

## HORACE'S PRIAPUS: A LIFE ON THE ESQUILINE (SAT. 1.8)\*

Horace's Priapus has traits familiar from the poems of the *Priapea*.<sup>1</sup> These traits are self-consciousness concerning ligneous origin, red phallus, raised arm, and protection of gardens against thieves.<sup>2</sup> Yet he has one trait unparalleled in the *Priapea*, a reed attached to his head. The reed scares birds away, and this scarecrow function is presumably also generic, whether or not there was always a reed.<sup>3</sup> Horace's *uolucres* ... / ... *uetat* ... *nouis* *considerare in hortis* (6–7) seems to refer to this particular function, because scarecrows protect newly sown gardens, where birds eat the unsprouted seeds.<sup>4</sup> Does Priapus speak of himself, then, as a new installation, and is the reader to assume that he has been fitted out as a scarecrow because these gardens are new? So one might at first assume, but already in line 8 Priapus begins to tell the history of the place. (It was once, he says, a potter's field, marked by a *cippus* that defined its

\* I am grateful to Chrystina Häuber and John Bodel for corresponding with me and for their great generosity in sending me copies of their writings; to Niklas Holzberg for corrections, suggestions and most of the references in n. 32; to Denis Feeney for information on the phenomenon discussed in n. 23; to the anonymous referee and Rhiannon Ash for helpful comments.

<sup>1</sup> In this article, the title *Priapea* (abbreviation *Priap.*) refers to what can be considered the standard collection of eighty epigrams about Priapus. On the collection and its various contents and names see 'Note to the reader' in W.H. Parker, *Priapea: Poems for a Phallic God* (London, 1988), facing p. 1. The date of this collection is controversial: see C. Goldberg, *Carmina Priapea: Einleitung, Übersetzung, Interpretation und Kommentar* (Heidelberg, 1992), 35–6. Even if it is entirely later than Horace, the epigrams have comparative value for *Sat.* 1.8 because their motifs would have been known to Horace. So Priapic poems by Catullus suggest: 47.4 *uerpus* ... *Priapus ille* (Phalaecian); fr. 1.1, 2 (Priapean). Cf. 16.1 *pedicabo uos et irrumabo* with the same pair of threats in *Priap.* 35.1–2, 5. J. Uden, 'Impersonating Priapus', *AJP* 128 (2007), 1–26 studies poems 16, 47, 56 as Catullus' experiments in the genre of Priapic poetry. For that matter the phallic threats appear already in Leonidas of Tarentum (*A. Pl.* 236 = lxxxiii G–P; *A. Pl.* 261 = lxxxiv G–P). Consider also the consistency of the representation of Priapus in art in the period 100 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.: W.-R. Megow, 'Priapos', in J. Boardman et al. (edd.), *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* 8.1 (Zurich, 1997), 1044.

<sup>2</sup> Self-conscious: *Priap.* 6.1, 10.4, 25.1, 43.1, 56.3, 63.9–12, 73.3; [Virg.] *Priapeum* 2.1 Richmond (OCT) = 85.1 Bücheler, etc. Red: *Priap.* 1.5, 26.9, 72.2, 82.8; Tib. 1.1.17; [Tib.] *Priapeum* 2.8 Luck = 82 Bücheler = *Priapeum* 'Quid hoc noui est?' Richmond (OCT). Raised arm, with club or *falx* (weapon or implement not specified in Horace): *Priap.* 6.2, 11.2, 20.5, 30.1, 33.6, 55.1.

<sup>3</sup> This function of a Priapus elsewhere only at Tib. 1.1.18, where it is not a reed but the *falx*: *terreat ut saeua falce Priapus sua*; Virg. *G.* 4.110–11; Ov. *Fast.* 1.400, in the much discussed story of Priapus' failed rape of Lotis, where it is the phallus, *quique ruber pauidas inguine terret aues*. Despite the impression conveyed by H. Herter, *De Priapo* (Giessen, 1932), 199, Cornutus *Theol. Graec.* says nothing about Priapus' protecting gardens against birds. Cf. Lactant. *Div. inst.* 2.4.2: *fures enim tam stulti sunt ut Priapi tentiginem timeant, cum aues ipsae, quas terrore falcis aut inguinis abigi existimant, simulacris fabre factis id est hominum plane similibus insidant nidificent iniquum* (cited by Herter, op. cit., 212). A reed is not mentioned, and Herter exaggerates when he says 'harundo saepe in capite eius fixa erat'. The short list of representations of Priapus in various media which he gives (200) hardly bears out this statement.

