agreed to read drafts of the paper. Their advice has helped tremendously. I owe a special debt of thanks to my colleague, Will Batstone, for fielding my many queries on Latin verse-technique over many months and for reading this paper in its several versions. His insights and criticisms, generously offered, have influenced nearly every page of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> On the mock Epicureanism of Catius see C. Classen, 'Horace—A Cook?', *CQ* 28 (1978), 343–8, and K. Büchner, *Horaz, Die Satiren* (Bologna, 1970), p. 221. It is likely that Horace draws on the braggart Epicurean cook of Damoxenus fr. 2K-A in creating Catius in 2.4 and Nasidienus in 2.8 (see Lejay, pp. 446–7). Just as Catius and Nasidienus, Damoxenus' cook is a student of Epicurus, and he applies his knowledge of natural phenomena to his studies of food and dining. He argues, for example, that 'Nature is the first author of every skill' (*ἡ φύσις πάσης τέχνης ἀρχέγονόν ἐστ'*, line 7), including his own cooking skill. He suggests that the true Epicurean cook will understand 'the difference between a horse-mackerel in winter and summer...for changes and movements create differences in foods (*αἱ μεταβολαὶ γὰρ αἱ τε κινήσεις...ἀλλοιώματα ἐν ταῖς τροφαῖς ποιοῦσι*, 21–3). The language is a parody of Epicurean technical vocabulary; see H. Dohm, *Magiēros: Die Rolle des Kochs in der griechisch-römischen Komödie* (Munich, 1964), pp. 163–9.

distinct shift in compositional technique, from the loose and untamed style of Damasippus to the highly regulated, predictable technique of Catius. In underscoring such aesthetic idiosyncracies, I hope to show that the issue of verse-technique is actively explored in Book two, not as something merely 'talked about', as it was in the programmatic poems of Book one, but as something practised, carefully, ineptly, or otherwise.

A closer look at the opening lines of S. 2.1 shows that questions of style figure in the poet's search from the very start. We see, for example, that the first group of critics has taken offence not only at the aggressive tone of his work, but at his overblown compositional style (that is, his *oratio acris*, marked by *nimis acer*, line 1), while the other opposes his careful attention to refinements of word-arrangement (*compositio*, marked by *composui*, line 3).<sup>3</sup> Here, as is true so often in the *Sermones*, moral issues possess latent aesthetic connotations: these lines are as much about verse-technique as they are about the proper use and extent of ridicule, which is their surface concern. The claim that his compositions 'lack sinews', that they are *sine nervis*, is drawn from the metaphorical language of rhetorical theory, where it refers to a style of speech that is choppy and listless, consisting of short bursts of thought which lack the internal cohesion, tension, and climax of a well-turned period.<sup>4</sup> What is required of speech 'lacking sinews and joints' (*sine nervis et articulis*, *ad Her.* 4.16) is greater structural complexity: longer, hypotactic sentences marked by a sense of motion, rhythm, tension and release. Such aspects of periodic speech the Roman grammarians commonly treated under the heading of *compositio*, arrangement, a term calqued from the Greek *synthesis*.<sup>5</sup> For example, the ninth book of Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* contains an exhaustive study of *compositio* treated under three broad headings: *ordo* (order), *iunctura* (connections), and *numerus* (rhythm). Quintilian works with each in some detail, sometimes with near bureaucratic officiousness; we learn, for example, that hiatus between *e* and *i* is less offensive to the ear than that of the open vowels, *a*, *o* and *u*; we learn that unpleasant effects result from placing a word ending in *s* before a word beginning with a liquid; and that one should always beware of setting too many monosyllables side by side.

The fastidious demeanour of these precepts, Quintilian is quick to point out, in no way detracts from their importance. Especially striking is his insistence that

<sup>3</sup> On the stylistic connotations of these lines see K. Freudenburg, 'Horace's Satiric Program and the Language of Contemporary Theory in *Satires* 2.1', *AJPh* 111 (1990), 188–93, and *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire* (Princeton, 1993), p. 164, n. 91.

<sup>4</sup> Compare the imagery used by the anonymous *Auctor ad Herennium* in his famous discussion of the middle style at *Ad Her.* 4.16: 'Qui in mediocre genus orationis profecti sunt, si pervenire eo non poterunt, errantes perveniunt ad confinii genus eius generis: quod appellamus dissolutum, quod est sine nervis et articulis; ut hoc modo appellem "fluctuans" eo quod fluctuat huc et illuc nec potest confirmate neque viriliter sese expedire. id est eiusmodi...' [Those who set out for the middle style, if they fail to reach it, swerve and arrive at the adjacent type of style, which we call disjointed, because it lack sinews and joints. For this reason I would call it wavering, because it surges back and forth and is unable to push forward with manly confidence. The following is of this type...]

