THE NAMES IN HORACE'S *SATIRES*

THE methods of assessing a writer's spirit vary in usefulness according to his genre. If he is a satirist much may often be learned through an examination of his names. This is certainly true of Horace, and one might have thought that in recent years a fair amount of attention would have been paid to this aspect of his work. Yet to the best of my knowledge no special study has been published in the present century.[1] Certain points have been well noted by scholars like Vogel, Becher, and Marouzeau,[2] and a few editions contain summaries of the material. The last detailed discussion, however, was that of Cartault, and one must admit that it was not wholly unbiased.[3] So it seems reasonable to review the evidence again, making use of the work done by Marx, Cichorius, Münzer, and others. We do not have to inquire about all the characters in the *Sermones*; only satirical references need be considered, and even here there is room for selection, because some of the figures are so obscure that nothing helpful can be said about them.[4]

At first sight one might assume that the best information about Horace's characters was to be found in the ancient commentators. While Porphyrion's notes date from about the third century and the Pseudo-Acron's may be as late as the fifth, both men had access to a lot of earlier material which has since been lost, including monographs on the characters of Horace.[5] As a result they occasionally preserve fragments of a genuine tradition. But if we ask them for reliable and detailed information they will let us down. Sometimes their notes conflict, as in the Fannius passage (1. 4. 21) where we are told that the senate presented book-cases to Fannius, that he presented book-cases to the senate, that his heirs presented his books to public libraries, and (splendidly) that at the hour of death Fannius begged to be cremated on a pile of his own books. Sometimes the scholiasts misinterpret what is in front of them. In 1. 2. 64, for example, they miss the irony of *Sullae gener* and state that Villius was a metrical substitute for Annius.[6] Often too, as in the case of Trebatius the famous jurist, they tell us a good deal less than we can learn from other sources.[7] So on the whole the ancient commentators are not of much assistance except where they provide corroborative evidence. In their treatment of Horace's names they usually assumed that they were dealing with real individuals. The analysis which follows will indicate that this, like other simple theories, is far from adequate.

For the sake of convenience I have classified the material as (*a*) the names of living people, (*b*) the names of dead people, (*c*) the names of Lucilian characters,

[1] I have not seen the unpublished dissertation by E. J. Filbey referred to by G. C. Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace*, p. 416.

[2] Vogel, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* xxxviii (1918), 404–6; Becher, ibid. lii (1932), 955–8; Marouzeau, *L'Ant. class.* iv (1935), 365 ff.

[3] Cartault, *Étude sur les Satires d'Horace* (Paris, 1899). The work as a whole is still of value, but in his chapter on the names C. was apt to look for individuals where none existed.

[4] e.g. Tanais and Visellius' father-in-law (1. 1. 105), Balbinus (1. 3. 40), Trausius (2. 2. 99).

[5] Keller's findings on the scholiasts are summarized by Wickham, i. 10–12.

[6] Fausta, Sulla's daughter, was married to Annius Milo. Her lover Villius was such a regular feature of her life that Horace called him 'Sulla's son-in-law'. Not all the scholiasts missed the point.

[7] For Trebatius (2. 1. 4) see Sonnet, *R.E.* vi A 2, 2251–61 and E. Fraenkel, *J.R.S.* xlvii (1957), 66–70.

(*d*) significant names, (*e*) the names of other type characters, and (*f*) pseudonyms. Not all the categories are self-contained—(*b*) and (*c*), for instance, obviously overlap; (*f*) has to be included for historical reasons, although we may hesitate to place any name under that heading. Also there are several figures who cannot be assigned with certainty to any one group. In such cases the most one can do is to assess probabilities.

(*a*) *Living people.* The first ones we meet are the hot gospellers Crispinus and Fabius.[1] The bearded, 'bleary-eyed' Crispinus was an obvious target. Like Stertinius, who appears in a later satire, he denounced many habits which Horace himself found objectionable, but his doctrinaire idealism ('all sins are equally culpable'), his lack of social graces, and his eccentric pose disqualified him from serious consideration. Also, from an aesthetic standpoint his sermons were deplorable, being long-winded, over-heated affairs with as little art as his own doggerel verses. The 'gas-bag' Fabius represents the same type. He was one of those speakers who hit the nail on the head with such relentless persistency that the wood eventually splits. As well as being a pedantic bore he has also been put down as an adulterer, but that is unfair. In 1. 2. 134, after listing the dangers of adultery, Horace concludes *deprendi miserum est; Fabio vel iudice vincam*, 'To be caught is a horrid experience—even Fabius would admit that'. Granted this could imply that Fabius had once paid the penalty himself, but a more natural interpretation is that even a Stoic like Fabius would find the consequences painful. So we may take it that Fabius was not an adulterer, but simply a man who had argued himself into believing that the true philosopher was immune to pain, or (to use the old paradox) that the good man could be happy on the rack.[2] Horace would certainly have applauded the student who remarked that it would have to be a very good man and a very bad rack. On the trip to Brundisium (1. 5) three more characters make their appearance. One is Aufidius Luscus the mayor of Fundi, who receives the travellers with grotesque pomp; the others are Sarmentus (a satellite of Maecenas)[3] and a local stalwart called Messius Cicirrus, both of whom keep the company amused by their bucolic repartee. Back in the city we come across the unfortunate Nasica (2. 5. 57), who married his daughter to a rich old fogey in the hope of a legacy and then discovered too late that his aged son-in-law had outwitted him. Two money-lenders also catch our attention. One is the younger Novius (1. 6. 121) who has his table beneath Marsyas' statue and whose face, we are told, accounts for the statue's gesture of abhorrence.[4] The other is Ruso (1. 3. 86), an amateur historian whose readings are always well attended—debtors find his invitations so hard to refuse. A third member of the profession is the 'mongrel' Persius (1. 7. 2), but we do not meet him in Rome since the scene of his operations is Asia Minor. So far we have two cranks, a petty official, a legacy-hunter, three money-lenders, and a couple of buffoons. Not an impressive collection. They

[1] Crispinus: 1. 1. 120, 1. 3. 139, 1. 4. 14, 2. 7. 45; Fabius: 1. 1. 14, 1. 2. 134.

[2] See *Vita Epicuri* 118 (Bailey) and for the general theme Seneca, *De Constantia Sapientis*.

[3] What we know of Sarmentus comes mainly from the scholiast's comment on Juv. 5. 3. It is all set out in Palmer's note on *Serm.* 1. 5. 52.

[4] Horace must surely be referring to an individual. The authenticity of the name may be open to question, but the sceptics have to show why it should have been applied here if it was not genuine. Vogel's theory (op. cit., p. 406) that Marsyas, being the symbol of freedom, could not bear the sight of Novius the upstart strikes me as over-ingenious, and his further association of Novius' position with that of Horace does not seem at all likely.

have scarcely a decent sin among them, and all may be dismissed as harmless nonentities, provided we remember that even nonentities may have feelings.

A more worthy target for the satirist's wit is presented by Tillius the stingy and unpopular magistrate,[1] and also by Galba and Sallust, a pair of well-to-do people who are accused of licentiousness in 1. 2.[2] It would be a mistake to imagine that Horace's satires were inspired by any of these characters. They did not interest him enough to arouse his anger, and their main function is to provide his essays with coloured illustrations. But again, having made this point, we should ask ourselves how far the victims would have been mollified by such delicate considerations.

