

## Horace's Journey Through Arcadia\*

---

TARA WELCH

University of Kansas

SUMMARY: Horace's Satire 1.5 encapsulates two of the Satires' major themes: friendship and aesthetics. This paper explores the poem's engagement with Epicureanism in connection with these themes. Through extended evocation of Vergil's *Eclogues*, several nods to Lucretian language and themes and praise of frank speaking among friends, the Journey to Brundisium meditates on Epicurean friendship in the context of life under the triumvirate in the 30s B.C.E. Horace's satiric Epicureanism dictates a golden mean delicately wended between extremes, avoiding both the blunt speech venerated in the Roman Republic and the complaisance—manifest as either silence or flattery—that puisance arouses.

*nam et eruditio in eo (sc: Lucilio) mira et libertas atque inde acerbitas et abunde salis. multum est tersior ac purus magis Horatius et, nisi labor eius amore, praecipuus.*

Quintilian *Inst.* 10.1.93

*....sed musa illa rustica et pastoralis non forum modo verum ipsam etiam urbem reformidat.*

Quintilian *Inst.* 10.1.55

AT THE CENTER OF HORACE'S FIRST BOOK OF POEMS SITS A LIVELY PIECE describing the poet's journey to Brundisium as part of Maecenas's entourage. Its modest length and its eye for the trivial threaten to throw us off

\*Many candid friends helped me develop this paper. I wish to thank Anthony Corbeill, Pamela Gordon, Emily Gowers, John Henderson, and TAPA's generous readers and editors for their suggestions. Like Horace (*Sat.* 1.5.44), *nil ego contulerim iucundo sanus amico*. I am grateful to KU's Hall Center for the Humanities for its support, through research leave, of this project. All translations herein are my own.

the scent of its weighty themes and, when the poem is read on its own, its seeming inconsequence almost succeeds. But when it is read in the context of *Satires* 1 as a whole, particularly its framing poems 1.4 and 1.6, and in the even broader context of the poet's literary and cultural milieu, the Journey to Brundisium becomes a virtuoso performance of Horace's most passionately expressed literary and personal values. When read against 1.4, 1.5 puts into practice the stylistic principles Horace preaches there—tempering Old Comic invective with New Comedy's focus on personal foibles and adding Callimachean technical elegance to create a polished and genteel exterior (Miller 2005: 138–39; Knorr 2004: 131–36; Ruffell 2003: 63; Freudenburg 1993: 201–05; Rudd 1966). The Journey to Brundisium, a close imitation of and improvement upon a Lucilian episode, emerges crisper and cleaner, as Quintilian puts it in the epigraph above. When read against 1.6, the poem portrays Horace as the sort of friend he will there profess himself to be: reserved and prudent, affectionate and loyal, genuine and not ambitious. In glossing over politics, Horace not only demonstrates to Maecenas and others his own discretion (Lyne 1995: 17–19; Oliensis 1998: 27–28; *contra* Tennant 1991), but he also soft-pedals the political crisis that necessitated the journey in the first place and presents Maecenas and his entourage in a friendly light (Kennedy 1992: 32–33; DuQuesnay 1984: 39–43). The Journey to Brundisium thus succinctly demonstrates the interconnectedness of stylistic, political, and personal themes (Miller 2005: 138–39).

In this paper I expand the literary and cultural context in which we must read this extraordinary poem, drawing attention to a further dimension of 1.5's core themes of friendship and literary values: its complex relationship with the Epicurean tradition and its adherents and commentators, notably Vergil. The poem's engagement with Vergil's *Eclogues* dominates its first half with an extended episode that recalls and inverts Vergil's pastoral world. This episode is bracketed by passages rich with references to Epicurean texts and ideas. The engagement with Vergil and Epicureanism culminates in a concise display of the new Epicureanism evolving at the bay of Naples. In what follows, I trace Horace's nods to his literary and philosophical friend and argue that the intertextual nexus at the heart of *Satires* 1 constitutes a meditation on Epicurean friendship and the disciplines it imposes, such as frank speaking to one's friends.<sup>1</sup> Horace advances a model shaped to fit the realities of