<sup>5</sup> Consider, for example, Quintilian *Inst.* 9.4.9 describing the essential qualities of arrangement, where again metaphors of tension and motion are prominent: 'Quare mihi compositione velut amentis quibusdam nervisve intendi et concitari sententiae videntur. Ideoque eruditissimo cuique persuasum est, valere eam plurimum non ad delectationem modo sed ad motum quoque animorum.' [Wherefore, to me it seems that it is by *compositio* that our thoughts are strung tight and sent flying, just as if by hurling-straps or bowstrings. And for this reason all the most learned scholars are convinced that *compositio* is extremely valuable, not only for conferring pleasure, but also for stirring the soul.]

compositional refinements affect not only the sonic impression of a speech, giving it a sense of euphony and balance, etc., but also the *ethos* of the speaker, actively shaping and defining the moral character he projects.<sup>6</sup> The same assumption is evident at *ad Her.* 4.16 (quoted above, n. 4) where the author claims that the middle style, properly handled, will project an air of 'manly confidence', and we see it again in the opening lines of *Sermones* 2.1, where Horace comfortably and naturally posits a connection between moral character and compositional technique. He too has been charged with having both a lack and a superabundance of 'manly confidence,' criticism which cuts both at the content of his work as well as its compositional style.<sup>7</sup> In the poems that follow in Book 2, pursuing the general tenor of these lines, Horace delivers extreme and contradictory precepts (some by Stoics, other by Epicureans) in verse that is equally varied and extreme. This suggests that, like Cicero and, later, Quintilian, he too perceived the value of compositional style in the creation of moral character.

To show this, I shall examine several aspects of the verse-technique of *S.* 2.3 and 2.4, poems which, in the philosophical views they posit, their diction, tone, even in their length, are uniquely extreme and antithetical in character. Much of what I have to say in this regard I draw from Paul Langford's study of 'Literary Dogmatism' in the second book of Horace's *Satires*,<sup>8</sup> and from the detailed metrical study of Nils-Ola Nilsson. Nilsson's data, reinforced by the findings of Harkness, Conrad, Patzer, and others (including some of my own), I will use to establish a connection between the moral and aesthetic extremism of *S.* 2.3 and 2.4, giving semantic force to what otherwise might seem nothing more than tedious metrical data.<sup>9</sup> In so doing, I will argue that the poems of Book 2 (especially poems 3 and 4) effectively recall and reify the dominant literary themes developed in Book 1, and that, because of this, the philosophical dialogues of Book 2, which have for so long languished in obscurity, deserve a prominent place within the landscape of Horace's theoretical works and, even more, in the larger context of stylistic theory in the Late Republic.

The juxtaposition of *S.* 2.3 and 2.4 underscores their incompatibility on several scores, setting them off as a contrasting pair of opposites. One sees an obvious point of contrast in their mutually-opposed philosophical perspectives: 2.3 is delivered by a convert to Stoicism, 2.4 by an Epicurean gourmand. Further, both Damasippus and

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Inst.* 9.4.17: 'Nam neque illud in Lysia dicendi textum tenue atque rasum laetioribus numeris corrumperetur erat; perdidisset enim gratiam, quae in eo maxima est, simplicis atque inadfectati coloris, perdidisset fidem quoque. Nam scribebat aliis, non ipse dicebat, ut oportuerit esse illa rudibus et incompositis similia; quod ipsum compositio est.' [For it would never have done for richer rhythms to destroy that delicate, smooth fabric of language in Lysias, since he would have lost that winning charm (which he possesses in such abundance) deriving from his simple, unassuming tone. He would have lost his trustworthiness as well, for he was writing speeches for others (to deliver). He didn't deliver them himself. They were, then, by necessity somewhat crude and faulty in composition, a thing which itself is a compositional art.]

<sup>7</sup> Cf. above, nn. 3 and 4.

<sup>8</sup> P. Langford, *Horace's Protean Satire: Public Life, Ethics, and Literature in Satires II* (diss. Princeton, 1989), pp. 156–205.

<sup>9</sup> In studying Horace's hexameters I have found the following metrical studies most helpful: C. Conrad, 'Traditional Patterns of Word-Order in Latin Epic from Ennius to Vergil', *HSCP* 69 (1965), 195–258; G. Duckworth, *Vergil and Classical Hexameter Poetry* (Ann Arbor, 1969); A. Harkness, 'The Relation of Accent to Elision in Latin Verse, not Including the Drama', *TAPhA* 36 (1905), 82–110; A. Kiessling and R. Heinze, *Q. Horatius Flaccus, Band II: Satiren* (Berlin, 1961), pp. xxvii–xlv; E. J. Kenney, *The Ploughman's Lunch* (Bristol, 1984), pp. xli–lxiv; N. Nilsson, *Metrische Stildifferenzen in den Satiren des Horaz* (Uppsala, 1952); H. Patzer, 'Zum Sprachstil des neoterischen Hexameters', *MH* 12 (1955), 77–95; E. Sturtevant and R. Kent, 'Elision and Hiatus in Latin Prose and Verse', *TAPhA* 46 (1915), 129–55.