From these rather detached and incidental allusions we turn to a few expressions of genuine personal dislike. They are to be found for the most part in 1.10, where they centre on characters like Hermogenes, Demetrius, Pantilius, Fannius, and a few others. Of these gentlemen one, we are told, is a pansy, another is an ape, a third is a louse, a fourth a fool, and they are all a crowd of malicious back-biters. Readers need hardly be reminded that the names belong not to any monsters of crime or vice but to men whose taste in poetry happened to differ from Horace's own.

Up to now we have been discussing people certainly or probably living when the *Satires* were written. More doubt exists in the case of characters like Fausta (1. 2. 64), Alfenus (1. 3. 130), Damasippus (2. 3. 16), Labeo (1. 3. 82), the son of Aesopus (2. 3. 239), and the sons of Arrius (2. 3. 243). Fausta, that lady of high birth and low morals, was born in 86 B.C. She was certainly living in 51 B.C.,[3] and when the second satire was written she could not have been more than forty-seven years old. Alfenus, if identical with Alfenus Varus the celebrated jurist,[4] was definitely alive; if not, there is no firm evidence either way. He was a man who had risen in the social scale, and it was naughty of Horace to recall his connexions with trade. Damasippus the wealthy art dealer is shown by Cicero's correspondence to have been alive in 45 B.C.[5] In Horace he appears as one driven out of his wits by financial losses and only saved from suicide by the timely intervention of Stertinius, who persuades him that he is really no madder than anyone else. The other names all belong to men who had achieved fame through some act of conspicuous lunacy. Labeo cannot be identified with certainty and should

[1] 1. 6. 24–26 and 107–11. On political grounds it is doubtful whether Tillius could have been the brother of Tillius Cimber the conspirator. See Münzer, *R.E.* vi A 1, 1037. (Subsequent references are to Münzer unless otherwise indicated.)

[2] I am assuming that Galba (46) belonged to a branch of the *gens Sulpicia*. Sallustius (48) was a man of some social consequence—probably not the historian, since the latter was alleged to be an adulterer (Gell. 17. 15) whereas this man made a point of avoiding *matronae* (54). It may be the historian's grand-nephew. See *R.E.* i A 2, 1955 (Stein) and *Carm.* 2. 2.

[3] Cic. *Att.* 5. 8. 2. Fausta's twin brother was killed after Thapsus in 46 B.C. Her lover Villius is usually equated with the Sextus Villius mentioned in *Fam.* 2. 6. 1 (53 B.C.). Longarenus is unknown. Another of Fausta's paramours, Pompeius Macula (Macrob. 2. 2. 9), was probably the man referred to in *Fam.* 6. 19. 1 (45 B.C.).

[4] This is the traditional view, see Klebs in *R.E.* i. 1472 and Frank in *C.Q.* xiv (1920). Such an eminent contemporary, however, appears rather out of place in this satire. The word *vafer* is of little assistance, for Alfenus must have improved his position after closing his shop and this would be enough to suggest shrewdness whether or not he took up law. The authority of F. Schulz (*Hist. of Roman Legal Science*, p. 42) has to be used with caution. Fraenkel is right in saying that Schulz rejects the scholiast's story (*Horace*, p. 89), but Schulz nevertheless believes that Horace had the jurist in mind.

[5] *Att.* 12. 33. 1; also *Fam.* 7. 23. 2 and 3.

perhaps be put in another category,[1] but the son of Aesopus is mentioned by Cicero.[2] He was a young man in 47 B.C.—about fourteen years before the poem in question was written. Arrius, who is also mentioned by Cicero, must have died about 50 B.C.[3] His sons could have survived to see the publication of book 2 in 30 B.C. If they did, they must have been disconcerted to find themselves described as 'a famous pair of brothers, twins in depravity and silliness and in their love of evil'.

Certain other figures are mentioned as though they were contemporary, but it is often hard to tell whether they are real or fictitious. Those which appear to be fictitious will be discussed later. In the case of the others one can point out that Cerinthus the pretty boy (1. 2. 81) is directly addressed in the most Lucilian of all Horace's satires, that the reference to Rufillus and Gargonius and their contrasting odours (1. 2. 27) is repeated in 1. 4. 92 in such a way as to suggest that it had given offence, that neither Natta (1. 6. 124) nor Iulius (1. 8. 39) sounds like a type name, and that the phrase *fragilis Pediatia* (1. 8. 39) seems too carefully pointed to be without a target. But none of these arguments would impress a tough-minded sceptic.

(*b*) *Dead people.* A number of Horace's gibes, though perhaps not quite so many as one often assumes, are aimed at persons whom we know to have been dead. Some of these characters may be classified by their attitude to money. Thus while Staberius and Ummidius worshipped it with the devotion of true misers, Aristippus was senselessly indifferent to it; so were Volanerius the obsessive gambler and Marsaeus who ruined himself for the sake of an actress.[4] Fufidius the miser (1. 2. 12) may also belong to this group. One thinks first of the Quintus Fufidius mentioned by Cicero in *Pis.* 86, *Q.F.* 3. 1. 3, *Att.* 11. 13. 3, 14. 3, 15. 2 (*R.E.* no. 1). If this is the man in question he must represent a type, because although dead he is spoken of in the present tense. Alternatively Horace might have had in mind a living person. We do know of a Fufidius who was alive in 46 B.C. (Cic. *Fam.* 13. 11. 1, 12. 1, *R.E.* no. 7), but there is no evidence that he was a miser.

Passing quickly over Sisyphus (Antony's dwarf, 1. 3. 47), the blustering poet Cassius Etruscus (1. 10. 61f.), and the black sheep Laevinus (1. 6. 12), we come to Priscus (2. 7. 9) the senator whose life was a jumble of absurd contradictions. The problem of consistency, which in morals involves the integration of the personality and in art the achievement of unity amid variety, held a special interest for Horace. So it is no accident that whereas most Horatian characters are presented with a few strokes here and a touch of colour there, Priscus should be honoured with a seven-line verbal cameo. But even Priscus is eclipsed by another of his kind—I refer to that splendid bohemian Tigellius, who occupies the opening section of 1. 3 (a poem written about 37 or 36 B.C.). Tigellius was a musician from Sardinia who had been quite a well-known figure in Roman society a few years before. He was on familiar terms with Julius Caesar and

[1] M. Antistius Labeo, the lawyer, is possible temperamentally but not chronologically, having been born *c.* 50 B.C. His father who died at Philippi, is of the right age, but there is no evidence of any *insania*. The tribune C. Atinius Labeo committed an act of *insania*, but this took place in 131 B.C. Fraenkel (*Horace*, p. 89) suggests that we overcome this chronological difficulty by assuming that the name occurred in Lucilius.

[2] *Att.* 11. 15. 3.

[3] He was alive in 52 B.C. (*Pro Mil.* 46), but dead before the *Brutus* was composed—i.e. before 46 B.C. *R.E.* ii. 1253 (Klebs).

[4] Staberius 2. 3. 84; Ummidius 1. 1. 95; Aristippus 2. 3. 100; Volanerius 2. 7. 15; Marsaeus 1. 2. 55.