<sup>1</sup> By appealing to "intertextuality," I intend my study to appraise not only the ways Horace brings multiple texts and discourses to bear on his poem, but how the reader does as well. See Fowler 1997: 15–18; Hinds 1998: 17–51, esp. 47–51; and Gale 2000: 4 for discussions of the reader-centric focus of intertextuality, and Fowler 1997: 17–18 and Gordon 1998: 192 for the range of ways one text might engage another.

life under the triumvirate in the 30s B.C.E., when power was consolidated into a very few, formidable hands. Horace's satiric Epicureanism dictates a golden mean delicately wended between extremes, avoiding both the blunt speech venerated in the Roman Republic and the complaisance—manifest as either silence or flattery—that puissance arouses. Blunt speech got Cicero proscribed; some form of complaisance left Cicero's friend Atticus alive and rubbing shoulders with both Octavian and Antony. Horace's intertextual poem offers an object lesson in how and why this softening of the vitriol associated with Lucilian satire makes Horace's gentler poetry the only possible medium for honest social exchange in the Republic's waning days.

### HORACE AMONG THE PHAEACIANS

Horace's opening lines beckon his reader into a richly resonant literary and cultural tradition (1.5.1–9):

Egressum magna me accepit Aricia Roma  
 hospitio modico; rhetor comes Heliodorus,  
 Graecorum longe doctissimus; inde Forum Appi  
 differtum nautis, cauponibus atque malignis.  
 hoc iter ignavi divisimus, altius ac nos  
 praecinctis unum: minus est gravis Appia tardis.  
 hic ego propter aquam, quod erat deterrima, ventri  
 indico bellum, cenantis haud animo aequo  
 exspectans comites.

Aricia took me in with modest accommodations after I left grand Rome; the rhetor Heliodorus was my traveling companion, by far the most learned of all Greeks. From there on to Forum Appi, jam-packed with sailors, and innkeepers up to no good. We lazily split this part of the journey into two parts; more athletic types could do it in one. The Appian Way is less difficult for the sluggish. Here I declare war on my belly because of the water, which was fouler than foul, and it was hardly with a calm temper that I waited around for my comrades while they dined.

Horace here recalls and adapts a passage from Homer's *Odyssey*, in which Odysseus opens the tale of his travels to the Phaeacian court (*Od.* 9.39–40):

Ἰλιόθεν με φέρων ἄνεμος Κικόνεσσι πέλασσεν,  
 Ἴσμάρω.

From Ilium the wind blew me to the land of the Ciconians, Ismaros.

Horace's vocalization as Odysseus introduces the poet, our narrator, as the ultimate *pícaro* in all his roguish glory, but more telling is Horace's change

to the Odyssean intertext. He replaces Odysseus's snappy follow up, "I sacked their city and killed them all," (*Od.* 9.40: ἔνθα δ' ἐγὼ πόλιν ἔπραθον, ὤλεσα δ' αὐτούς), with a reference to his stay in a modest inn (*hospitio modico*, 1.5.2).<sup>2</sup> He is not the boasting epic hero, but the undemanding guest.

This is the first hint of the Epicurean content to come. It is enriched by the context and *Nachleben* of Odysseus's remark. Just before he settles into his adventure tale with the opening cited above, Odysseus praises the life of song and friendship (*Od.* 9.5–11):

οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ γέ τί φημι τέλος χαριέστερον εἶναι	5
ἢ ὅτ' εὐφροσύνη μὲν ἔχη κατὰ δῆμον ἅπαντα,	
δαιτυμόνες δ' ἀνὰ δώματ' ἀκουάζωνται ἀοιδοῦ	
ἥμενοι ἐξείης, παρὰ δὲ πλήθωσι τράπεζαι	
σίτου καὶ κρειῶν, μέθυ δ' ἐκ κρητῆρος ἀφύσσων	
οἶνοχόος φορέησι καὶ ἐγγεῖρ δεπάεσσι·	10
τοῦτό τί μοι κάλλιστον ἐνὶ φρεσὶν εἶδεται εἶναι.	

