TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

1961

I. *Venusina lucerna*: The Horatian Model for Juvenal

WILLIAM S. ANDERSON

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Juvenal inherits a tradition in satire to which belong Lucilius, Horace and Persius; and like his predecessors he exploits a program poem in order to define his place in that tradition. Horace had thought it so important to establish his relation to Lucilius that he wrote three program satires. Persius did not challenge Horace and restricted his programmatic theories to *Satire* 1 and to the beginning of *Satire* 5. Therefore, when Juvenal cites first Lucilius, then Horace as models, it is natural to think that, just as he can only mean Lucilius the *inventor* of *satura*, so he must refer to Horace the writer of the *Sermones* and *Epistulae*. The scholiasts and such editors as Grangaeus, Britannicus, Lubinus, Calderinus, Macleane, Mayor, Wright and Duff all agree that *Venusina lucerna* (1.51) should be interpreted as Horace the satirist. However, in the comment of Duff one can see the implicit difficulty to which I shall address myself in this paper; Duff remarks: "The allusion is to Horace, a satirist of a very different kind."[1] It will be my purpose to question the general assumption and advance reasons for interpreting *Venusina lucerna* as an allusion, not to Horace the satirist, but to Horace the poet of fiery patriotic indignation.

[1] J. D. Duff, *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae* XIV (Cambridge 1898) 122.

Let me begin by analyzing the verbal associations of this striking phrase *Venusina lucerna.* With the adjective, no commentator experiences any difficulty; it patently denotes Venusia, birthplace of Horace.[2] On the other hand, we find that *lucerna* evokes several interpretations. One early scholiast thought it necessary to understand the word in direct relation to the satiric tradition and accordingly commented: "'Lucerna' ideo dicit, quia satirici ad omnium vitia quasi lucernam admovent et vel adurunt vel ostendunt crimina, quae noverunt." Mayor developed this interpretation as follows: "There is also an allusion to the scorching heat of satire . . . and its fierce glare (cf. the lantern of Diogenes, *seeking a man*)."[3]

I think we can firmly reject this theory of the scholiast, as elaborated by Mayor. In the first place, satirists do not necessarily expose vices to the scorching heat and fierce glare of their verses, least of all Horace the satirist. While the scholiast may evoke the picture of Diogenes the Cynic, only Persius even vaguely approached the manner of Diogenes. Horace, who carefully represents himself in his very first *Satire* as the man who laughingly tells the truth, would be diametrically opposed to this classification of *satirici.* Of Lucilius, I need only say that he was read by the men of the first century B.C. as an urbane, elegant, witty and highly frank poet; such a complex impression does not fit the scholiast's simplification of the satirist. In the second place, *lucerna* does not connote to the Romans either scorching heat or fierce glare.[4] Although Diogenes did go around with his lantern looking for an honest man, *lucerna,* for a Roman, signifies first and foremost the ordinary illumination required at night. Horace, for example, uses the word six times, thrice in the *Sermones,* thrice in the *Odes,* and with no distinction of meaning appropriate to the different poetic form. Four times the *lucerna* graces banquets and suggests the pleasant protraction of convivial drinking far into the night.[5] Once a brothel and sexual intercourse are illuminated (*Serm.* 2.7.48), and once we hear of Natta

[2] Cf. the scholia: "'Venusina' autem ideo, quia haec fuit civitas Horatii."

[3] J. E. B. Mayor, *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*[4] (London 1889) 1.109. I repeat his italics. "The scorching heat of satire" he documents by citing Ennius' famous fragment about his *versus flammeos* (Vahlen, *Sat.* 6–7).

[4] Nor, for that matter, do I believe that Ennius' phrase *versus flammeos* indicates scorching heat; rather, it seems to concentrate our attention on the flaming, brightly shining quality of his poetry.