Catius are novices who rehearse precepts heard from others, one delivering a very long speech (2.3 is the second longest poem Horace ever wrote), the other a short speech (2.4 is the second shortest poem in its book). Similar contrasts can be detected at less obvious levels. For example, in 2.3 the poet plays an unwilling listener, forced to put up with Damasippus' abuse until he can take no more (*o maior, tandem parcas, insane, minori!*, 326), while in 2.4 he is the one who interrupts and cajoles the unwilling Catius into relating the precepts of his unnamed master. In 2.3 the *auctor* of Damasippus' precepts is revealed, in 2.4 he is ceremoniously hidden. Further, both poems begin with references to Greek authors (and with specific reference to Plato's dialogues): Damasippus chides the poet for not taking full advantage of his Greek sources (2.3.11–12), while Catius claims to have surpassed them (2.4.3). Then there is the contrast between Damasippus' love of all things old and rugged (the legacy of his life as an antiques dealer, which he describes as his search for *quid sculptum infabre, quid fusum durius esset*, 2.3.22) and Catius' love of all things new and tender (e.g. *novis praeceptis*, 2.4.2; *ne gallina malum responset dura palato*, 18, etc.). This last contrast, I contend, is evident not only in the makeup of Damasippus and Catius as moral agents with specific moral identities, but it is evident in their speech as well, one preferring a loose, archaic style of composition, the other a style that is refined and new.

Now for some of the details. Near the beginning of his disquisition on fine dining, Catius describes the precepts he has learned from an anonymous *auctor* as *res tenuis, tenui sermone peractas* (S. 2.4.9). The contrived shape of the line, that is, the pronounced chiasmus pivoting around the principal caesura, the self-contained nature of the hexameter (What the Germans call *Satzvers*), coupled with the repetition of the highly suggestive 'thin' (*tenuis*), one of the most overworked metaphors of Callimachean poetics, mark the verse as thoroughly neoteric. The line is typical of the poem as a whole, which, I will show, is unique among the satires of Book 2 for its intense, flamboyant display of the technical refinements of the neoterics. And all of this is in glaring contrast to S. 2.3, directly preceding, which is characterized not by brevity and refinement, but by a loose, archaic verse-style eschewed by the neoterics, though favoured in certain contemporary Stoic circles.<sup>10</sup>

Consider, for example, the way in which elision is used in these two satires. Generally speaking, Horace is restrained in his use of elision (this applies to both his lyric and his stichic hexameters). Overall, the rate of elision in Books 1 and 2 is 40.1%, that is about four elisions for every ten verses.<sup>11</sup> This is less than half the rate of Lucilius, whose elisions occur at a rate of 84.8%, and significantly less than even Vergil, who uses elision at a rate of 49% in the *Georgics*, and 52.8% in the *Aeneid*. Among earlier writers of stichic hexameters only Catullus shows a lower, more restrained rate, 35.2%. Within the *Sermones* themselves, however, there are vast divergences from poem to poem, and the most noteworthy of these is the shift from the extremely high rate of S. 2.3, a near-Lucilian 69% (the highest rate by far of all the *Sermones*), and the extremely conservative rate of 27.4% in S. 2.4. This latter rate becomes even lower when one treats separately the 81.5 verses assigned to Catius from the 13.5 verses assigned to his interlocutor, presumably Horace. Consider, for example, the first 20 lines of S. 2.4 (elisions are marked in bold type; italic type at line-end marks clash of ictus and accent in final two feet, discussed below):

<sup>10</sup> On the preference of certain Stoics for a rugged verse-technique, see Freudenburg, *Walking Muse* [n. 3], pp. 132–9, and 150–62.

<sup>11</sup> On the frequency of elision in Horace, Lucilius, Vergil, and Catullus, see Nilsson [n. 9], pp. 8–10.