For I say that there is no end more pleasing than when joy takes hold of the whole people, and revelers throughout the house listen to a musician perform as they sit side by side and nearby the tables are filled with bread and meat and, drawing wine from jars, the server brings it out and pours it into our cups; in my opinion this is a thing most beautiful to see.

Odysseus's attitude was taken in antiquity as a succinct (if anachronistic) encapsulation of Epicurean values by both enemies and friends of Epicurus's school at Athens, the Garden (Gordon 1998: 189–98). Odysseus's extended conversation with the Phaeacians over food and drink became a model of behavior to be emulated or excoriated, depending on one's position. Those hostile to the Garden paint the Phaeacians as wanton hedonists, while Epicurus's defenders were left two options. Either they could condemn the Phaeacians as hedonists but sever Scheria's ties with Epicureans. Such was Lucretius's stance (*Lucr.* 2.24–28; Gordon 1998: 194). Or they could cast the idle Phaeacian lifestyle as that of the simple pleasures of friendship and song. Philodemus falls into this latter category, and one of his most influential epigrams is an invitation to dinner on Epicurus's birthday ("the Twentieth")

<sup>2</sup> Seneca got Horace's point; his deified Claudius botches the same intertext at *Apocolocyntosis* 5. As many readers have noted, Horace fails to live up to his epic model elsewhere in the poem as well; the traveling Roman poet observes rather than fights a "Cyclops" (1.5.63), is jilted even by a prostitute (1.5.82–85), and only visits the town Diomedes founded (1.5.92). For these and other nuances of Horace's shortcomings as an epic hero, see Richlin 1983: 179–83; Ehlers 1985: 80–81; Gowers 1993: 42–43 and 59–60; Connors 2005: 132; and Keane 2006: 54.

that combines Phaeacian fellowship with what Gigante (1995: 82) calls the “meager table that is the Epicurean stronghold” (*Epigrams* 27 [Sider]):

αὔριον εἰς λιτὴν σε καλιάδα φίλτατε Πείσων,  
 ἔξ ἐνάτης ἔλκει μουσοφιλῆς ἕταρος  
 εἰκάδα δειπνίζων ἐνιαύσιον· εἰ δ' ἀπολείψεις  
 οὔθατα καὶ Βρομίου Χιογενῇ πρόποσιν,  
 ἀλλ' ἐτάρους ὅψει παναληθείας, ἀλλ' ἐπακούσῃ  
 Φαιήκων γαίης πουλὺ μελιχρότερα,  
 ἦν δέ ποτε στρέψῃς καὶ ἐς ἡμέας ὄμματα, Πείσων,  
 ἄξομεν ἐκ λιτῆς εἰκάδα πιωτέρην. 5

Tomorrow, Piso dearest, at the ninth hour of the day your music-loving companion drags you into my modest hut to entertain you at the annual celebration of the Twentieth. If you pine for rich udders and a libation of Bromian juice born in Chios, you'll see instead the truest companions, you'll hear things sweeter by far than the land of the Phaeacians.<sup>3</sup> But should you turn your eyes onto us, Piso, we'll upgrade our humble feast to a fat one.

Horace's insertion of *hospitio modico* gains Epicurean resonance in this context, perhaps even rendering Philodemus's εἰς λιτὴν...καλιάδα at *Ep.* 27.1. Indeed modest dwellings are a hallmark of Epicurean living, according to Cicero *Fin.* 1.20.65, and Horace later in his poem stays at a *villula* (1.5.45), a modest villa—the same word Vergil uses to describe the house given to him by the Epicurean Siro (Sider 1997 *ad* 27.1).