[5] *Serm.* 2.1.25, *C.* 1.27.5, 3.8.14, 21.23.

stealing oil from lamps (*Serm.* 1.6.124). The one occurrence of *lucerna* in Persius adds nothing (cf. 5.181). Juvenal himself employs the word seven times. Of these, five agree with the usage of Horace, and two of the five appear direct variations of Horatian passages.[6] In short, *lucerna* itself does not evoke to the Roman mind burning, glaring satire; and even if it did, it would never fit the character of Horace the satirist.

Since the lamp functioned not only to illuminate banquets and prostitution, but also any activity of the dark hours, a derivative association of *lucerna* early appeared in Latin. While the scholiast ignored this second association completely, Mayor, it should be noted, regarded it as the dominant meaning of the word in this context. The *lucerna* could and did frequently evoke the "midnight lamp" and the "midnight oil" which we today still associate with studying. Most commentators urge this interpretation, and Mayor provides the reader with copious illustrations of its application in Latin. Indeed, the one remaining passage of Juvenal, which I did not cite above in connection with the connotation of mere illumination, produces the phrase *olfecisse lucernas* (7.225), to describe study in the early morning before dawn. From the context of 7.225 we also gather that both Horace and Vergil were school authors who demanded such extreme labor. Unique though Juvenal's phrase *Venusina lucerna* is because of its rhetorical compression, nevertheless Varro provides us a reasonably close analogue: *non solum ad Aristophanis lucernam sed etiam ad Cleanthis lucubravi.*[7]

Putting these associations together, we may conclude that Juvenal's phrase, "Venusine lamp," suggested the inspiration of studious Horace or the poetic example elicited from carefully studying Horace. Up to this point we can follow the commentators. However, when they proceed to specify the inspiration or the poetic example of the Venusine as the *Sermones*, we need not agree. It is not unreasonable to assume that one satirist, referring to another poet who among other things is renowned for his satires, would invoke those satires as his model. If, on the other hand, the satires of the first do not in the least resemble the putative model either in tone or in content, then we

[6] Cf. 6.131 with Hor. *Serm.* 2.7.48; 6.305 with Hor. *Serm.* 2.1.25. The other three occurrences of *lucerna* which agree with Horace are in 8.35, 10.339, and 12.92.

[7] Varro, *Ling. lat.* 5.9.

might well hesitate to obey our first instinct. As Duff automatically notes, and as all readers of Juvenal quickly sense, Juvenal does not write Horatian satire.[8] But not only should our immediate awareness of the peculiarly Juvenalian tone prepare us to question it when the commentators interpret the "Venusine lamp" as Horace the satirist; we can also inspect the phrase more closely and detect surer indications that it alludes to Horatian works quite other than the *Sermones* and *Epistulae*.

The poet who studied late was conventionally the epic or tragic poet; the speaker who worked far into the night on his oration was the thunderous successor of Cicero or Demosthenes; and even the scholar, like Varro, who pored over his texts by the light of the lamp was no ordinary pedant but a mighty intellect like Aristophanes of Byzantium or the celebrated Stoic Cleanthes. Lucretius invites us to visualize him staying up in the quiet hours of many nights as he seeks to find words and phrases appropriate to his vitally important poetic ideas.[9] This is quite different from the image which we have of Catullus, who spends his nights in love and feasting, his days in playful recollections. With Horace, the *persona* of the satirist differs sharply from that of the writer of formal odes, at least those which engage the emotions. Moreover, where he exploits the *topos* of *recusatio*, Horace brings out the obvious contrast between his slight ability and the magnitude of the epic subject,[10] between the intrinsic poetic quality of epic and the mere poetic trappings of satire.[11] Not only that, but the characteristic pose of the satirist is of a man who dabbles at verse, never toils at it, least of all into the late hours of night.[12] When Damasippus attacks Horace in *Serm.* 2.3.1 ff.,

[8] Cf. I. G. Scott (Ryberg), *The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal* (Northampton [Mass.] 1927), especially 112 ff. I suspect, too, that the scholiast's effort to generalize about *satirici* sprang from embarrassment with the facts of Horatian satire.