Hor. 'Und[e] et quo Catius?' Cat. 'non est mihi tempus, aventi ponere signa novis praeceptis, qualia vincent Pythagoran Anytique reum doctumque Platona.'	
H. 'peccatum fateor, cum te sic tempore laevo interpellarim; sed des veniam bonus, oro.'	5
quod s[i] intercedit tibi nunc aliquid, repetes mox, sive [e]st natur[ae] hoc siv[e] artis, mirus utroque.'	
C. 'quin id erat curae, quo pacto cuncta tenerem utpote res tenuis, tenui sermone peractas.'	
H. 'ed[e] hominis nomen, simul et, Romanus an hospes.'	10
C. 'ipsa memor praecepta canam, celabitur auctor. longa quibus facies ovis erit, illa memento, ut suci melioris et ut magis alba rotundis, ponere: namque marem cohibent callosa vitellum. cole suburbano qui siccis crevit in agris dulcior: inriguo nihil est elutius horto. se vespertinus subito t[e] oppresserit hospes, ne gallina malum responset dura palato, doctus eris vivam musto mersare Falerno: hoc teneram faciet...	15 20

Here 5.5 lines are assigned to Horace, and 14.5 to Catius. Within the lines assigned to Horace one sees six elisions, that is, an average of more than one per line. Catius, however, elides only once, between *t[e]* and *oppresserit* in line 17. This last elision, moreover, is by no means casual, but has been carefully constructed to suggest, by way of mimetic syntax, the stress felt by the host when suddenly 'oppressed' by a late-arriving guest.<sup>12</sup> Compare the casual, conversational elisions in line 7: *sive [e]st natur[ae] hoc siv[e] artis, mirus utroque*, one of only two lines in this satire with multiple elisions (the other, line 92, is also assigned to Horace). This free, conversational verse-technique, an oddity in 2.4, is the rule in 2.3. As a representative sample consider lines 77–96:

audir[e] atque togam iubeo componere, quisquis ambitione mal[a] aut argenti pallet amore, quisquis luxuria tristive superstitione aut alio mentis morbo calet: huc propius me,	80
dum doce[o] insanir[e] omnis vos, ordin[e] adite. danda [e]st ellebori multo pars maxim[a] avaris: nesci[o] an Anticyram rati[o] illis destinet omnem. heredes Staberi summ[am] incidere sepulcro, ni sic fecissent, gladiatorum dare centum	85
damnati populo pari[a] atque epul[um] arbitr[o] Arri, frumenti quantum metit Africa. 'siv[e] ego prave seu rect[e] hoc volui, ne sis patruus mihi': credo, hoc Staberi prudent[em] animum vidisse. 'quid ergo sensit, cum summam patrimon[i] inculpere saxo heredes voluit?' quoad vixit, credidit ingens pauperiem viti[um] et cavit nihil acrius, ut, si forte minus locuples uno quadrante perisset, ipse videretur sibi nequior: <i>omnis enim res,</i> virtus, fama, decus, divin[a] humanaque pulchris divitiis parent.	90 95

<sup>12</sup> An obvious case of word-order imitating sense (mimetic syntax) is *S.* 2.8.42–3, describing the (in)famous eel served up by Nasidienus: *affertur squillas inter murena natantis / in patina porrecta*. The word-arrangement which results is mimetic, with the eel positioned directly among the 'swimming prawns' (*squillas...natantis*) to suggest the appearance of the dish itself. On mimetic arrangement generally see L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 65–6; and D. Lateiner, 'Mimetic Syntax: Metaphor from Word Order, Especially in Ovid', *AJPh* 111 (1990), 204–37.

The passage contains 20 elisions in 19 lines, four of which occur in a single verse, line 86: *damnati populo pari[a] atqu[e] epul[um] arbitr[o] Arri*. This is an extremely rugged verse, one of only two such lines with four elisions in all the *Sermones*.<sup>13</sup> Yet, in the context of S. 2.3 it is not particularly exceptional: the poem as a whole contains no fewer than 26 verses with triple elisions, while 2.4 has only one such verse, line 7, assigned to Horace.

Perhaps even more telling than the rate at which elisions occur in these two satires is the nature of these elisions, for it is clear that, among poets such as Catullus and Horace, who were obsessed with matters relating to euphony, certain 'smooth' elisions, especially short-vowel elisions, were freely allowed, while others, difficult in pronunciation and harsh in sound, were studiously avoided. According to Nilsson's reckoning, S. 2.3 contains a very high rate of harsh elisions, while 2.4 (along with 2.8) contains a very low rate. Consider again the passage cited from S. 2.3. One sees here five cases, lines 81, 83 (where it occurs twice), 86, and 92, where an elided vowel is preceded immediately by another vowel. The consequence of such elision is a virtual hiatus between the penultimate vowel of the first word and the initial vowel of the second, thus a very harsh elision.<sup>14</sup> There are 28 examples of such elisions in S. 2.3, a rate of 12.8 per 100 elisions. I have found only one example in 2.4, line 82, which again may be explained as a case of word-order/rhythm imitating sense.<sup>15</sup>