The lines following Horace's *incipit* confirm the satirist's interest in the Phaeacians and their Epicurean pleasures. Instead of dining and talking with friends, Horace must sit out since his stomach hurts; he is not as lucky as Odysseus or Piso. Yet Horace's failed banquet still acts as an Epicurean lesson. Comfort of the body (not its overindulgence) constitutes its pleasure. Horace's stomach ache is precisely the sort of physical discomfort the Epicureans wish to avoid since it is a distraction from *ataraxia*, notably translated into Latin as *aequo animo* (Lucr. 1.42). What is more, the social aspect of the dinner is the pleasure to be sought above all. Horace's *haud aequo animo* may be a reaction to his sore belly, but it is grammatically linked with *cenantis...expectans comites* (1.5.8–9). He is grumpy not so much because he misses dinner, but because he misses dinner companions, the sincere sort that, together with tales of Phaeacians, constitute the proper focus and true gratification of the

<sup>3</sup> Sider 1997 *ad* 27.6 discusses what exactly Piso might hear: either “sweeter than the Phaeacian land (heard)” or “sweeter than (those told about) the Phaeacian land.” Philodemus, reciting his poem, acts either as Odysseus or Homer or, as Sider argues, both.

Epicurean feast in Philodemus's description (*Ep.* 27.5–6 and cf. ἐϋφοροσύνη, *Od.* 9.6).<sup>4</sup>

Two features of the opening passage add extra nuance to Horace's emerging Epicurean outlook. First, the characterization of his pace at 1.5.5–6 pokes fun at Lucilius, whose *Iter Siculum* covered far more geographical ground but moved, poetically speaking, much more slowly. Horace's pace is geographically sluggish, but poetically brusque.<sup>5</sup> But these lines also admit awareness of the equation of Phaeacianness and laziness when Horace describes himself as lazy (*ignavi*, 1.5.5 and *tardis*, 1.5.6) for taking two days to reach Forum Appi from Aricia, when more hearty folks could travel the distance in a day. As mentioned above, because of the "lazy Phaeacian" notion, not all Epicureans embraced Scheria's people as models for the Garden. Lucretius was one such skeptic who espoused a firmer and more energetic Epicureanism. By embracing the slow road, Horace endorses a gentler—Philodemean—philosophy, but he makes certain to flag it as expedient.

Second, the Epicurean echoes explored above lead the careful reader to wonder about Horace's companion (specifically, his dinner companion—*comes*) Heliodorus, "the best Greek rhetor by far" (1.5.2–3). Scholarly consensus identifies Heliodorus as a pseudonym for the metrically-impossible Apollodorus of Pergamum, tutor of Octavian.<sup>6</sup> His association with Octavian (underlined by the fresh mention of Aricia, Octavian's mother's home town) quietly ushers Octavian into the poem early on. One might see here Horace rubbing noses with the important people, but the presence of Octavian's tutor also raises the specter of political speech, that is, the combination of speech and power; the triumvir has a preferred way of speaking. This turns out not to be Horace's.<sup>7</sup> Apollodorus was a rhetor of the Atticist school, which arose and flourished in the mid-first century B.C.E. (*RE* sv. Apollodorus 64.2889). The Atticists, like the Stoics, valued austerity and authenticity of word and manner as opposed to the richness, feeling, and craft of the Asianist (and Epicurean) approach. Those hostile to the Atticist style, such as Cicero, linked rhetorical style to culture and character, casting this austerity as ruggedness, and the

<sup>4</sup> As *Epigrams* 27.3–6 indicates, the feast itself will be modest but the pleasures of conversation with candid friends (παναληθές) will be sweeter by far.

<sup>5</sup> Cucchiarelli 2001: 60–61 (and see also 88–89) discusses the Lucilian nuance and adds an additional dimension: Horace's lower status mandates his slow travel by land, whereas Maecenas's higher status enables the great patron to travel by sea.

<sup>6</sup> Frank 1920a first made the identification. Gowers 1993: 57 cleverly suggests this is a book rather than a person.

<sup>7</sup> Through the Atii Octavian, like Odyssean Horace, has his own Trojan war identity (Vergil *Aen.* 5.568–69), albeit one very differently motivated and mobilized.

authenticity as off-the-cuff, careless composition (Narducci 2002; Dugan 2001). In contrast, Horace—and, one might note, Philodemus—professed the superiority of a more polished compositional technique, treated at some length in 1.4 and summed up twenty years later in Horace's phrase *callida iunctura* (Ars 47–48), itself laden with Epicurean import (Freudenburg 1993: 139–56; Oberhelman and Armstrong 1995: 242–44). Given these rhetorical differences between Horace and Heliodorus, one can imagine the spirited, perhaps tense or even cautious, conversations between traveling companions (Frank 1920a: 393). Heliodorus disappears from the poem after this mention of him in the second line; we shall see below that the aesthetic and political tensions his presence raises do not.