Octavian; he knew Cicero well enough to quarrel with him; and he had the distinction of being lampooned by Calvus.[1] In 1. 2, written shortly after his death, he is depicted as one who spent money freely in rather raffish company. And the description in 1. 3 suggests a man who lived not according to this or that philosophy but simply for dramatic effect. Had someone reminded him of the old Delphic maxim 'Know thyself' he would have answered with a sigh 'Ah, but which one?' Flamboyant and unstable, amusing and insincere, Tigellius represented the antithesis of the ideal Roman type. The empire called for sound purposeful men with a strong sense of duty and not too much imagination, and Stoicism, when suitably adapted, provided the necessary intellectual framework—rather like public school Christianity. So in commending the man who is 'all of a piece' Horace is affirming a national ethical tradition. Yet the amount of time spent in deriding Tigellius reminds us that Horace himself was not always a model of *aequabilitas*; indeed this very point is hinted at in line 19:

> nunc aliquis dicat mihi 'quid tu?
> nullane habes vitia?'

after which the satire takes a new turn and proceeds to its main theme of friendly tolerance.

Before leaving this group one should say a word about Cervius the informer, Turius the crooked judge, and Scaeva the poisoner, who all appear in 2. 1. 47–56. The charges against them are grave ones, but they are made in a poem

[1] Cic. *Att.* 13. 49, 50, 51; *Fam.* 7. 24. The evidence is summarized by Wickham in his introduction to *Serm.* 1. 3. I have distinguished the Sardinian Tigellius of 1. 2. 3 and 1. 3. 4 from the Hermogenes (Tigellius) mentioned in 1. 3. 129, 1. 4. 72, 1. 9. 25, 1. 10. 17–18, 80, 90. The two men were regarded as identical by the scholiasts and this opinion has been held in recent times by Münzer (*R.E.* vi A1, 943–946), Ullman (*C.Ph.* x [1915], 270–96) and Fairclough (Loeb, 54). But since Kirchner many scholars have recognized two different men. Argument has centred on personal characteristics, on the names employed, on the relationship with Calvus, and on the question whether Hermogenes was alive or dead. Nothing can be proved under the first two headings; the traits and names could belong to one person but need not do so. As regards Calvus, we know that he ridiculed the Sardinian (*Sardi Tigelli putidum caput venit*), but according to 1. 10. 17–18 he was *admired* by Hermogenes and his friend (*nil praeter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum*). The natural interpretation of this point is in favour of the separatists. Realizing this, Ullman wanted to take *cantare* either ironically or else in the sense of 'satirize' (op. cit., pp 295–6). But *cantare* cannot mean 'satirize' without considerable help from the context, as in 2. 1. 46. Fairclough, who purports to follow Ullman, translates it by 'droning', but this does not bring out the opposition required by Ullman, namely Horace–Calvus–Catullus–Atticists versus Lucilius–Tigellius–Asianists.

We know that the Sardinian was dead. What about Hermogenes? He certainly appears to be alive, because his actions occur in the present tense, except at 1. 10. 18 and there the perfect is always taken as primary. Again the unitarians have to provide another explanation, and they do not offer the same one. Münzer says that Hermogenes had become a type figure and could therefore be referred to in the present tense. Ullman regards Hermogenes as a very specific individual and would explain the tense in terms of idioms such as 'Horace tells us to enjoy our youth'. Münzer's is the more plausible theory (Ullman's idioms are not strictly analogous), and it must be tested by an examination of each passage. Now in 1. 3. 129, 1. 4. 72, and 1. 9. 25 it is possible to substitute some general phrase for Hermogenes, e.g. 'a Hermogenes', or 'someone like Hermogenes'. But in the other passages this cannot be done so easily. In 1. 10. 18 Hermogenes is associated with a particular ape (*iste*); in 80 he is closely connected with Fannius, and almost as closely with Demetrius and Pantilius. And if they are all banished from reality, the following lines with their references to Maecenas, Virgil, and the rest are gravely weakened. Finally, in 90–91 a general substitution of this kind is virtually impossible.

which, because of its late date, is unlikely to contain any real aggressiveness; moreover, they come immediately after Horace's promise that he will not attack any live person unless provoked. Therefore it is best to assume that the characters in question were not living. This leaves two possibilities; they may be fictions, in which case we can hardly hope to guess why these particular names should have been chosen,[1] or they may be real people whose sinister reputation was still fresh. The second suggestion would be well in line with the satire's jocular tone, for we all know how a criminal who has captured the popular imagination becomes on his death a kind of mythological hero-villain. Rasputin regularly makes his appearance in the Sunday newspapers, and Dr. Crippen is still with us, enshrined by an affectionate public within the chamber of horrors.

(*c*) *Lucilian characters.* The most straightforward case is that of Gallonius (2. 2. 47):

> haud ita pridem
> Galloni praeconis erat acipensere mensa
> infamis.

This is a clear reference to the gluttonous auctioneer attacked by Lucilius:

> 'o Publi, o gurges Galloni, es homo miser' inquit.[2]

We can also feel fairly confident about Maenius. His extravagance is mentioned in *Epist.* 1. 15. 26–42, and also by Porphyrion on *Serm.* 1. 3. 21, who tells us that when Maenius was forced to sell his house in the Forum he reserved one column to enable him to watch the gladiatorial shows—a column which Lucilius referred to in the fragment *Maenius columnam dum peteret.*[3] So the Horatian and the Lucilian Maenius are probably the same person. There is an equal degree of probability in the case of Pacideianus, who according to Lucilius was 'far and away the best gladiator the world has ever seen'.[4] A Pacideianus also appears in *Serm.* 2. 7. 97 and it is most likely that the two men are identical, though Heinze thinks that the name had been adopted by a fighter of Horace's own day—a practice which was not unknown.[5]

From now on more serious problems arise. Take the rich skin-flint Opimius (2. 3. 146 ff.). There is also an Opimius in the Lucilian fragments, in fact there are two. One is Quintus Opimius, consul in 154 B.C., who as a boy had a reputation for sexual depravity; the other is his son Lucius Opimius who held the consulship in 121 B.C. and was later exiled for accepting bribes from Jugurtha.[6] Obviously neither has anything to do with the Horatian figure, who

[1] Vogel (op. cit.) points to the antithesis *Scaeva–dextera*. I should think, however, that *dextera* was put in on account of *Scaeva* rather than *vice versa*.

[2] Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin*, iii. 200–7. I give references to W. since Marx is not so widely available.

[3] W. 1136–7. In 180 B.C. when Cato was buying land for the Basilica Porcia, Maenius sold his house, reserving the right to build a balcony on one of the columns of the new Basilica. This is the column to which Porph. is referring. Lehmann-Hartleben (*A.J.P.* lix [1938], 280–90) rejects the evidence for an earlier column in honour of C. Maenius.

[4] W. 174–5.

[5] See Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners*, iv. 257–63 of the Eng. trans. The other two names do not help us. Fulvius is common enough. Rutuba may be a significant name. Varro used *rutuba* in the sense of *perturbatio* (Non. 167. 9), hence Marouzeau (op. cit., p. 374) renders Rutuba by *Le Grabuge*. All this proves nothing about the figure's reality. No one who saw 'The Brown Bomber' in action would have mistaken him for an abstract type.