[9] *Rer. nat.* 1.140 ff. Cf. Propertius 2.3.7, *studiis vigilare severis*, where he opposes the conventions of epic to those of his elegy.

[10] Cf. *tenues grandia*, *C.* 1.6.9.

[11] Cf. the deliberate comparison of Ennian style with that of *sermo merus* in *Serm.* 1.4.39 ff.; also the implicit paradox of the phrase (influenced by Callimachus), *Musa pedestri* in *Serm.* 2.6.17.

[12] Cf. *cantamus vacui*, *C.* 1.6.19; *relictis iocis*, *C.* 2.1.37; *ubi quid datur oti / illudo chartis*, *Serm.* 1.4.138–39; the picture of Horatian leisure in *Serm.* 1.6.111 ff., especially 122–23: *post hanc vagor, aut ego lecto / aut scripto quod me tacitum iuvet unguor olivo*, and 128: *domesticus otior*; and finally, the direct opposition between the satirist and the epic poet in 1.10.36–37, concluded by: *haec ego ludo*. All the conventions of *sermo* and the plain style conflict with the studied skill of the grand poet.

he concentrates on precisely these features. Although Horace has brought along important poets to study, says the critic, he has failed to study them; instead, he has wasted his time drinking and sleeping: *vini somnique benignus/nil dignum sermone canas* (3–4). Part of the irony in Trebatius' remarks may also depend on this same theme. Consulted by Horace in *Serm.* 2.1 as to what he should do about adverse reactions to the *Sermones*, Trebatius tells the satirist to take a rest, that is, from poetry and from replying to the critics. To this, Horace rejoins that he would dearly like to take a rest but he would not be able to sleep (7). Well, says Trebatius, if you cannot sleep, you should try hard exercise in the form of swimming—unimaginable for Horace, the reader quickly sees—or you should write an epic poem about Augustus (10–12). That is, Horace should either overcome his insomnia or utilize it in the conventional manner.

According to the recognized convention, therefore, Horace and his fellow satirists belong among the writers of light verse, who compose slight poetry in a playful manner, in odd moments of idleness, and who would never waste a good night of banqueting and precious conversation among friends and lovers to labor over a poem.[13] A few years before Juvenal wrote his program satire, Martial composed a programmatic epigram, in which he exploited the same contrasting conventions. While the wretched epic and tragic poets work to midnight by the lantern, he plays (*ludere*), produces witty, light little material.[14] Juvenal's *Satire* 7 exhibits his awareness of the convention. With bitter amusement he describes the epic subject as *vigilata proelia* (27), battle scenes which have obliged the poet to work many sleepless nights. Twice he introduces Horace in this *Satire*, the only times he mentions him after 1.51; and in each case he associates Horace with Vergil. To depict the true poet, he cites the inspired Bacchic Horace of

[13] I stress this matter of convention, because behind the mask of the playful satirist existed a dedicated poet who worked as hard and as late on the *Sermones* as he did on the passionately serious formal poems. Cf. *Epist.* 2.1.111–13.

[14] Mayor cites this useful *Epigram* 8.3.17–20:

scribant ista graves nimium nimiumque severi
quos media miseros nocte *lucerna* videt.
at tu Romano lepidos sale tinge libellos:
adgnoscat mores vita legatque suos.

I have counted 21 occurrences of *lucerna* in Martial; almost all of them fit into scenes of banqueting and love. For the *topos* of late study applied to epic by an epic poet himself in Juvenal's time, cf. Statius *Theb.* 12.811.