### ARCADIA IN THE POMPTINE MARSHES

The poem's beginning thus introduces Horace's stymied Epicureanism: his preference, not always fulfilled, for feast and cottage, for friends and conversation. The next section of the poem moves Horace into different geographical and emotional territory—the frustrating Pomptine marshes—where the malfunction of the Epicurean ideal is even more palpable. Horace ushers in this leg of his journey with language that stands apart from the conversational tone of the rest of the satire (1.5.9–10):

iam nox inducere terris  
umbras et caelo diffundere signa parabat 10

Already night was preparing to bring darkness onto the lands and to spread its signs across the sky.

These lines have a distinct epic flavor, similar to Horace's claim to have declared war on his belly (1.5.7–8), and they foreshadow the epic-style battle of wits that dominates the poem's second half.<sup>8</sup> Critics note these lines for the gap they make visible between what Horace's poetry could be—grand, encomiastic—and what it disappointingly is: modest, personal, and parodic (Connors 2005: 131–36; Ehlers 1985; Sallmann 1974: 200–06; Fraenkel 1957: 111; and cf. Rudd 1966: 61–62). It is also possible to see in these lines the shadow of a different hexametric genre: Lucretian didactic, whose epic tone elevates the description of nightfall as a cosmological phenomenon (*et neque*

<sup>8</sup> Horace's incorporation of the high style has been taken as a way to highlight (through contrast) more personal themes (Connors 2005: 131–36), as his evolving response to the pressure to compose encomium in the high style, cf. Ehlers 1985, and as parodic harbinger of the low-life episode that follows. See Sallmann 1974: 200–06; Fraenkel 1957: 111; and cf. Rudd 1966: 61–62.

*opinantis tenebris obducere terras*, they hide with shadows the lands unwary, 5.777 and *hoc ubi roriferis terram nox obruit undis*, when night overwhelms the land with its dew-bringing waves, 6.864). For the Horatian reader attuned to Lucretius, these echoes contribute to the satirist's self-portrait as an Epicurean and mark his attempt to elevate the humble over the heroic.<sup>9</sup>

An additional intertext informs and complicates the epic or Epicurean Horace, and increases the tension between the great deeds in the former and the disregard for such deeds in the latter. Horace's high-style nightfall calls to mind the similar atmosphere of Vergilian pastoral, suffused in shades of various sorts—from the pleasant shade of trees to the ominous falling shadows of eventide. Vergil's first eclogue ends with a combination of the two, when at nightfall Tityrus invites Meliboeus to take some cheer with him. Just as in Horace's poem, though in reverse order, Vergil's shade is connected to a meal (*Ecl.* 1.79–84):

hic tamen hanc mecum poteris requiescere noctem  
fronde super viridi: sunt nobis mitia poma, 80  
castaneae molles et pressi copia lactis,  
et iam summa procul villarum culmina fumant,  
maioresque cadunt altis de montibus umbrae.

But you could stay the night here with me on a fresh bed of grass: I have ripe apples, and tender chestnuts, and lots of cheese, and already the chimney tops of homes far off begin to glow with smoke, and heavier shadows fall from the high mountains.

These Vergilian lines cap a poem infused with Epicurean echoes. In the most overt of these, Tityrus describes his savior Octavian in the same terms Lucretius uses to describe Epicurus (*namque erit ille mihi semper deus*, for he will always be a god to me, *Ecl.* 1.6–7 and cf. *deus ille fuit, deus*, that man was a god, a god, *Lucr.* 5.7–8). Octavian was like Epicurus to Tityrus, providing peace and security from worldly ills—paradoxically, through worldly means. Meliboeus is not so lucky, and all Tityrus can offer his dispossessed friend is a more conventional Epicurean palliative to the ills born of the (epic) world of politics and war.<sup>10</sup> Faced with the pain of land confiscation and the loss of

<sup>9</sup> Lucretian echoes are frequent in *Satires* 1; see, e.g., 1.3.96–124, summarizing *Lucr.* 5.783–1457. For Freudenburg 2001: 53–54, this Lucretian Epicureanism is a posture of the satirist to mask his inability or refusal to engage in free-speaking poetry of the Lucilian sort. Grimal 1993 denies Horace's subscription to Epicurean ethics but suggests that Horace offers poetry as an alternative way to escape hope and fear. Turpin 1998 sees Horace's Epicureanism as parodic.