<sup>4</sup> See the second of Porphyrio's comments on line 7, quoted in n. 7 below. Note that Porphyrio was aware of the ambiguity of *nouis*. In an established garden, birds might have been pleasant companions of Maecenas. Cf. *Pieridas Phoebumque colens in mollibus hortis / sederat argutas garrulus inter aues* (*Eleg. Maec.* 1.35–6).

dimensions [8–13].) One assumes that he is speaking from his own memory and must pre-date the new gardens. What, then, had he been doing there? Was he threatening thieves with anal penetration, as his subsequent reference to thieves might suggest (17–18)? Was he a scarecrow?

The answer to these questions, and to other questions soon to be posed, will depend upon the reader's ability to fill in the blanks in this Priapus' elliptical life story. It will be suggested that the best way to do so is to assume that Horace's *persona loquens* was a real Priapus, i.e. a physical image which the first readers or auditors of the poem could see. Further, as a perceptible physical entity, he had a particular location on the Esquiline, known to the first audience. He speaks, like his generic cousins, from a fixed 'deictic centre', indicated at the outset by *huc* (8).<sup>5</sup>

Even if Horace's Priapus is not real but notional, as many or most of the Priapuses in the *Priapea* are notional (i.e. the epigrams are not inscriptions in a shrine or somehow posted near the figure of a Priapus, despite their conceit of realism), the question of location will not go away. The modern reader is not spared the task of coordinating Horace's Priapus' words with his location; cannot otherwise make sense of Priapus as the speaker of this poem; *a fortiori*, has no access to the mind of Horace except on Priapus' terrain.

To return to Priapus' account, the Esquiline, that is the part of the Esquiline rendered foul by the cemetery, has become habitable, and one can take walks along the *agger* (14–16), that is south of the Esquiline Gate.<sup>6</sup> As readers of Horace have known since the time of Porphyrio, if indeed it was ever forgotten, Priapus is talking about Maecenas' clean-up of the area and his building of his own estate.<sup>7</sup> But it would be odd if a Priapus had been guarding a cemetery like the one this Priapus describes. What would he have guarded? Why would the thieves, with whom Priapus was once concerned (17–18), have come into such a place?

As for me, Priapus goes on, my role has changed, along with the changes in the area. I am less preoccupied by thieves and wild creatures than by witches, who come

<sup>5</sup> For the concept of 'deictic centre', I cite the foundational work, K. Bühler, *Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache* (Jena, 1934), 102–20 ('Die Origo des Zeigfeldes und ihre Markierung'). 'Centre' is now commonly used instead of Bühler's 'Origo'. As a statue or statuette, and the *persona loquens* of most of the epigrams, Priapus is the perfect 'deictic centre' or deictic 'zero point'. For *huc*, cf. *Priap.* 12.5, 14.1, 63.9, 64.2, 69.2, 70.5, 77.3, 80.10. *hic* occurs 12 times and *hinc* 5 times. The combined total of the occurrences of the three deictic adverbs is 26.

<sup>6</sup> J. Bodel, *Graveyards and Groves: A Study of the Lex Lucerina*, *American Journal of Ancient History* 11 (1986 [1994]), 52; id., 'Dealing with the dead: undertakers, executioners and potter's fields in Ancient Rome', in V.M. Hope and E. Marshall (edd.), *Death and Disease in the Ancient City* (London, 2000), 131–2; C. Häuber, 'Zur Topographie der Horti Maecenatis und der Horti Lamiani auf dem Esquilin in Rom', *Kölner Jahrb. Vor- u. Frühgesch.* 23 (1990), 11–107 (best maps, loose-leaf, by Helga Stöcker); ead., 'Horti Maecenatis', in E.M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* 3 (Rome, 1996); T.P. Wiseman, 'A stroll on the rampart', in M. Cima and E. La Rocca (edd.), *Horti Romani* (Rome, 1998), 13. For maps see also Häuber, 'Das Archäologische Informationssystem "AIS ROMA": Esquilin, Caelius, Capitolium, Velabrum, Porta Triumphalis', *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma* 106 (2005 [2006]), 9–59. It is not clear why at *Sat.* 2.6.32–3 Horace says *atras* / ... *Esquilias*. See the questions raised by A. Kießling and R. Heinze, *Quintus Horatius Flaccus: Satiren* (Berlin, 1957), ad loc.