[6] W. 450–3.

owes his name to the oxymoron *pauper Opimius*—'Poor Mr. Rich'. Albucius is a somewhat similar case. A person of that name appears twice in Horace, once as a victim of Canidia's poison (2. 1. 48) and once as a cruel old martinet (2. 2. 67). The Lucilian character, however, was Titus Albucius, who was ridiculed by Q. Mucius Scaevola for his addiction to Greek phrases.[1] In *Serm.* 1. 4. 69 Caelius is a brigand. What was the Caelius in fragment 1008 of Lucilius? Wickham, very conveniently, thinks he was a brigand. Others have seen in him a poet, an historian, a judge, a ball-player, and a friend of the satirist's. The most likely guess is that of Lucian Müller, namely that he was an officer celebrated by Ennius for his deeds in the Istrian war.[2]

> quid mi igitur suades? ut vivam Naevius aut sic
> ut Nomentanus?

These exasperated words come from the miser in 1. 1. 101. Porphyrion comments: *Naevius autem fuit in tantum parcus ut sordidus merito haberetur Lucilio auctore.*[3] So Naevius appeared as a miser in Lucilius. That is very interesting, if true. But he is not a miser in Horace; in fact he is the very opposite. Porphyrion must have misread the lines. A further complication is introduced by 2. 2. 68–69 where Naevius is a careless host who gives his guests greasy water to wash in. This is certainly not the action of a spendthrift, nor does it quite suggest a miser. It is rather a sign of slackness. The *simplex* Naevius carries informality too far.

Last of all there is Nomentanus.[4] He is so widely accepted as a Lucilian character that one is apt to forget that he owes his place in the fragments to the good offices of Scaliger and Stephanus. At W. 80–81 Scaliger proposed *Nomentani quae* for the MSS. *nomen iamque.* This conjecture is endorsed by Müller, Cichorius, and Warmington,[5] and it is called 'uncertain, but neat and plausible' by Housman;[6] it is rejected by Baehrens, Marx, and Terzaghi. The admission of Nomentanus to W. 82 is likewise disputed. Donatus on Terence, *Phormio* 1. 2. 73 gives *qui te montane malum.* By his correction *Momentane* Stephanus opened the way for *Nomentane.* In his text of Donatus Wessner prints *Nomentane*, but in the Appendix he apparently accepts *qui di te, montane, malum* with Marx.[7] Suppose, however, that Nomentanus should be restored in both passages, then the Lucilian character would appear to have been L. Atilius Nomentanus, an associate of Scaevola's. This suggestion is advanced by Cichorius,[8] and notice what he adds: 'Eine Beziehung freilich auf den bei Horaz mehrfach vorkommenden Verschwender Nomentanus, der nach Porphyrio zu Horaz *Sat.* 1. 1. 102 L. Cassius Nomentanus hiess, muss ganz ausser dem Spiele bleiben.' This statement may be a little over-confident, because Porphyrion could have been wrong. It is also fallacious to argue, as Cartault does,[9] that since Nomentanus was present at Nasidienus's dinner party he cannot have been the man mentioned by Lucilius. But at least we *can* say that no certain connexion has been established between the Horatian and the Lucilian Nomentanus.[10]

Under this heading, therefore, we have found three characters (Gallonius,

[1] W. 84–93.

[2] See Cichorius, *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius*, pp. 187 ff.

[3] *Lucilio auctore* is a conjecture of Marx's (1212 in his edition).

[4] 1. 1. 102; 1. 8. 11; 2. 1. 22; 2. 3. 175, 224; 2. 8. 23, 25, 60.

[5] But I do not see how W. arrives at his translation.

[6] *C.Q.* i (1907), 59.

[7] Donatus ii, P. Wessner (Teubner), 536.

[8] Op. cit., pp. 244 ff.

[9] Op. cit., p. 288.

[10] The occurrence of Lucilius in the Pseudo-Acron's comment on 2. 1. 22 makes no sense and must be a slip.

Maenius, and Pacideianus) who may be said with confidence to have been drawn from Lucilian satire. There may be others, but we cannot be sure.[1]

(*d*) *Significant names.* Let us start with names which were certainly or probably chosen solely on account of their derivations. Opimius (2. 3. 142) has already been mentioned. Apart from the oxymoron involving his name, the context is that of a fable which could well have begun with 'once upon a time'. Then we have Maltinus (1. 2. 25). According to Nonius 37. 6 *malta* meant an effeminate fop,[2] and that is just what Maltinus was. The coincidence is too great and the name too uncommon to permit the possibility of a personal reference. Moreover the opposite extreme, namely that of virile exhibitionism, is represented by the colourless *est qui* (25). Cupiennius the adulterer (1. 2. 36) is a similar case. Again the aptness of name to context is too good to be true, and again the antithesis is supplied by an anonymous phrase *quidam notus homo* (31). Porcius also belongs to this group. He is projected by his situation and we see him just long enough to catch his party piece, which was to polish off a whole cake in a single mouthful (2. 8. 24). He is linked with Nomentanus, who, whatever his origins, had now become a type figure. The same goes for Nomentanus' other comrade the *scurra* Pantolabus (1. 8. 11 and 2. 1. 22).[3]

If the five names just quoted are clear cases, another five can be cited which do not allow the same degree of confidence. In 2. 6. 72 the dancer Lepos no doubt epitomizes the subjects of fashionable gossip, but Lepos is also just the kind of name which a real dancer might have had. Heinze reminds us of an actor called Favor (he omits the reference, which is Suet. *Vesp.* 19), and Stein in *R.E.* vi. 2078 assures us that this was not an isolated instance. The mean Avidienus (2. 2. 55) looks very like a type figure until we find that he possesses a nickname—*Canis* (56). This is inconclusive, since *Canis* may recall simply the general notion of Cynic asceticism, but the pun in 64—*hac urget lupus hac canis*—is slightly improved if one assumes that Horace had not invented the nickname. Or consider Ofellus (2. 2. 2). At first sight it seems a suspiciously neat paradox that the virtues of frugality should be expounded by a man called Mr. Titbit (*ofella*), but when Horace steps forward in 112 with the words

> puer hunc ego parvus Ofellum
> integris opibus novi non latius usum
> quam nunc accisis. videas metato in agello . . .

and when we hear that Ofellus' farm has now been assigned to a veteran with the very specific name of Umbrenus, we begin to believe that we are dealing with a real person after all. There is also something more than word-play behind 'that louse Pantilius' (*πᾶν τίλλειν*) in 1. 10. 78. The name is found in *C.I.L.* 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. Finally, let us take an instance where the balance appears evenly poised. In 1. 6. 40 the upstart Novius seems a perfect example of a significant name. What then are we to say of the younger Novius in 121 who, as we argued above,

[1] Fraenkel has suggested that Labeo (1. 3. 82) and Barrus the fop (1. 6. 30) may have figured in Lucilius (*Horace*, p. 89, and *Festschrift Reitzenstein*, p. 130, n. 1).

[2] See W. 744.

[3] Pantolabus (*πᾶν* + *λαβεῖν*) is identified by the scholiasts with one Mallius Verna; in *Epist.* 1. 15. 26 he is equated with Maenius. Franke wanted to alter Mallius to Maenius, and some editors, e.g. Orelli and Palmer, have disposed of Naevius (1. 1. 101) in the same way. These changes simplify matters, but the method is a drastic one.

is almost certainly an individual? Perhaps the least difficult solution here is to break the balance in half and to say that the two figures are unrelated.[1]

A significant name, though in theory quite general, may be limited in some way by its context. Thus while Porcius on his own would represent The Glutton, his frame of reference is narrowed by his appearing at table in the company of Fundanius, Viscus, Varius, and Maecenas. So that readers would tend to see him not just as The Glutton but rather as the sort of glutton that Horace knew.