C. 2.19 and Vergil deeply involved with the tragedy of Turnus (62 ff.). Similarly, when the lamps smell up the study as the students pore over Vergil and Horace, I am inclined to think that the grimy text of Horace was rather a collection of the *Odes* and *Epodes* than the *Sermones* (225–27). For, as Quintilian shows, the high and serious tone of grand poetry could immediately serve the interests of the budding orator.[15]

In itself, therefore, *Venusina lucerna*, a phrase which probably suggests both Horace's own meticulous labor over his poetry and the example which he sets to a careful student of his craft, does not connote the conventions of humble, playful satire; rather, it evokes the *persona* of the epic and tragic poet, the *vatis*. Further indications as to its significance are supplied by the word which, ignored thus far as the reader undoubtedly observed, belongs to the full phrase written by Juvenal. Angrily he asks in 1.51: May I not believe these details of moral enormity worthy of the Venusine lamp? (*haec ego non credam Venusina digna lucerna?*) The adjective *digna* requires two comments. First, one of its basic meanings involves a comparison between one thing or person and another, in which the first is said to possess the *dignitas* of the other.[16] Among the things frequently so compared are the subjects of poetry with the magnitude of the topic and the conventional idea of the genre, or one poet's work with another's. Lucretius, whom I mentioned above as exhibiting the *topos* of work by night, also speaks of poetry on which he has long toiled and contrived with sweet labor, which he desires to be worthy of his noble reader (*carmina digna*, 4.420). Even more relevant to our interest is that the poet who desires to write *carmina digna* usually looks up to the epic and tragic poets. Vergil, addressing Asinius Pollio, exalts his patron's tragedies in these terms: *sola Sophocleo tua carmina digna coturno.*[17] In refusing to produce an epic on Agrippa's exploits Horace asks how anyone could write worthily of Homer's topics.[18]

[15] The values which Quintilian anticipates from poetry assume concentration on grand poetry. Cf. *Inst. orat.* 10.1.27: *namque ab his* (i.e., poetis) *in rebus spiritus et in verbis sublimitas et in adfectibus motus omnis et in personis decor petitur.*

[16] Cf. *ThLL*, s.v. "*Dignus* I."

[17] *Ecl.* 8.10. Horace similarly refers to the *dignitas* of tragedy: cf. *Epist.* 2.1.164 and *AP* 91.

[18] *C.* 1.6.13 ff. For other uses of *dignus* in connection with the high style of epic, cf. Horace *C.* 4.8.28 and *AP* 138; Ovid, *Am.* 1.3.20 and *Met.* 5.345; and Statius, *Theb.* 3.102. The context of Juvenal's phrase, which we cited above (*vigilata proelia,*

In the second place, *digna* might well be connected with the preconceptions of *indignatio*. The basic idea behind rhetorical indignation is that the speaker, himself *dignus*, feels stirred by something *indignum*. Just before Juvenal proclaims his use of *indignatio*, he sardonically summarizes the moral plight of Rome as follows:

> aude aliquid brevibus Gyaris et carcere *dignum*,
> si vis esse aliquid. (73–74)

It is because Romans have destroyed the ethical conception of *dignitas* and attach honor now to crimes which merit serious punishments, that Juvenal feels impelled to vent his *indignatio*, he asserts. As we shall shortly see, certain works apart from the *Sermones* do exploit the devices of *indignatio*.[19] I would suggest, therefore, that *digna* indicates two aspects of Juvenal's material: that it rises to the level of the more exalted works of Horace and that it merits the same tone of patriotic indignation.

If now we momentarily turn away from our phrase and consider the entire program satire and the book for which it was written, we find several additional clues by which, I think, we can determine the Horatian poetry to which in fact Juvenal refers. One hardly needs to argue that Juvenal knew Horace's works well. Like the schoolboys he describes in *Satire* 7, Juvenal himself studied searchingly all the poems of the great poet.[20] Now were he using Horace's *Satires* as his model, we should expect to find some evidence of the *Sermones* and possibly the *Epistulae* in Book 1. However, of the comparative material collected by Schwartz and Highet, little of importance connects Book 1 with the satiric efforts of Horace; and the most compelling verbal echoes of the *Sermones* prove the utterly un-Horatian approach of Juvenal.[21] Highet correctly notes that, when composing his memorable phrase, *si natura negat, facit indignatio versum*, Juvenal could not have been unaware of Horace's programmatic comments in *Serm.* 1.10.56 ff.:

7.27), includes also *carmina sublimia* and *dignus hederis*: the epic poet must work late in order to be worthy of the Homeric crown.