Another type of harsh elision which occurs with notable frequency in 2.3 is the elision of a middle vowel (that is a final vowel + *m*) before a word beginning with a short vowel. There are 20 cases of this in S. 2.3 (for example in line 89 of the passage quoted above), yielding a rate of 9.7 per 100 elisions.<sup>16</sup> S. 2.4, on the other hand, has only one example of an elision of this type, line 92, which, significantly, is assigned not to Catius, but to Horace. Among the many other notably difficult and unusual elisions which occur in the *Sermones*, Nilsson makes a special study of: the elision of pyrrhic words ending in *-m*, *-a*, or *-o* (six of 10 examples in Book 2 occur in 2.3); the elision of anapaestic words (12 of 16 instances in Book 2 occur in 2.3; cf. lines 81 and 83 of the passage quoted above); the elision of dactylic words ending in *-m* or *-a* (five of six total examples in Book 2 are in 2.3); the elision of iambic words, and the extremely rare elision of choriambic words (2.3 has four of six examples in Book 2, cf. line 86 of the passage quoted above).<sup>17</sup> All told, *Sermones* 2.3 contains 31 cases of these difficult elisions (of only 50 in the entire book!), while 2.4 has not a single example.

Especially noteworthy among the many other rhythmic oddities separating S. 2.3 from 2.4 are the following: a high rate of 'blurred' caesurae in 2.3, that is, caesurae weakened through elision;<sup>18</sup> and a pronounced lack of the normal secondary caesurae in 2.3 (which has 35 cases, versus only four in 2.4, yielding the highest and lowest rates in Book 2).<sup>19</sup> There are two examples of this in the passage quoted above, lines 84 and

<sup>13</sup> The other is S. 1.3.20.

<sup>14</sup> Nilsson [n. 9], 20: 'Der Grund der Abneigung gegen derartige Elisionen muss wohl mit Mueller darin zu suchen sein, dass, weil die elidierte ultima *quadamtenus absorbeatur synizesis*, eine Art Hiatus nach dem Paenultimavokal entsteht'.

<sup>15</sup> The figures derive from Nilsson [n. 9] Table V, p. 203, discussed pp. 17–19. On mimetic syntax see above n. 12. The harsh elision in line 82 between *flagitium* and *ingens* can be taken as a compositional *flagitium* ('shocking circumstance', or 'offence against decent feeling', cf. *OLD flagitium* 3a and 4a), a poetic counterpart to an equally offensive social gaffe described by the line.

<sup>16</sup> See Nilsson [n. 9], Table IV, p. 202.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., Table VI, p. 203, discussed pp. 21–8.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., pp. 94–7.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., Table XI, p. 206, discussed pp. 57–86. Langford [n. 8], 165 points out that two of the four lines lacking one of the normal secondary caesurae in 2.4 (none lacks both) can be explained as creating 'special effects' (what I call mimetic syntax): 'in line 69, as Nilsson points out,

85, where *summ[am] incidere* and *gladiatorum* (both of five syllables) cover the two places in the line where one normally expects secondary caesurae with a principal strong caesura in the third foot, i.e. after the fourth *longum* and at the bucolic diaeresis. This phenomenon occurs 17 times in 2.3 and not at all in 2.4.<sup>20</sup> Further, there are numerous instances of so-called pause-elision in 2.3, that is, elision across strong punctuation (of 19 cases in Book 2, fully 15 are in 2.3, none in 2.4).<sup>21</sup> Of these pause-elisions in 2.3, three are especially harsh, breaking Harkness's rule that the syllable elided into in a pause-elision is normally not both long and accented.<sup>22</sup> In no other poem does Horace allow himself this freedom.<sup>23</sup> Finally, and perhaps these are the most obtrusive examples one can cite, S. 2.3 contains the only two cases in the *Sermones* of lines lacking all the normal caesurae, both principal and secondary:

*an tu reris eum occisa insanisse parente, 134*  
*iurando obstringam ambo: uter aedilis fueritve, 180*

These lines are, for all practical purposes, caesura-less.

Moving into some of the more abstruse areas of verse-technique, one notes a great proliferation of unusual verse-ends in 2.3, often resulting in the clash of ictus and accent in the fifth and/or sixth foot. Such clash, which is characteristic of a loose, rugged verse-technique, was studiously avoided by the neoterics, very often even in the fourth foot. One sees this, for example, in five of the first seven lines of Catullus 64 (' marks agreement of ictus and accent where it occurs in each of the last three feet):

Peliaco quondam prognatae vértice pinus  
dicuntur liquidas Neptúni násse per úndas  
Phasidos ad fluctus et fines Aéetaeos,  
cum lecti iuvenes, Argivae róborá púbis,  
auratam optantes Colchis avertere pellem  
ausi sunt vada salsa cita decurrere puppi,  
caerula verrentes abiégnis aéquora pálmis.