<sup>7</sup> Porphyrio (Hauthal) on line 7: (1) *Ideo dixit, quod, cum Esquilina regio prius sepulchris et bustis uacaret, primus Maecenas [ad] salubritatem aeris ibi passus hortos constituit.* (2) *Potest nouis hortis accipi pro recens satis. Maxime enim aues tum prohibendae ex hortis sunt, ne semina in terra missa colligant.* I have numbered the two parts of the gloss. Cf. Hor. C. 3.29.5–12 for Maecenas' estate.

here to collect bones and noxious herbs.<sup>8</sup> Though he says that he cannot find a way to keep them out, he proceeds to tell a story about how he once drove a pair of these intruders away, and this story takes up the rest of the Satire. They had come into the *noui horti* by night and were performing their abominable rites, when Priapus farted so loudly that he split his wooden buttocks and sent them running off in confusion (46–50).<sup>9</sup>

So concludes the story and so also concludes the poem. As a conclusion to the poem, the split buttocks are most effective if they correspond to an observable peculiarity of a real Priapus, one which Maecenas and the first readers or auditors of this poem could see. So Adolf Kießling long ago suggested.<sup>10</sup> In this way the story about the witches becomes a surprise *aition* for a physical feature which a modern reader can easily imagine. In his years of tenure on the Esquiline, Priapus had dried out, and the wood had split along the crease between the buttocks.<sup>11</sup> Whether or not Kießling's suggestion adds a virtual image to the collection of artefacts from the Horti of Maecenas which one now sees in the Museo dei Conservatori in Rome, it certainly gives the modern reader a useful way of thinking about Horace's Priapus *as the speaker of the poem*.

With an old, cracked Priapus in mind, one can try to give a more definite answer to the question of Priapus' relation to the new gardens. Assuming that Priapus' location has remained unchanged, larger 'new gardens', that is the urban villa, must have absorbed the garden in which Priapus began his life. The question then becomes: what garden was it? Pierre Grimal, who was aware of the difficulties of the phrase 'new gardens', thought that they were an extension of older gardens of Maecenas, in which Horace's Priapus would already have had a place.<sup>12</sup> This suggestion would solve the problem, and is on the right track, but there is no evidence for older gardens of Maecenas.<sup>13</sup>

A more likely possibility is a pre-existing tomb garden or *kēpotaphion* somewhere in the vicinity of the potter's field. Two inscriptions are cited for the role of a Priapus in such a setting. One is from Verona: after *Dis Manibus C H C* there is added *locus adsignatus monumento in quo est aedic(u)la Priapi* (CIL 5.3634). It sounds as if the shrine of Priapus was already there and is mentioned as a way of defining the area of the tomb. The other inscription is a couplet in iambic senarii: *custos sepulcri pene*

<sup>8</sup> Lines 17–22. Note that 'thieves and birds' (3) have become *furesque feraeque suetae* (17). Birds are already forgotten as objects of his attention. They return, in the form of crows, and *he* is now the possible object of *their* attention: *mentior at si quid, merdis caput inquinare albis / coruorum* (37–8).

<sup>9</sup> J. Hallett, 'Pepedi / diffisa nate ficus: Priapic revenge in Horace, *Satires* I.8', *RhM* 124 (1981), 341–7 explores anal associations of the word *ficus* (Horace's Priapus is made of fig-wood) and suggests that, because of these associations, this poem redefines the typical (threatened) Priapic punishment, anal penetration. Here the anus is not the object of Priapic punishment but its instrument. If this interpretation is possible, it would not be inconsonant with the point I am making about Priapus' loss of generic identity in this Satire.