This leads on to a further point. In English literature we are all familiar with My Lord Plausible, Sir John Brute, Lady Fanciful, and the other types which bow and sidle through the drawing-rooms of Restoration Comedy. Now in spite of the dramatist's assurance that no personal references were intended the audience would persist in using its imagination. This practice can be illustrated by the epilogue to *The Way of the World*:

> Others there are whose malice we'd prevent
> Such as watch plays with scurrilous intent
> To mark out who by characters are meant.
> And though no perfect likeness they can trace
> Yet each pretends to know the copied face.
> These with false glosses feed their own ill nature
> And turn to libel what was meant a satire.

Something of the same kind must have happened to Horace. Granted his readers were as a whole less idle, less sophisticated, and less malicious than the patrons of the London playhouses, but on the other hand his names, unlike those of the Restoration Comedy, were in actual use at the time. The truth is that the Roman system of *cognomina* made it difficult to employ significant names without appearing personal. One need only recall the dramatic role played in Republican politics by gentlemen called Pea, Bald, Dull, and Soak—names which an Englishman would not expect to encounter outside a Shakespearian romance. Or think of that occasion in 59 B.C. when the actor Diphilus raised a storm of applause by declaiming the innocuous line *nostra miseria tu es magnus*—all because of Pompey's *cognomen*.[2] In much the same way when Horace's *Satires* first appeared they caused a certain amount of enjoyable if misguided speculation. Several of the names clearly belonged to individuals; as for the rest, a little stretching here, a little padding there, and the cap could usually be made to fit someone. Cupiennius, for instance, was linked by one tradition with C. Cupiennius Libo of Cumae, an acquaintance of Augustus, and some scholars still find this credible.

Apart altogether from readers' fantasies, there are several places where a definite person is named, and where the derivation, however apposite, can be

[1] Caprius and Sulcius (1. 4. 65 f. and 70) also present a problem. Radermacher (*Wien. St.* liii [1935], 80 ff.) thinks (*a*) that the names suggest figs called *caper* and *sulca*—an inference from *caprificus* and Columella 5. 10. 11, (*b*) that this in turn suggests the Greek συκο-φάντης, an informer (cf. Porph.'s note: *hi acerrimi delatores et causidici fuisse traduntur*), (*c*) that the names also hint at *caper* and *sulcus* (=*cunnus*). (*c*) is scarcely apposite. (*b*) is ingenious but somewhat far-fetched. It also depends on (*a*) which is by no means certain. I have not seen *caper* alone in this sense, and the reading at Columella 5. 10. 11 is doubtful. On the whole it is probably best to take the names as referring to contemporary lampoonists. See Ullman, *T.A.P.A.* xlviii (1917), 177–18. This would be still more likely if we followed Fraenkel's suggestion (*Horace*, p. 127, n. 3) and read Sulgius.

[2] Cic. *Att.* 2. 19. 3. The Roman audience was always on the look-out for a line which could be given a contemporary application. Cf. *Sest.* 57, 120.

of only secondary importance, e. g. Stertinius (*stertere*), Furius (*furere*), and Philodemus (φιλεῖν + δῆμος).[1] The last is of special interest, for when Philodemus of Gadara joked about his name suiting his nature

αὐταί που Μοῖραί με κατωνόμασαν Φιλόδημον
ὡς ἀεὶ Δημοῦς θερμὸς ἔχει με πόθος[2]

he little thought that the verbal coincidence would some day be used to argue him out of his place in a Roman diatribe.[3]

Etymology therefore, if used with restraint, does help us to understand the *Satires*. But when we are asked to note the significance of Luscus ('Squint-Eye'), Nasidienus ('The Nose'), and Arellius ('Dry Old Croesus'), and when we are urged to alter Gargonius to Gorgonius and Scetani to Sectani, then it is time to call a halt.[4]

(*e*) *Names of other type characters*. Under this miscellaneous heading we may include figures taken from Greek myth and legend such as Tantalus, Sisyphus, Agave, Orestes, Atrides, Ulysses, Ajax, Teiresias, Penelope, and Helen;[5] the slave types Dama and Davus;[6] and also probably Apella the superstitious Jew.[7] Apella was a common name among freedmen, and most of the Jewish community in Rome belonged to that class. This would not rule out the further possibility that Horace was punning on the custom of circumcision. Such was the view of Porphyrion (*finxit nomen quasi sine pelle*), and it would link up with *curtis Iudaeis* in 1. 9. 70.

Lastly we should include the figures mentioned in 2. 3. 69 ff. Nerius suggests a man of wisdom and prophetic insight. Wily Cicuta ('Hemlock') is the keen financier. Both stand for 'Something in the City' and both are tricked by Proteus the archetype of slippery customers. Perellius in 75 should probably be placed among the dead people who had come to represent a particular occupation. Our equivalent, allowing for the vast difference in scale, would be someone like Morgan or Rothschild. The alternative is to regard Nerius Cicuta, and the others as nicknames of living characters. But this is less plausible. It will not work in the case of Proteus or Perellius, and in 175 Cicuta is associated with the typical spendthrift Nomentanus.

(*f*) *Pseudonyms*. We all know how love poets like Catullus and Propertius used to conceal their lady-friends' identity under false names. Perhaps 'conceal' is hardly the right word, for since the pseudonyms were metrically equivalent to the real names (Lesbia = Clodia, Cynthia = Hostia), and since tongues wagged as busily in the Forum as they do in Mayfair or Park Avenue, the disguise tended to be about as effective as Coan silk. What we should like to know is whether Horace used the same device in the *Satires*. Certainly the scholiasts thought he did, and there is no *a priori* reason why he should not have done so. Nevertheless, not one case has been proved, and the guesses vary greatly in plausibility. The most widely accepted case is Pitholeon (1. 10. 22),

[1] Stertinius 2. 3. 33; Furius 2. 5. 41; Philodemus 1. 2. 121.

[2] *A.P.* 5. 115. Cf. *Epig. ascribed to Martial* 20. 4–5 (Demophilus).

[3] Palmer, p. xvi.

[4] Luscus 1. 5. 43; Nasidienus 2. 8. 1; Arellius 2. 6. 78; Gargonius 1. 2. 27; Scetanus 1. 4. 112. These suggestions are to be found in Palmer, p. xvi, and Marouzeau, op. cit.

[5] Tantalus 1. 1. 68; Sisyphus 2. 3. 21; Agave 2. 3. 303; Orestes 2. 3. 133; Atrides 2. 3. 187 ff.; Ulysses 2. 5. 100; Ajax 2. 3. 187; Teiresias 2. 5. 1; Penelope 2. 5. 76; Helen 1. 3. 107. Tyndaridae (1. 1. 100) should also be included.

[6] Dama 1. 6. 38; 2. 5. 18, 101; 2. 7. 54; Davus 1. 10. 40; 2. 5. 91; 2. 7. 2.