5

S. 2.4 contains three examples of a strong clash of ictus and accent in the fifth and/or sixth foot. Two of these, as we might now expect, are assigned to Horace, lines 5 and 6 (marked in italic type in the passage quoted above). The third example, the only such line assigned to Catius, may be construed a case of sonic impression imitating meaning, line 82, which also contains a very harsh elision between *flagiti[um]* and *ingens*.<sup>24</sup> In S. 2.3, however, the clash of ictus and accent in the fifth and/or sixth foot is relatively common. I have found thirty-one such cases in 2.3,<sup>25</sup> several of which

the occurrence of the fourth and fifth trochaic caesurae characterizes the ceaseless flow of Catius' speech... in line 75, Catius himself seeks a special effect in bragging of a culinary invention. The metrical looseness allows for an imposing four-word line.'

<sup>20</sup> Nilsson [n. 9], Table X, p. 205, discussed pp. 61–2.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., pp. 36–7.

<sup>22</sup> Harkness [n. 9] has shown that, when the second syllable in a pause-elision is, in fact, long, it is normally unaccented; if accented, it is, in most cases, a sentence-enclitic (and thus, only 'apparently' accented, e.g. when the second element is *et*, *atque*, *ac*, *aut*, etc.) or an 'unemphatic element of the sentence which would not have a marked sentence-accent' (91).

<sup>23</sup> Harkness [n. 9], 86 gives nine 'apparent exceptions' to his rule in the complete works of Horace. He isolates the three cases in S. 2.3 (236 *possideam*; *aufer*; 283 '*quid tam magnum?*' *addens*; 307 *vitis?*' *accipe*) as the most exceptional: 'If we take into account only the lines in which these elisions occur and in each case the four preceding and following lines, we find for these 27 lines a higher percentage of elisions than the average of Lucilius' (96). He goes on to note that 'There does not seem to be any reason to assume that Lucilius strove to avoid a long accented syllable in the second syllable of pause-elision. This was doubtless one of the characteristics of his verse which led Horace to criticize so severely the style of his predecessor to whom he owed so much' (97).

<sup>24</sup> See above n. 15.

<sup>25</sup> They are: 2.3.18 (weak clash), 39, 48, 58, 74, 75, 85, 86, 94, 99 (weak), 120, 135, 148, 158, 166, 177 (especially harsh), 201, 202, 213, 214, 215, 217, 236, 237, 262, 267, 268, 301, 311, 314,

occur in the passage cited above (lines 85, 86 and 94, marked in italic type). One also sees in these lines one case, line 79, of a line ending in a word of six syllables, the only example of its type in the *Sermones*. The passage also contains three lines ending in monosyllables, one of which, line 94, produces a strong clash of ictus and accent in the sixth foot (common in lines ending in a single monosyllable). In all there are 29 lines in *S. 2.3* which end in monosyllables, yielding a rate of just under 9%. This contrasts strongly with 2.4, which has only one case, line 6, which, we have already noted, belongs not to Catius but to Horace.

Among the many other criteria available for judging verse-technique, there are two which especially underscore the uniqueness and compositional diversity of the two satires in question; namely, *Satzvers* and *Sperrung*. *Satzvers*, as the term implies, refers to a self-contained verse, that is, an individual line of (in this case) hexameter verse which consists either of one or more complete clauses (subordinate or independent) or of one or more complete sentences.<sup>26</sup> Given the pithy, epigrammatic quality of *Satzvers*, it is a device well suited to the expression of the various sententiae and aphorisms which make up the philosophies of both Damasippus and Catius. As a result, fully 27% of all verses in *S. 2.3* are of the *Satzvers* type, the second highest rate in the *Sermones*.<sup>27</sup> The highest rate, however, 51.6% in 2.4, is nearly double the lofty rate of 2.3, and such an inordinate preponderance of *Satzvers* will naturally have an impact upon the overall rhythmic effect of the poem; for without regular enjambment, there is little scope for subordination and the building of impressive periods. Consider lines 30–36 of *S. 2.4*:

lubrica nascentes implent conchyliæ lunæ;	30
sed non omne mare est generosæ fertile testæ:	
murex Baianus melior, Lucrina peloris,	
ostrea Circeis, Miseno oriuntur echini,	
pectinibus patulis iactat se molle Tarentum.	
nec sibi cenarum quivis temere arroget artem,	35
non prius exacta tenui ratione saporum.	