<sup>10</sup> Kießling and Heinze (n. 6), 136, 'Anlaß zu den lustigen Versen (i.e. Sat. 1.8) wird gegeben haben, daß eines der Priapbilder in Maecenas' Gärten wirklich die Beschädigung aufwies, deren Entstehung hier erklärt wird'. I refer to Kießling without having checked pre-Heinze editions. Heinze says in his preface to the fifth edition (1921), 'ganz unverändert ist kaum eine Seite geblieben'.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *Priap.* 48 for observable physical peculiarity; perhaps also 26.

<sup>12</sup> P. Grimal, *Les Jardins romains* (Paris, 1969<sup>2</sup>), 143–5.

<sup>13</sup> So Häuber (e-mail message to me 3 Apr. 2007).

*destricto deus / Priapus ego sum. mortis et uitae locus.*<sup>14</sup> This guarding of a tomb is unique in Priapic texts (and this metre is attested in a Priapic poem elsewhere only in [Tib.] *Priapeum* 2 Luck = *Priap.* 83 Bücheler). These two inscriptions are the first two items in Hans Herter's inventory under the heading 'De Priapo mortis et uitae deo'.<sup>15</sup> But in this inventory one will not find, after the inscription just quoted (*custos sepulcri*, etc.), any certain example of a Priapus guarding a tomb. One has to distinguish, then, between guardianship of tomb and of garden belonging to tomb. There were many such gardens, many *kēpotaphia*, on the outskirts of Rome.<sup>16</sup> They are described in detail in inscriptions, for example, 'to this tomb belong the vegetable garden which is enclosed within the wall, and the summer house built beside the door to serve as a porter's lodge' (*CIL* 6.13823) or 'shops, three in number, to the left and right of the tomb ... and the enclosed market garden within ...' (*CIL* 6.31852).<sup>17</sup> One would expect to find a Priapus in such gardens, which were, after all, his normal venue.<sup>18</sup>

These vegetable and market gardens, even with no connection to a *kēpotaphion*, should in fact be considered. They could certainly be found on the Esquiline outside the *agger*, as elsewhere on the outskirts of Rome,<sup>19</sup> and Maecenas' project, which he began in c. 40 B.C.E., was easily large enough to include them. It took in an area far more extensive than the potter's field, already large by today's standards at 1,000 by 300 feet (*Sat.* 1.8.12), or almost seven acres.<sup>20</sup>

Cicero in *Pro Cluentio* (66 B.C.E.) preserves a picture of the place from about a quarter of a century earlier. It appears in a catalogue of the murders perpetrated by Oppianicus, the father of the plaintiff. One of his victims was Asuvius, a rich young man whose fortune he hoped to acquire. He lured him from Larinum to Rome. There, Oppianicus' henchman, Avillius, forged a will, signing it with Asuvius' name and making Oppianicus the heir. *Asuvius ... , quasi in hortulos iret, in harenarias quasdam extra portam Esquilinam perductus occiditur* (37). Asuvius, gullible though he was, would not have gone outside the Esquiline Gate *quasi in hortulos* unless he knew or could have believed that *hortuli* were in fact to be found in this place.

<sup>14</sup> *CIL* 6.3708 = 5173 = *ILS* 3585 = *CLE* 193 = 153 Courtney. Courtney comments, 'Priapus guards a tomb placed in a garden or vineyard'. But the report of the find-spot given in *CIL* is only 'near the monument', i.e. the one from which 4881–5172 come and for which a plan is given on p. 926, along with quotations from Giovanni Campana's excavation report.

<sup>15</sup> Herter (n. 3), 229–32. Megow (n. 1), 1029 states that the protective function of Priapus extended to houses and graves, citing for the latter Herter (n. 3) and a museum catalogue of Gallo-Roman figurines, M. Rouvier-Jeanlin, *Les Figurines gallo-romaines en terre cuite au Musée des antiquités nationales* (Paris, 1972).

<sup>16</sup> For this phenomenon, see J. Bodet, 'Roman Tomb Gardens', forthcoming in W. Jashemski (ed.), *Gardens of the Roman Empire* (vel sim.) (Cambridge).