[19] For a full discussion of the rhetorical conventions of *indignatio*, see my article, "Juvenal and Quintilian," *YClS* 17 (1961) 30 ff.

[20] Cf. P. Schwartz, *De Juvenale Horatii imitatore* (Diss. Halle 1882).

[21] G. Highet, "Juvenal's Bookcase," *AJP* 72 (1951) 388, lists the most striking imitations of Horace in Juvenal; his list is a sound reduction of Schwartz' exaggerations.

> quid vetat et nosmet Lucili scripta legentis
> quaerere, num illius, num rerum dura *negarit*
> *versiculos natura* magis *factos* et euntis
> mollius . . .?

It is even more important for our argument to point out the difference in meaning which the two satirists develop with their parallel vocabulary. Horace criticizes the inartistic verses of Lucilius and suggests that we can legitimately ask whether Lucilius' natural ability (or the intractability of the material) be held responsible. Inasmuch as one of the dominant features of Lucilius' nature was the *libertas* which comes under consideration in *Serm.* 1.4 and 10, Horace insists on disciplining by art the instinct to blurt out exactly what one feels; and his superbly controlled satire provides the perfect example of classical order in the history of Roman satire. But Juvenal patently rejects discipline and classical order, explicitly here, implicitly throughout Book 1. I may be deficient in *natura*, he admits, but if so, indignation will write or justify my verse; for I am not interested in art, content to produce as ragged poetry as the works of the poetaster Cluvienus. In short, Juvenal turns away from the classical discipline of Horatian satire to the outspoken attacks characteristically attributed to Lucilius: *indignatio* comes before *ars*; he makes no attempt to compromise.

Juvenal also uses the themes of the program satire, first exploited by Lucilius and then made conventional through the adaptations of Horace. Besides modifying the conception of *libertas*, Horace had made quite clear that he did not attack people for the sheer pleasure of injury but to make of them moral *exempla*; that he regarded *satura* as stylistically quite distinct from epic and other types of grand poetry, without, however, impugning the values of epic; and that he utilized an artistic version of the plain style, of which one implicit definition comes in his familiar phrase, *ridentem dicere verum*, an appeal to the image of Socrates. What does Juvenal do with these themes? He attacks people who are (or recently were) utterly depraved, who do not serve as *exempla* for moral improvement, but as illustrations of the utter degeneracy of Rome. He holds himself in from assaulting the living only because it is dangerous, not from concern for another's feelings. He denies the validity of epic in his time, in order to raise *satura* up to the level of the grand style and so replace the

counterfeit topics and emotions of epic and tragedy. On every count, then, Juvenal distances himself from Horace, writer of the *Sermones*.

Again, we may compare subjects attacked in Juvenal with those in Horace. Juvenal's *Satire* 2 concentrates on male perversions, something which Horace never mentioned in his *Sermones*. *Satire* 3 contrasts the city with the country, a topic also utilized in Horace, *Serm.* 2.6; but the two satirists can treat it in diametrically opposed manners. Horace does not hate Rome, nor does he restrict corruption to the city; he belongs both to the city and to the country, essentially interested in a manner of living rather than in outward circumstances. Juvenal makes of Rome a monster of tragic proportions, which one must forsake. *Satire* 4 has no analogue in Horace, and the mock-epic attack on Domitian belongs, as Juvenal himself consciously notes (cf. 4.34–36), to a style avoided by Horace.[22] Finally, *Satire* 5 depicts a *cena*, one of the favorite topics of Horace in Book 2 of the *Sermones*. No reader needs to be told that the urbanity of the *cena Nasidieni* (*Serm.* 2.8) differs utterly from the express indignation (cf. 5.120) suffusing Juvenal's picture; nor is it an accident that so much of Juvenal's high emotion depends for its conviction on his skillful use of epic allusion.