From the standpoint of traditional theory, these lines could rightly be charged with lacking vigour and virility, that is, of being *sine nervis et articulis*, in the words of the *Auctor ad Herennium*. They are entirely non-periodic: the strong, predictable pause at the end of each line separates them from one another, preventing them from gaining significant forward momentum. The result is a style which is quiet, balanced, and, some would say, monotonous.<sup>28</sup>

322. I have excluded all cases where an 'apparent' clash is mitigated by the presence of a proclitic (relative pronouns, unemphatic adverbs, prepositions) and/or enclitic (personal and indefinite pronouns, certain uses of *esse*, cf. Nilsson [n. 9], 50), e.g. 53 *est genus unum*, 87 *sive ego prave*, etc.

<sup>26</sup> For the definition cf. Nilsson [n. 9], 158. Though closely related, *Satzvers* is not synonymous with end-stopping. For example, in the passage quoted below (*S. 2.4.30–36*) four of the seven lines are end-stopped (in Klingner's edition). All seven lines, however, fit the criteria of *Satzvers*.

<sup>27</sup> The numbers are from Nilsson [n. 9], Table XXIII, p. 212, discussed pp. 158–63.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Duckworth [n. 9], 42 on the predictability of Catullus' hexameter patterns: 'His epyllion on the marriage of Peleus and Thetis... has been praised for passages of astonishing beauty and at the same time criticized for its monotony. The monotony results largely from the poet's handling of the hexameter patterns. His metrical procedures differ not only from those of the other Republican poets, as we have seen, but are in most respects quite unlike those of any other Latin poet, with the possible exception of one or two writers of the Late Empire, especially the Christian poet Cyprian of Gaul. For example, Catullus' high percentage of the first eight patterns, 90.98, is surpassed by Cyprian with 91.06; only 30.63 percent of Catullus' 16-line



Yet, it is a style which has certain advantages and was actively sought by a significant number of poets in Rome, most notably by Catullus, whose stichic hexameters show a strong penchant towards *Satzvers* and end-stopping, and away from strong punctuation within the verse. Considered from this angle, *S. 2.4* is by far the most 'neoteric' of all the satires: within Book 2, the overall rate of strong punctuation within the verse is 56.5 per 100 lines with strong punctuation (with the remaining 43.5 per 100 at the verse end). In *S. 2.4*, however, the number of end-stopped lines is more than double that of lines with strong internal punctuation: the numbers are 38 versus 17 (yielding rates of 69 per 100 and 31 per 100).<sup>29</sup> The end result of such compositional practices is a style which, rather than effacing the predictable metrical structure of the hexameter, and thereby giving the impression of a free-flowing conversation, calls attention to it by delivering itself to the listener in discrete, hexametric units.

Beyond end-stopping and *Satzvers*, yet another compositional feature which links *S. 2.4* with the hexameters of Catullus 64 is what is commonly referred to as *Sperrung*, or 'separation', a term which I define as a significant, stylized separation of an attribute from the substantive with which it agrees. Such separations are to be found in the poetry of Roman writers of every period, beginning with Ennius. Yet any reader of Latin elegiac poetry or of the hexameters of Catullus and Cicero cannot help but be struck by the frequency and predictability of such separations in these works. Conrad has made a thorough study of such separations in Latin epic from Ennius to Vergil to conclude that the frequent recurrence of certain patterns of separation (which he divides into five main types with several variants, see below, n. 31) is one of the most obvious and predictable stylistic features of the neoteric hexameter. According to his reckoning, the stylized separation of an attribute from its noun occurs in Catullus fully 266 times within a space of 408 lines; that is, at a rate of more than 65 per 100 lines.<sup>30</sup> Again the opening lines of poem 64 (some showing two patterned separations per line, the second of which is marked in boldface type) are typical of the poem as a whole:

*Peliaco* quondam **prognatae** *vertice* **pinus**  
dicuntur *liquidus* Neptuni nasse per *undas*  
Phasidos ad fluctus et fines Aetæaeos,  
cum lecti iuvenes, *Argivæ* robora *pubis*,  
*auratam* optantes Colchis avertere *pellem*  
ausi sunt vada salsa *cita* decurrere *puppi*,  
*caerula* verrentes **abiegnis** *aequora* **palmis**.

5

With this one might compare the compositional technique of Lucretius who uses such patterns at a rate of only 18.6 per 100 lines, barely one-quarter the rate of Catullus. Using Conrad's criteria for determining *Sperrung*, I have examined the patterns of separation which occur in *S. 2.3* and *2.4*, to discover that in *2.3* stylized separations of epithet from substantive occur at a rate of 29 per 100 lines, while in *2.4* the rate is

units have the usual eight or more patterns... Catullus has the highest frequency of repeats, one every 7.0 lines (Cyprian, 7.9), and of repeats plus near repeats, one every 3.0 lines (Cyprian, 3.2).'