<sup>17</sup> The translations are those of N. Purcell, 'Town in country and country in town', in E.B. MacDougall (ed.), *Ancient Roman Villa Gardens* (Washington, DC, 1984), 188, n. 4.

<sup>18</sup> But not in a cemetery, despite P. Lejay, *Oeuvres d'Horace* (Satires) (Paris, 1911), 217: 'Un Priape n'était pas déplacé dans un cimetière'.

<sup>19</sup> Suetonius called the Pincian Hill the *collis hortulorum* (*Ner.* 50).

<sup>20</sup> An acre is 43,560 square feet. If Häuber is right about the location of the grove of the *Querquetulanae uirae* (cf. n. 25 below), then Maecenas' gardens extended as far south as the modern Via Labicana. She believes the so-called *horti Lamiani* were part of the gardens of Maecenas (see 'Il luogo del ritrovamento del gruppo del Laocoonte e la *domus Titi imperatoris* (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 36,37–38)', in *Laocoonte alle Origini dei Musei Vaticani* [Rome, 2006], 41–7) and estimates the size of the gardens as about 62 acres (25 hectares), while the size would have been about 35 acres (14 hectares) if, as others believe, the gardens of Maecenas and the so-called *horti Lamiani* were divided by the former ancient Via Merulana (e-mail message to me 23 Apr. 2007).

Livy's description, applying to a much earlier time (211 B.C.E.), coincides in two details with what is known of the Esquiline at the end of the Republic and the beginning of the Principate. Hannibal is only a few miles from Rome. The consuls organize the defence of the city. Amongst other things they decide to send a band of 1,200 Numidian deserters from their bivouac on the Aventine to the Esquiline: *media urbe transire Esquilias iusserunt, nullos aptiores inter conualles tectaque hortorum et sepulcra et cauas undique vias ad pugnandum futuros rati* (26.10.5–6).<sup>21</sup> The gardens will reappear in Cicero's description (though Cicero refers to *hortuli* and perhaps means a different kind of garden).<sup>22</sup> The tombs will reappear in the Satire under discussion. Priapus can see *magna sepulchra*.<sup>23</sup>

Renewal of the Esquiline outside the *agger* had to deal with a variegated terrain, put to various uses over the centuries.<sup>24</sup> From Cicero one knows also of the sandpits in which Asuvius met his end. If there was an oak tree tall enough to provide shade for Maecenas, it had to have preceded the *horti*, as Häuber has argued, proposing that it belonged originally to a sacred grove which she identifies as that of the *Querquetulanae uirae*.<sup>25</sup> It has been suggested that the *kolumbēthra* constructed by Maecenas (Dio Cass. 55.7) was a thermal spring found on the spot and reused by him for his own purposes.<sup>26</sup> Similarly, the old Priapus of *Satire* 8 could have been found in one of the gardens referred to by Cicero and left there, somewhere within eyeshot of the potter's field.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Tacitus' description of a place 'not far from the city', to the north, on the Via Salaria, where Petilius Cerealis, sent ahead by Antonius with a thousand horse, was routed by a motley band of Vitellians: *inter aedificia hortosque et anfractus uiarum* (Hist. 3.79). See K. Wellesley, *Cornelius Tacitus: The Histories, Book III* (Sydney, 1972) on *anfractus uiarum*: 'the north-eastern suburbs of Rome beyond the Castra Praetoria seem to have contained a number of cemeteries and suburban estates, connected with the main roads by rough tracks; cf. Suet. *Nero* 48–49'.

<sup>22</sup> These gardens make one think of the garden plots which one still sees in cities in the U.S., England and Europe: the English 'allotments', the 'German 'Einzelgärten' in a 'Kleingartenanlage', the Italian 'orti urbani', the French 'jardins potagers communautaires' or 'potagers urbains municipaux'. *Tecta* makes one think of the charming, ingeniously constructed sheds that these gardens sometimes have.

<sup>23</sup> Line 36. Cf. Cic. *Ph.* 9.17 for such a tomb on the Esquiline. See J. Bodel, 'Monumental Villas and Villa Monuments', *JRA* 10 (1997), 20–1 for monumental tombs on villa properties.