<sup>10</sup> See Davis 2004: 70–72, who traces the consolation motif throughout Epicurean—particularly Philodemean—literature.



identity and the familiar that accompanies it (*Ecl.* 1.46–58, 64–78), Meliboeus might find in his friend's invitation fellowship (*mecum*), simple food (*poma*, *castaneae*, *pressi lactis*), and Epicurean *ataraxia* (*requiescere*). Pleasant though it may sound, the Epicurean solution Tityrus offers his friend is clearly second best to the one Octavian offered. This disparity between what Epicureanism wants and what it can achieve is, I believe, the same one that allows the *umbrae* to be both pleasant and melancholy in the *Eclogues*.

It is not my contention that Horace's nightfall quotes directly from Vergil's text. Rather, I suggest that the reader conversant with Vergil's poetry and alert to Epicurean texts and ideas here begins to see them at play in this journey poem. The faint echo of Epicurean-tinted pastoral grows louder as the poem advances, operating on the level of details and extending to the broader interpretive themes of the relationships between poetry and friendship, and between Epicureanism and affairs of the day. First, let us trace the details of the transformed eclogue that Horace presents in the Pomptine marshes. Whereas Vergil's shade brings his eclogue to a close, in Horace's text the action is just beginning (1.5.11–23):

tum pueri nautis, pueris convicia nautae	
ingerere. ‘huc appelle!’ ‘trecentos inseris: ohe,	
iam satis est!’ dum aes exigitur, dum mula ligatur,	
tota abit hora. mali culices ranaeque palustres	
avertunt somnos, absentem ut cantat amicam	15
multa prolutus vappa nauta atque viator	
certatim: tandem fessus dormire viator	
incipit, ac missae pastum retinacula mulae	
nauta piger saxo religat stertitque supinus.	
iamque dies aderat, nil cum procedere lintrem	20
sentimus, donec cerebrosus prosilit unus	
ac mulae nautaeque caput lumbosque saligno	
fuste dolat. quarta vix demum exponimur hora.	

Then the slaves and sailors piled insults onto each other, back and forth: “Here, put in here!” “You’re cramming in three hundred: hey, that’s enough already!” We lose a whole hour while cash changes hands, while the mule is tied up. Damned mosquitos and marsh frogs make sleep impossible, as a sailor, drunk off the dregs of a bad wine, and the shorebound guide exchange songs about their absent girlfriends: finally the guide falls asleep exhausted, and the lazy sailor ties up the mule so it can eat and starts snoring himself as soon as he’s horizontal. And it was already daylight when we realize that the boat hasn’t moved an inch, at which point some hothead jumps up and starts beating both the mule and the sailor about the shanks and head with a willow cudgel. We finally get started again at ten o’clock.

To the reader who has the *Eclogues* in mind, even vaguely, certain features of Vergil's Arcadia are visible here, albeit distorted by Horace's bleary and irritated satiric eye. The insults exchanged by slaves and sailors (1.5.11–13) recall the exchange of insults that opens the third eclogue, in which Menalcas accuses Damoetas of overmilking another man's herd, while Damoetas retaliates by a sort of blackmail, threatening to reveal Menalcas's own unsavory secrets (*Ecl.* 3.5–9). Next in Horace's passage an hour passes, money changes hands, and it's time for a break. The latter is spent in good pastoral fashion, with a singing contest of the sort that occupies eclogues 2, 5, 7, and 8. Horace's sailor and his shorebound guide exchange songs about their missing girlfriends (1.5.15–17). The verb Horace uses to describe their contest (*cantat* in line 1.5.15) is the same used by Vergil sixteen times in the *Eclogues* to indicate pastoral song.<sup>11</sup> Horace's sailor and guide sing in turns, *certatim*, 1.5.17; the verb *certare* appears eight times and its noun *certamen* once in the *Eclogues* as an indicator of amoebaeon song.<sup>12</sup> In Horace's poem, their topic, their contest, and their song recreate a pastoral episode not in lovely Arcadia but in the brackish Pomptine marshes. Notably, the occasion for Horace's amoebaeon song is not a moment of leisure with the flocks, but rather of sleeplessness forced by bugs and frogs.