[7] Apella 1. 5. 100.

whom Bentley identified with the Pitholaus mentioned in Suetonius, *Iul.* 75. Tenney Frank may also be right in his theory that Heliodorus (1. 5. 2) is the scholar Apollodorus.[1] But these two instances are somewhat exceptional in that the alteration would have been made for metrical reasons, not for the sake of concealment. One of the ancient rumours which have come down to us alleges that Maltinus (1. 2. 25) is a mask for Maecenas. The latter certainly dressed in an effeminate style,[2] 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 after enjoying Maecenas' patronage for over three years. As for the other proposals, while it is interesting to toy with the idea that Catius (2. 4. 1) is a skit on the gourmet C. Matius or that Nasidienus Rufus (2. 8. 1) is based on memories on Salvidienus Rufus,[3] one may pass quickly over attempts to link Baius (1. 4. 110) with Bavius and the son of Aesopus (2. 3. 239) with Ticidas.[4]

The most tantalizing name is, of course, Canidia. In addition to other brief appearances she plays a major role in *Serm.* 1. 8 and *Epodes* 5 and 17. Porphyrion on *Epod.* 3. 8 says her real name was Gratidia and that she was a cosmetician from Naples. The first detail may be an invention, and the second a combination of Neapolis (5. 43) with *nardo perunctum* (5. 59). On the other hand, it must be conceded that no other fictitious character crops up so persistently, and a detail like *cum Sagana maiore* (*Serm.* 1. 8. 25) makes one pause before saying anything too dogmatic. The problem is largely a matter of degree. No one believes that Canidia is either a personified idea or a recognizable portrait, but between these limits there is room for argument. Three intermediate types of creation may be distinguished: (1) a figure constructed imaginatively on the basis of a group, (2) a figure constructed imaginatively on the basis of a group but with overtones hinting at a real individual, (3) a figure constructed imaginatively on the basis of an individual. If Canidia belongs to type one we can say that Horace created her from his knowledge of contemporary witchcraft intending her, perhaps, to serve as a fictitious substitute for Archilochus' Neobule. If we are dealing with a case of the second type then the individual, whoever she may have been, will remain a shadow in the background and can never be identified. If Canidia falls under the third heading the witches will cease to have much importance, and Canidia herself will emerge as a travesty of one of Horace's acquaintances. Some supporters of the last view have even been bold enough to hazard an identification.[5] My own feeling is that the second possibility is the most likely. On points like this Roman opinion was probably as divided as our own. Not everyone would have accepted Canidia and the rest as composite figures, and Horace's lack of precision may well have increased rather than checked the flow of rumour and conjecture. Martial gives us an example of this ageless curiosity:

> Nomen Athenagorae quaeris, Callistrate, verum.
> si scio, dispeream, qui sit Athenagoras.
> sed puta me verum, Callistrate, dicere nomen:
> non ego sed vester peccat Athenagoras. (9. 95 b)

[1] *C.P.* xv (1920), 393.

[2] Sen. *Epist.* 114 and Mayor on Juv. 1. 66 and 12. 39.

[3] Palmer, pp. 314 and 368.

[4] Frank, *Class. Stud. presented to Capps* (Princeton, 1936), pp. 159 ff.

[5] Frank, ibid.; A. Hahn, *T.A.P.A.* lxx (1939), 231 ff.

One might also cite the beginning of 2. 23:

> Non dicam, licet usque me rogetis,
> qui sit Postumus in meo libello,
> non dicam.

The foregoing analysis shows that Horace's use of names was far from uniform. Such a conclusion is neither new nor surprising, but this variety has to be constantly reaffirmed if we are to avoid the generalizations which so often appear in editions and literary histories. Clearly the scholiasts and modern critics of similar leanings such as Cartault and Courbaud[1] cannot be right in maintaining that Horace usually had real people in mind. But there is an opposite way of thinking which can also mislead and which is more frequently encountered. Put crudely it goes like this: Lucilius, a man of high social standing protected by the powerful Scipio family, could afford to attack contemporary statesmen (so far so good); 'the conditions under which Horace wrote were altogether different', 'the political situation between 42 and 31 B.C. would not have borne rough handling and the softening of manners had put a check on personalities'. 'Personality is the essence of satire and Horace dared not be personal.' He had to beware of infringing the law of libel—'there is a touch of serious anxiety beneath the jest upon the *mala* and the *bona carmina* with which *Serm.* 2. 1 closes'. Horace's *Satires* are therefore 'free from vehemence', 'they are directed against types rather than individuals'. 'Horace is the dragon-fly of satire, ornamental but stingless', and one can hardly doubt that 'he was acting wisely . . . in avoiding personal attacks on living men'. In brief Horace 'stood to Lucilius in much the same relation as Menander to Aristophanes'.[2]

There is much truth in these statements, but they are so over-simplified as to be misleading. It is, of course, a fact, and a significant fact, that Horace did not attack men of real importance—least of all prominent politicians. Something more will be said about this below; here I would simply point out that the political and the personal are not coextensive. The absence of Marcus Antonius does not make Crispinus fictitious. Moreover, even where no living individual is involved it is hardly enough to say 'so-and-so is a type figure', for, as we have seen, type figures can be of several kinds.

In drawing attention to the diversity of Horace's names I have also tried to bear in mind the effect which the *Satires* were likely to produce when they first appeared. This point should not be overstressed, and I have only given it this much prominence because it is usually ignored altogether. It would be absurd to suggest that the first book of *Satires* caused anything in the nature of a public outcry or even widespread resentment; but it does seem that in certain quarters Horace was regarded with suspicion. True, the names were mostly employed as a means to some ethical or aesthetic end. (An indication of this is the fact that with Horace, as opposed to many of the eighteenth-century satirists, our ignorance concerning a name rarely if ever makes a passage unintelligible.) But people do not like being used to point a moral or adorn a tale, especially

[1] Courbaud, *Horace. Sa vie et sa pensée à l'époque des Épîtres*, p. 5, n. 2.

[2] The quotations are taken respectively from Palmer, p. xii; Morris, p. 15 of the introduction to his edition; Palmer, p. xii; Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace*, p. 370; Page, p. xv of his edition of the *Odes*; Hadas, *A Hist. of Lat. Lit.*, p. 167 (cf. Wright's article on Horace in *O.C.D.*: 'Horace's humour . . . is directed against types rather than individuals, foibles rather than vices.' Are we to regard greed, malice, adultery, and murder as foibles?); Highet on *Satura* in *O.C.D.*; Wilkins, *Rom. Lit.*, p. 95; Palmer, p. xiii.

when the tale is one of vice and stupidity. As for the dead, they were beyond taking offence, but their relatives were not, and in the Roman family relatives mattered. We may therefore assume that the line

> cum sibi quisque timet quamquam est intactus et odit[1]

for all its ironic exaggeration contains a core of truth, and that the opening words of book 2

> sunt quibus in satura videor nimis acer et ultra
> legem tendere opus

do reflect an authentic situation. The critics were naïve in their judgement and too remote from the poet to appreciate his real intentions, yet occasionally they were right, and sometimes their mistakes were excusable.

So much for book 1 and its reception. In book 2, which is over fifty lines longer, there is a sharp drop in the number of names. Living characters appear hardly ten times in 1,083 verses, and it is significant that most of the names in group (*e*) above are drawn from the later collection. We can guess at some of the factors behind the change. For one thing, unlike its predecessor, book 2 must have been written with the prospect of publication in mind, and so it is possible that by cutting down the number of personal references Horace wished to forestall the kind of half-informed criticism mentioned above. Moreover the poet now enjoyed a position of esteem and security such as he had never known before, and as the gliding years carried him into his middle thirties he began to take a more detached view of his material. I do not mean that he became less sensitive to moral evil, but rather that he saw it in less personal terms. This tendency towards greater detachment can also be seen in the form of the poems; for instead of being delivered by Horace himself the sermons are in most cases put into the mouths of intermediate characters like Ofellus and Stertinius. The increase in dialogue is part of the same process.