To return to *Satire* 1, we should review the vicious characters whom Juvenal presents in 22 ff., both before and after his outcry concerning Horace. Not one of them, I make bold to assert, reminds us of people in the *Sermones*. Horace could not have presented such imperial perversions as the female gladiator or the *delator*; but the political upstart, the unscrupulous trustee, the husband conniving at his wife's prostitution, the poisoner, and the like all existed in the first century B.C. Therefore, when after listing a group of such depraved men Juvenal asks whether such people and such vice do not merit the Venusine lamp, he looks elsewhere than to the Horatian works of specifically satiric form.

We seek a Horatian model for Juvenal which will possess the following qualities, as implied by *Venusina digna lucerna* as well as

[22] I regard *Serm.* 2.5 as an exception. Indeed, E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957) 144–45, discusses its proximity to the Juvenalian tone and quotes W. Y. Sellar, *Horace and the Elegaic Poets*[2] (Oxford 1899) 70: "If Juvenal recognizes any affinity between his own invective and the 'Venusina lucerna,' it must have been with the spirit of this Satire that he found himself in sympathy." The critics, that is, find no Horatian Satire but 2.5 which even vaguely fits the manner of Juvenal.

by its context; it will be written in the grand style, close to that of epic and tragedy; it will involve urgent moral problems centering on the utter perversion of Rome; it will contain some of the topics specified by Juvenal in 1.22 ff.; and it will appropriate the rhetorical manner of *indignatio* or something closely akin to it. Since we have discarded the *Sermones* and *Epistulae*, we must look in the *Odes* and *Epodes*. However, many of the *Odes* and *Epodes* obviously do not fit our specifications, and we can remove them from consideration right away. When we pass over the erotic and convivial poems, we find ourselves left with a nucleus which includes among its most striking components the patriotic odes and epodes. Here we encounter Horace the *vatis*, the inspired poet, or, as he also calls himself, *Musarum sacerdos* (*C.* 3. 1.3); he thunders forth his denunciations of Roman degeneracy and his urgent demands for moral reform, while reform is possible. Aroused as he is, he perceives situations which evoke utter despair and the indignation which often erupts against triumphant vice.

The clearest prototypes of Juvenalian indignation in Horace appear in *Epodes* 4, 7, 16, the Roman *Odes* of Book 3, and also *C.* 3.24. As has often been noted, these poems strike the same notes as much of Sallust; Sallust's grim picture of Rome stirred echoes in Juvenal's day, most notably in Tacitus.[23] The entire setting of *Epode* 4 corresponds to the situation in Juvenal 1. A former slave, who has promoted himself to great riches and political prominence during the civil wars, parades haughtily down the Sacra Via in Rome; at the sight, native Romans cannot help but express their feelings of outrage, characterized by Horace in the significant words *liberrima indignatio* (10). Similarly Juvenal stands on the street-corner in Rome (1.63–64) and denounces upstarts like Crispinus the Egyptian (26 ff.) and the nameless ex-slave from Mesopotamia who now claims priority over tribunes on account of his wealth (102 ff.). *Epode* 7 voices the despair of the thirties in a highly rhetorical manner, implying that the rival camps, all *scelesti* (1), are bringing Rome to inevitable doom (16). Equally despairing, *Epode* 16 recommends the action which Umbricius takes in *Satire* 3: namely, to abandon Rome. In the pose of the *vatis* (66), afire with emotion, the speaker urges people to forsake corrupt Italy altogether and

[23] Cf. G. Schörner, *Sallust und Horaz über den Sittenverfall und die sittliche Erneuerung Roms* (Diss. Erlangen 1934).

sail to the mythical Isles of the Blest, where they may recapture the honesty and happiness of the Golden Age.

In the Roman *Odes*, Horace forces upon the reader an awareness of the grand style which he appropriates to render his patriotic emotions. While we never sense the total pessimism of Juvenalian satire, the poet does focus on crucial moral perversions and resort to the same illustrations and mood as we find later in Juvenal. Most obvious, in this respect, is the conclusion of *C.* 3.6: the inevitable degeneracy which Horace foretells has become a reality for Juvenal in 1.147:

> nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat
> posteritas, eadem facient cupientque minores.