<sup>24</sup> See Bodel (n. 16) on the competition for space outside the walls: 'Romans looking for extra-mural burial sites competed for space not only with the suburban villas of the wealthy but also with warehouses, manufactories, transportation depots, markets, and squatter communities of laborers (notably teamsters, tanners, and brickmakers) and marginalized groups such as funerary tradesmen, foreign immigrants, and devotees of certain exotic cults'. The best-known case is Cicero's search for *horti* for a shrine for Tullia, an obsessive theme of *Att.* 12–13 (45–44 B.C.E.). As he himself says, *de hortis etiam atque etiam rogo* (12.22.3). See also N. Purcell's evocation of what a person would have seen as he or she left Rome through the Esquiline Gate in 55 C.E.: (n. 17), 187–8 and, more specifically on the area of Maecenas' estate, Häuber (n. 6 [1990]), 106–7 with fig. 73. Inside the wall, in the Vicus Sabuci (see Häuber 1990, loose-leaf Map 2 E6), where kilns have been found, Maecenas seems to have taken over a business district as part of his 'urban renewal': see Häuber, op. cit., 106.

<sup>25</sup> *maluit umbrosam quercum* (*Eleg. Maec.* 1.33). Häuber, 'Wald und Siedlung im antiken Rom – Spuren heiliger Haine auf dem Mons Oppius', *Siedlungsforschung: Archäologie – Geschichte – Geographie* 19 (2001), 59, 76 (with citation of F. Castagnoli, 'Il tempio romano: Questioni di tipologia e di terminologia', *PBSR* 52 [1984], 20, n. 85 for the incorporation of pre-existing shrines in private estates), 88; for the location Häuber (n. 6 [2005(2006)]), 16, 18; (n. 20), 45.

<sup>26</sup> S. Rizzo, 'Horti Mecenatiani', in '7c. Gli "Horti" dell'Esquilino', in *Roma Capitale 1870–1911*, 7: *L'Archeologia in Roma capitale tra sterro e scavo* (Venice, 1983), 195–6.

One should consider, then, the possibility that Priapus is punning when he says *nouis ... in hortis*, simultaneously using *horti* in two senses: as the plural of *hortus* 'garden' and as the plural *horti* in the sense of 'urban villa' (cf. *OLD* s.v. *hortus* 2).<sup>27</sup> Priapus' life story begins with a description of his generic function in gardens in the primary sense, including two lines on his scarecrow function in 'new gardens', that is newly planted gardens. He goes on to say, in effect, that he has outlived his generic function and, in the setting of 'new gardens', that is Maecenas' new estate, now has a new, post-generic function to guard against witches.

The generic self-description with which the Satire opens would, then, refer first of all to Priapus' functions in that old garden (*hortus* in the primary sense), which would have been either a tomb garden or a market garden or a family vegetable garden. He would have continued to play these generic roles in the indeterminate period extending from the inauguration of Maecenas' new gardens (*horti* in the sense of 'urban villa') up to the moment in which Priapus is speaking (*nunc*, 14). But in this period he has gradually (as *non tantum*, 17 implies) shed these roles, though the main traits of his physical identity, phallus, raised arm and reed, remain the same. The ambiguity of *nouis ... in hortis* (7) covers this diachronic range from the time of someone's old garden with newly planted seeds to Maecenas' incorporation of this old garden into his vaster gardens – from someone's market garden or family vegetable garden or *kēpotaphion* to Maecenas' pleasure gardens. The present tenses of *terret* and of *uetat* (7) are also ambiguous, complementing the ambiguity of 'new'. After *deus inde ego* (sc. *eram* or *sum*?), these present tenses sound at first like an imperfective, descriptive present, that is, descriptive of what Priapus is actually doing, but they turn out to be a general present expressing a *vérité d'expérience* concerning Priapuses which no longer applies to this Priapus' existence.<sup>28</sup>