It may be asked how much was contributed to the change by external factors like the political situation and the law of libel. One would be inclined to answer 'little or nothing'. It can be argued that during the period of book 1 Horace, the pardoned rebel and the son of a freedman, was deterred from writing pamphlets by the fear of the consequences—since Octavian and Antony were at least officially united. But if fear was the only deterrent one might have expected that when the two giants became estranged Horace would have felt free to make political attacks, sheltered by the power of Octavian. As we know, the very opposite took place. So it looks rather as if after Philippi Horace resolved never to become embroiled in political struggles again. Anyhow he wished to use the *sermo* for a different purpose. Personal attacks on Octavian's enemies, even if approved by Octavian himself, would have diverted attention from the moral issues which were always the poet's main concern.

As for the libel law, when one considers the vicious lampooning which was in progress during the late thirties one can hardly believe that the *Satires* ever put Horace in danger of prosecution. It has to be remembered that when Horace spoke of *mala carmina* in 2. 1. 82 he probably had the other seven poems of the book in front of him and knew perfectly well that they contained no defamatory material. The more one thinks about 2. 1. 80 ff. the less inclined one feels to take the passage as anything but a joke. The libel law existed to be sure—

[1] 2. 1. 23.

otherwise the play on the requirements of law and satire would have been pointless—but Horace was in no danger of infringing it.[1]

The names are of central importance in what may be called the evolutionary approach to the *Satires*. This approach, which regards Horatian satire as a kind of living organism passing through the phases of growth, maturity, and decay, is associated in particular with the distinguished name of Eduard Fraenkel, who presents it in some detail in *Das Reifen der horazischen Satire*,[2] and again, more briefly, in his *Horace*.[3] The facts underlying this analysis are as follows. In 1. 2, which is by common consent one of the earliest of the *Satires*, numerous people are mentioned by name and the poet himself remains out of sight; in 1. 6 the names occur in the first half only, and the rest is autobiographical; names play a much smaller part in book 2 as a whole, and in 2. 6, one of the latest pieces, they have almost disappeared, leaving the entire stage to Horace himself; finally the *Epistles* may be said to abandon personal censure still more completely in favour of a genial moral discourse centred on the poet and his friends.

Abstracted in this way the scheme is certainly impressive, but we have to see how the pattern is affected when all the other satires are included. The biological analogy when applied to art has two aspects, both of which cause trouble in the present case. The first aspect is chronological. If 1. 3 comes immediately after 1. 2 we can argue, as Fraenkel does, that it shows signs of growth, since names are fewer and vv. 63–65 give the first hint of self-portraiture. But it may well be that 1. 4, which lacks any reference to Maecenas, is earlier than 1. 3. If so, then 1. 3 marks a retrogression, for its autobiographical content cannot be compared with the account of Horace's upbringing in 1. 4. 105 ff. Again, 1. 1 is probably later than both these pieces, yet it contains no self-portraiture at all. If, however, it is earlier, why are there so few names? Finally, why should 1. 10, the latest poem in the book, be so sharply personal in tone?

The problem is not confined to book 1. A poem like 2. 3 proves on these grounds to be a less-developed specimen of Horatian satire than 1. 6; yet it can hardly represent a decline, since it was written two years before 2. 6. Fraenkel does point out that 'the evolution of the style of a poet . . . does not, as a rule, proceed in an unbroken straight line'.[4] But once this is admitted the comparison with nature is weakened, since no fruit or vegetable periodically recedes in the course of its growth.

The other aspect of the analogy is evaluative, as may be seen from terms like 'ripeness' and 'maturity'. This means that Fraenkel's approach involves some rather severe judgements. The first part of 1. 6, for instance, is a 'parade of dreary characters' and both writer and reader are relieved 'to get out of the Lucilian masquerade'.[5] This implies that using names was a rather regrettable mannerism which Horace had to grow out of.[6] To Fraenkel 2. 6 represents the

[1] So even the cautious conclusion of R. E. Smith, *C.Q.* i (1951), 178, should be modified; the same applies to my own remarks in *Hermathena*, xc (1957), 51.

[2] *Festschrift Reitzenstein*, pp. 119 ff.

[3] See e.g. 87–88, 101, 144, 152.

[4] *Horace*, p. 101 n. 2.

[5] Ibid., p. 103. Cf. *Fest. Reitz.*, p. 130.

[6] It is a short step from this to the not uncommon idea that what Horace took from Lucilius was not 'his own', and that the early poems did not really indicate his 'true self'. The violence and grossness of certain epodes are often excused by reference to the Greek iambic tradition or the harsh circumstances of the poet's life at that period—circumstances which are supposed to have goaded him into writing poems essentially

peak of Horace's achievement as a satirist—the poet is the centre of interest and there is an absence of personal ridicule. Accepting this for the moment we ask how the rest of the book fares when measured by the same standards. All the poems, it appears, except one are found wanting. The third 'looks like a prolonged *tour de force*',[1] the fifth is 'full of vigour and brilliant wit, but acid and cynical throughout'[2] and when Teiresias returns to Hades 'we are not sorry to see him go'.[3] All six indicate that 'the stage of over-ripeness has now arrived',[4] and in some of them Horace has 'betrayed his noble ideal of *satura*'.[5]

These verdicts prompt us to ask whether the criteria adopted are really satisfactory. If maturity in Horatian satire is marked by self-portraiture and an absence of names, then a poem like 2. 5, which on other grounds would be considered excellent (and which is just as late as 2. 6) must be classed as inferior. Also is it not strange that the *Satires* should reach their highest point of perfection in a poem which, to quote Courbaud, 'est déjà une véritable épître'?[6] One cannot help feeling that the *Satires* are being assessed as so many imperfect attempts at writing epistles, and that the τέλος of the form has been placed outside the form itself.

Against these criticisms it may be urged that since the *Satires* and *Epistles* both belong to the same genus the latter must represent a more mature conception of what the genus should be like. The biological method of analysis might then be justified in this larger perspective. There is something to be said for this objection and it demands careful consideration.

Ancient writers, including Horace himself, had no uniform method of referring to the hexameters. If we let A stand for the *Satires* and B for the *Epistles* we get the following scheme:

(1) Horace: A—*satura* (generic) (*Serm.* 2. 1. 1)
—*saturae* (*Serm.* 2. 6. 17)
—*sermones* (*Epist.* 1. 4. 1; 2. 2. 60)
A, B—*sermones* (*Epist.* 2. 1. 250)

(2) Horace, according to the scholiasts: A *sermones*, B *epistulae*—*satura* (generic)[7]

(3) Quintilian: A, [B]—*satura* (generic)[8]

(4) Statius: A—*satura*
B—*epistula*[9]

alien to his nature. The ultimate stage in this approach is reached by Courbaud (op. cit., p. 21), according to whom neither epode, nor satire, nor ode provided the natural vehicle for Horace's genius; the epistle, it appears, was the only genre for which 'il fût réellement né'. One can only feel thankful that the poet discovered his proper *métier* before it was too late.