The same ode derives its harsh verdict from the utter pollution of the institution of marriage (17 ff.). Indeed, while it evokes common details with *Satire* 1, we might well recognize its proximity to the ideas of *Satire* 6. For our purposes, however, it suffices to note the scene in 25 ff., an admittedly conventional topic, but one never mentioned in the *Sermones*: the husband prostitutes his wife, pretending to be too drunk to notice. Juvenal exploits precisely the same scene in 1.55, portraying the husband as *doctus leno*, and with the same fury.[24] The effects of *avaritia* and *luxuria*, which pervade all of Book 1 of Juvenal's *Satires* and particularly attract the satirist's fury in 1.87 ff., constitute basic themes, as causes of Roman corruption, in the Roman *Odes*. Furthermore, just as Horace exalts the ideal of martial *virtus* in 3.2 and 5 and contrasts with the ignoble behavior of Crassus' soldiers the inflexible bravery of the ancient and legendary Regulus, so Juvenal represents the gap between the heroism of old Republican Rome and the unheroic, cowardly contemporary Rome, most vividly, of course, in the savage details of *Satire* 2. Juvenal differs from Horace in his complete absence of hope. Nothing in the *Satires* of Book 1 corresponds to the quasi-epic exaltation of *C.* 3.3 and 4. However, if Juvenal does think of a specific Horatian precedent for his indignant despair over Roman degeneracy, he could not have chosen better than from the *Epodes* and from the pessimistic *Odes* which frame Horace's visions of Augustan grandeur.

To conclude, I find it impossible to believe that Juvenal referred to Horace, the author of the *Sermones*, in the striking phrase

[24] Horace voices concern over the breakdown of marriage also in *C.* 3.24.17 ff.

Venusina lucerna. If my interpretation be correct, the phrase would connote a type of Horatian poetry akin to the grand style of epic and tragedy, automatically ruling out the *Sermones*, the model of the plain style. Furthermore, the details which Juvenal specifies as *haec* do not correspond with those found in the *Sermones*; they do, in part, find analogues in the *Epodes* and *Odes* devoted to patriotic issues: the upstart viewed with *liberrima indignatio*, the compulsion to flee from degenerate Rome, the husband conniving at his wife's prostitution, the lost military virtue of the country. I need not point out that Archilochus, inspiration behind the *Epodes*, also constituted one of the influences on Lucilian invective. But just as these *Epodes* parallel the outspoken patriotic fervor of Lucilius, Scipio's friend, so the Roman *Odes* develop themes common to the moralists, whether satirists, historians, or diatribists, living at the end of the Republic. Therefore, when Juvenal chose *indignatio* as his mood and a perverse Rome as his topic, when he selected from the Lucilian corpus only those poems which fitted the heroic type,[25] then he naturally turned from the *Sermones* of Horace to poems which he could also view as "satiric" in his restricted sense: namely, to the patriotic *Odes* and *Epodes*.

[25] Juvenal represents Lucilius in a manner quite different from his predecessors Horace and Persius. For Horace, he is many things, but most of all a delightful, outspoken type who belongs in the setting of a *convivium*. Persius in 1.114–15 emphasizes the invective in Lucilius' *Satires*. In doing so, however, he attributes no grandeur to the satirist, but develops an image of an animal biting people. When Juvenal describes Lucilius, he makes him into an epic hero, a portrayal which he can make only by ignoring those large portions of Lucilius' writings in which humorous confessions and good-natured jokes provide the dominant note. The chariot metaphor in 1.19–20 goes with an epic periphrasis, *magnus Auruncae alumnus*, which effectively exalts Lucilius into epic stature. Similarly, *Lucilius ardens* wearing armor and fighting his mighty battles against vice is a Lucilius created after Juvenal's image rather than a Lucilius corresponding to the great satirist of the second century B.C. (cf. 1.165 ff.).