An antique, fissured Priapus, one losing his physical integrity, a Priapus physically recontextualized in new *horti* in which he abandons his traditional functions – he would be the perfect image for loss of poetic-generic identity. In his new role Priapus is post-generic in this sense too. He makes fun of himself as a Priapus.<sup>29</sup> He is not speaking, after lines 1–7, to a reader imagined as reading Priapic verses posted in a shrine of Priapus or near a Priapus statue. He no longer conveys his characteristic phallic threats. He has forgotten the metres of the *Priapea*.<sup>30</sup> Speaking in dactylic hexameters, he refers to those ne'er-do-well's Pantolabus and Nomentanus (11; cf. *Sat.* 2.1.21); he describes Horace's horrid fascination, Canidia, and her companion

<sup>27</sup> The suggestion concerning *horti* as a pun came to me from John Bodel (e-mail message 31 Mar. 2007).

<sup>28</sup> On the Latin present see A. Ernout and F. Thomas, *Syntaxe Latine* (Paris, 1953), 220–1.

<sup>29</sup> Parody is the theme of the short discussion of *Sat.* 1.8 by V. Buchheit, *Studien zum Corpus Priapeorum*, *Zetemata Monographien zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 28 (Munich, 1962), 63–4.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. n. 1 above for the comparative value of the *Priapea*.

<sup>31</sup> For Canidia, *Hor. Epod.* 5, 17; cf. 3.8; *Sat.* 2.1.48, 8.85. For Sagana, *Epod.* 5.25. For a survey of views on the identity of Canidia see D. Mankin, *Horace: Epodes* (Cambridge, 1995), 299–301. L. Watson, *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes* (Oxford, 2003), 188–9 points out a previously unnoticed parallel between the boy's curses in *Epod.* 5, introduced by *dubius unde rumperet silentium* (85) and Priapus' fart in *Sat.* 1.8: both, by breaking ritual silence, have the effect of vitiating the witches' magical ceremonies.

<sup>32</sup> The description of the trio is from P.M. Brown, *Horace: Satires I.* (Warminster, 1993), ad



Sagana<sup>31</sup>; and he refers to a trio of 'unidentifiable undesirables' (39), all in a way that might remind one of a Satire by Horace.<sup>32</sup>

Rutgers University  
lowedmunds@gmail.com

LOWELL EDMUNDS

loc. Interpretation of this Satire has often called attention to similarities between Priapus and Horace (i.e. in the persona of satirist): W.S. Anderson, 'The form, purpose, and position of Horace's *Satire* I, 8', *AJP* 94 (1972), 4–5; J.E.G. Zetzel, 'Horace's Liber Sermonum: The Structure of Ambiguity', *Arethusa* 13 (1980), 61, 66; J. Henderson, 'Satire writes "Woman": *Gendersong*', *PCPhS* n.s. 35 (1989), 60–2; this piece was 'trimmed and rewritten' (v) under the same title in id., *Writing Down Rome: Satire, Comedy, and Other Offences in Latin Poetry* (Oxford, 1999), 188–91; cf., for the same take on *Sat.* 1.8, id., 'Not "Women in Roman Satire" but "When Satire writes "Woman"'', in S. Braund (ed.), *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome* (Exeter, 1989), 188–91; S. Braund, *Roman Verse Satire*, *Greece & Rome New Surveys in the Classics* 23, (Oxford, 1992), 21; B. Hill, 'Horace, *Satires* 1.8: Whence the witches? Thematic unity within the satire and within the *Satires* of Book I', in M. DeForest (ed.), *Woman's Power, Man's Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King* (Wauconda, IL, 1993), 261; M. Habash, 'Priapus: Horace in disguise?' *CJ* 94 (1999), 285–6, 288–9, 295–6; F. Felgentreu, 'Horaz, *Satiren* I,8 und die Vielfalt der Einfalt', *Hyperboreus* 5 (1999), 281; T.S. Welch, 'Est locus uni cuique suus: City and Status in Horace's *Satires* 1.8 and 1.9', *CA* 20 (2001), 184–7; E. Gowers, 'Blind eyes and cut throats: Amnesia and silence in Horace *Satires* 1.7', *CP* 97 (2002), 159–60; S. Sharland, 'Priapus' magic marker', *AClass* 46 (2003), 105.