[1] *Horace*, p. 144.
[2] Ibid., p. 145.
[3] Ibid.
[4] *Fest. Reitz.*, p. 135: 'das Stadium der Überreife eingetreten ist'.
[5] *Horace*, p. 129.
[6] Op. cit., p. 11. On the same page cf. the remark that 'une telle œuvre . . . n'est plus du tout une satire.'
[7] Introd. to *Serm.* 1; Introd. to *Epist.* 1; cf. Porph. on *Serm.* 2. 1.
[8] Hendrickson, *A.J.P.* xviii (1897), 316, maintains that Quint. 10. 1. 93–94 includes the *Epistles* in *satura*. This seems improbable, hence the brackets around B.
[9] *Silv.* 1. 3. 103–4.

(5) Suetonius: A, B? —*saturae*[1]

(6) Sidonius: A—*sermones*
B—*epistulae*[2]

Another piece of evidence may be added which I have not seen quoted in this connexion, namely Persius 1. 1. 116–18:

> omne vafer vitium ridenti Flaccus amico
> tangit et admissus circum praecordia ludit
> callidus excusso populum suspendere naso.

Conington and others take this as referring to playful banter of a personal kind addressed to Horace's friends. Now the analysis of Horace's names shows that such an interpretation is impossible. Conington is uneasily aware of this, so he adds: 'Possibly *amico* may refer more particularly to the Epistles.' Némethey too says *referendum maxime ad epistulas*. Having contrasted Lucilian satire with Horace's *Epistles* these scholars are then confronted with *callidus excusso populum suspendere naso*. Since this obviously refers to the *Satires* they are obliged to postulate a sharp antithesis between *amico* and *populum*. Such an antithesis, emphasized by asyndeton, greatly weakens the force of Persius' argument. What he wants to say is 'Lucilius was a critic in *his* way, Horace was a critic in *his* way, why shouldn't I be a critic in *my* way?' Clearly a subdivision within the Horatian *sermo* is quite out of place.

The cause of the mistake is the assumption that 116–18 describe direct, personal banter. They do not. It is *through* his satirical criticism of the public in general (118) that Horace lays his finger on the faults of his friends. They laugh at his wit, and at the same time (or perhaps a little later[3]) they realize that their own faults are being censured. So there is no subdivision. As one might expect, Persius is referring primarily, if not exclusively, to the *Satires*.

From the passages cited above it appears that the only term which we may safely use to embrace both *Satires* and *Epistles* is *Sermones*. *Satura* (2) should be disregarded, since it is based on a false inference of the scholiasts. They have taken the word from *Serm.* 2. 1. 1 and extended it to the *Epistles*. It is most unlikely that *satura* (3) includes the *Epistles*, and it is at least questionable whether *saturae* (5) does so. Taking *sermo*, then, as the one comprehensive term, let us remind ourselves of what it means in this context. First, it denotes a range of style, a choice of vocabulary and phrase. Thus in *Epist.* 2. 1. 250 *sermones . . . repentis per humum* are contrasted with an historical epic written in the grand manner. Secondly, it indicates a particular metrical form. Thirdly, it points to

[1] *Vita Horati*, Rostagni, p. 118. Was Suetonius consciously including *Epist.* 1. 4. 15 and 1. 20 24 in the term *saturis*? Or did he think in a moment of forgetfulness that the obesity reference came in *Serm.* 2. 3. 308 ff.? Certainty is impossible, hence the query after B.

[2] 9. 211 ff. Anderson (Loeb) renders 'After the medleys of the Epistles, the witty sallies of the Satires'. In punctuation and interpretation this is preferable to the view advanced by Hendrickson, op. cit., p. 318, who wants to take *per satiras* as generic and *epistularum sermonumque sales* as subdivisions.

[3] The scholiast's suggestion has been undeservedly neglected: 'castigavit . . . ita ut amici, qui eum audirent recitantem, putarent non tangi vitia eorum. Deinde cum dicta diligentius apud se pertractarent viderunt vitia sua per illum descripta' (Jahn, p. 275). All we need take from this is the idea of delayed action. Cf. *quid rides? mutato nomine de te / fabula narratur* (*Serm.* 1. 1. 69–70).

a general similarity of subject-matter, viz. the behaviour of men in society. Clearly the *Satires* and *Epistles* are sufficiently alike in all these respects to make *Sermones* a useful comprehensive term. When we read in the scholiasts' introduction to *Epist.* 1 that the *Satires* and *Epistles* are different only in name, *nam et metrum et materia verborum et communis assumptio eadem est*, and then on turning to Hirschfelder's introduction (Orelli–Baiter–Hirschfelder, *Proleg.* 35) find *epistulae a satiris elocutione, ratione metrica, rerumque tractatione magnopere differunt*, we need not worry, since there is no real contradiction. Hirschfelder is simply operating at a higher level of sophistication.

But when we pass from language, metre, and subject-matter to form and manner, a different picture emerges. Dialogue gives way to letter, and the lively direct speech which was such a feature of the *Satires* is greatly reduced. As a recent writer has said 'the conversationalist gradually absorbs the dramatist'.[1] More important is the change in manner. The emphasis moves from censure to affirmation. Moral defects are still observed, but instead of exposing them to ridicule the poet is more concerned to reform them by exhortation and advice. Adapting the remark quoted above, we might say that 'the moralist absorbs the satirist'. Names occur far less frequently than in *Serm.* 2, and the practice of *ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν* is abandoned. It is significant that *Epist.* 1. 19, a very angry poem, does not name a single adversary—a remarkable contrast with *Serm.* 1. 10. Lucilius, in short, has been left behind.

These differences are important enough to distinguish the *Satires* from the *Epistles*. It is a distinction which goes back to Horace himself, and it clearly reflects an alteration in the poet's intention. When he wished to criticize wickedness and folly in the manner of Lucilius, he wrote satires; when he wished to uphold certain values in a more positively didactic manner he turned to the epistle. If we admit (as Fraenkel readily does[2]) that the change in manner is both deliberate and significant, then surely we are not justified in criticizing the *Satires* by canons derived from the *Epistles*.

To try to determine the value of the concept of evolution to literary theory would be far too complex a task. One feels, however, that Horace's *Satires* are not a very suitable field for that method of investigation, partly because they were all written within the space of eight or nine years and therefore belong to the same period of the poet's career, partly because within that period so few of the pieces can be dated with certainty, but mainly because, being *saturae*, they show a considerable variety of subject and treatment. Is 2. 8 more 'evolved' than 1. 1? Or is 2. 7 more 'developed' than 1. 6? Such questions are hardly to the point.

To sum up. There are fewer names in book 2 than in book 1; but the decrease is not a regular process, nor does it either enhance or diminish the satires' literary merit. As for self-portraiture, it does indeed form an element in many of the finest pieces, and these are to be found in the first book as often as in the second; but it is never the only element, and never, I would maintain, the most essential. Throughout Horace's *Satires* it is ridicule and criticism (however

[1] R. A. Brower, *Alexander Pope. The Poetry of Allusion* (Oxford, 1959), p. 184. There is a fine appreciation of *Serm.* 2. 6 on pp. 168–76.

[2] e.g. 'On abandoning the writing of satires . . . ' (*Horace*, p. 147), 'He returned to the writing of sermones . . . but not as satires' (ibid., p. 153), 'The potentialities of the Horatian *satira* were exhausted, the potentialities of the Horatian *sermo* were not' (ibid., p. 309).

impersonal and however mild) that remain predominant. When these activities cease to be Horace's main concern he abandons satire and turns eventually to a more positive, though not necessarily a superior form of didactic writing, viz. the epistle. Satire must always retain a breath of the Lucilian spirit, otherwise it will turn into something else.

NIALL RUDD

University College, Toronto