<sup>29</sup> Nilsson [n. 9], Table XXI, p. 211, discussed pp. 138–42. He says of these figures (p. 139): 'In Buch II is nur eine relevante Abweichung, aber eine sehr kräftige, festzustellen: in Sat. 4 stehen von 55 starken Ip nur 17—fast nur die Hälfte der durchschnittlichen Zahl—in Versinnenren.' There are four lines in Klingner's edition of *S. 2.4* which have strong punctuation both within the line and at the line-end (lines 5, 14, 16, and 82). Nilsson takes no special consideration of these lines in computing his figures.

<sup>30</sup> These figures I have compiled from summary tables in Conrad [n. 9], 206, 208, 215, 219, 225, 244–5. Patzer [n. 9], using slightly different criteria, achieves virtually the same results.

a near Catullan 64.2 per 100 lines.<sup>31</sup> Thus once again, 2.4 shows strong neoteric leanings. Its style is unique among the satires of Horace, contrasting strongly with that of *S.* 2.3, directly preceding. This contrast, so obvious in matters such as elision, unusual line-ends, end-stopping, and so on, is built upon the idea that the philosophical fanaticism of Damasippus and Catus demands a certain compositional fanaticism as well: mad men are best painted in mad verse. The best of rhetorical principles concerning arrangement and characterisation, as we have seen, bear this out.

Enough has been said of the verse-technique of these poems. That there is an aesthetic side to the dogmatism of both Damasippus and Catus is by now obvious, since the styles they cultivate prove to be every bit as extreme and antithetical as the moral views they insist on. The two are linked in these poems in such a way that, along with a decided shift in moral viewpoint, one actually hears a distinct change in verse-technique upon moving from *S.* 2.3 to 2.4. Even within the poems Horace fashions his verse in such a way that one notices the relative looseness and/or precision of the respective interlocutors. None of this, I maintain, is accidental or meaningless. Especially significant in this regard are the programmatic poems of Book 1 (*Sermones* 1.4 and 1.10) where technical matters of arrangement (*compositio*) constitute the central issues of the satirist's debates with the *fautores Lucili*. Elsewhere I have argued that these poems are directed against two diametrically opposed sets of critics: Stoics of a distinctly antiquarian and conservative stamp, and Epicurean neoterics (precisely the same opposition set up in poems 3 and 4 of Book 2). These two groups, I maintain, subscribed to what each, from separate philosophical principles, considered a 'natural' theory of verse-technique (*compositio*). Given their diametrically opposed theories of 'nature', however, their views of verse-composition constituted opposite extremes.<sup>32</sup> Horace was well aware of these debates and he draws upon the compositional tenets and practices of both the Stoics and the neoterics in creating his own unique hexameter style, roughly something between the styles of Lucilius and Catullus (on average, that is; as *S.* 2.3 and 2.4 make clear, Horace tends to include and display extremes rather than temper them into non-existence). The opening lines of *S.* 2.1, through their allusion to technical matters of verse-composition, reintroduce the debates of *S.* 1.4 and 1.10. The more important point, however, is that, in so doing, they look ahead to the poems that follow, for in Book 2 talk about compositional extremism, which is the principal theme of the so-called 'programmatic' satires, gives way to the thing itself. This is especially obvious in poems 3 and 4. Here more than anywhere else, theoretical discussion is converted into poetic display.

Through this cursory study of the verse-technique of these poems, I hope to have shown that the satires of Book 2 are far from the tedious 'experiments' in moralizing dialogue which they are commonly assumed to be. In the end, they are some of the most complex and innovative poems that Horace ever wrote. By underscoring their

<sup>31</sup> The 95 patterned separations in *S.* 2.3 include: 17 with the first element directly before a strong caesura in the third foot and the second element at the line-end (= type 1; cf. Conrad [n. 9], p. 208); six with the first element before a strong caesura in the third foot and the second element after the bucolic diaeresis (= type 1a; cf. Conrad [n. 9], p. 215); six with the first element before a strong caesura in the second foot (= type 2; cf. Conrad [n. 9], p. 219); 15 with the first element placed first in the line (= type 3; cf. Conrad [n. 9], p. 225); 17 in enjambement (= type 4; cf. Conrad [n. 9], pp. 244–45); 34 with the first element before a strong caesura in the fourth foot or the bucolic diaeresis (= type 5; cf. Conrad [n. 9], p. 206). In *S.* 2.4 the separations break down as follows: 17 of type 1; two of type 1a; five of type 2; 12 of type 3; eight of type 4; 17 of type 5.

<sup>32</sup> See Freudenburg, *Walking Muse* [n. 3], pp. 132–84.

aesthetic aims, it becomes obvious that they belong to a specific, sometimes volatile, theoretical context, and that only within this context can something of their true intensity and sophistication be gauged.

*Ohio State University*

KIRK FREUDENBURG