Vergil's pastoral songs, be they about love, friendship, or song itself, are closely linked with the natural environment. Pastoral's *locus amoenus* inspires shepherds to sing and mimics the shepherd's songs, even when the effect is melancholy.<sup>13</sup> Sometimes nature even provides an alternative to pastoral song, or a model for it.<sup>14</sup> In Horace's inverted pastoral world, the *locus amoenus* is replaced with the Pomptine marshes, a place nauseating down to its water (*deterrima*, 1.5.7). Like the *locus amoenus*, Horace's *locus satiricus* is sympathetic and participates in the song—in the form of frog and mosquito accompaniment (1.5.14–15).<sup>15</sup> And don't forget the snoring (1.5.19).

<sup>11</sup> *Ecl.* 2.23; 3.21 and 25; 5.54 and 76; 6.71; 7.5; 8.71; 9.29, 52, 64 and 65; 10.31, 32, 41, and 75. I count nineteen uses of *canere*.

<sup>12</sup> *Ecl.* 2.57; 3.31; 4.58; 5.8, 9, and 15; 7.16 (*certamen*); 8.3 and 55. Miller 2005: 140 notes the pastoral send-up at play in *certatim*.

<sup>13</sup> Nature inspires song: *Ecl.* 5.3 (breeze and shade lead Menalcas to sing). Nature mimicking human song: *Ecl.* 1.4–5 (woods echo Tityrus's song), 8.3–4 (songs cause lynxes to settle down and rivers to change course). Melancholy sympathetic nature: *Ecl.* 2.3–4 (densely shaded grove mimics Corydon's despair).

<sup>14</sup> Nature offering alternative or model: *Ecl.* 5.82–84 (Mopsus compares Menalcas's song to nature).

<sup>15</sup> The frog serenade suggests a different intertext to Andrea Cucchiarelli: Aristophanes' *Frogs*. See Cucchiarelli 2001 and 2002. Cucchiarelli finds a similar connection between literary pedigree and the problems and resolutions of contemporary political strife, see Hooley 2003.

Horace retains pastoral's pathetic fallacy only to show its other side; rather than elegant shepherd-poets, Horace gives us real-world rustics performing in concert with raucous nature.

Other pastoral features appear. Horace's sailor in 1.5.16 doesn't drink the sweet wine of Vergil's bucolic world,<sup>16</sup> but he is drunk, *prolutus*, on the dregs, the *vappa*. An important part of pastoral is of course the pastoral part: the fact that Vergil's characters are typically shepherds, often accompanied by their grazing flocks. In Horace's parody there is grazing, too, but by a mule, that paradigmatic animal of satire (1.5.17–19). Finally, Vergil's pastoral willow appears, but it's not a musical instrument that lulls the shepherd to sleep, nor is it a sweet treat for goats.<sup>17</sup> On the contrary, it is a tool to whip the mule and sailor (1.5.21–23), who, incidentally, catches a nice pastoral nap, but does so on the job.

### HORACE AND PASTORAL'S EPICUREANISM

In Horace's poem, the song and setting recreate an eclogue only to turn it upside down. To what ends? This pastoral episode in Horace's poem is a generic tour-de-force, as Horace explores what happens when satire casts its critical eye on the bucolic countryside. Not prone to see the beauties of the landscape or the charm of its inhabitants, Horace instead focuses on the flies and the troubles of travel, on the rude strangers and the bad food. The pastoral episode also marks a tribute to Vergil just before his arrival into the traveling party. Vergil is clearly Horace's favorite traveling companion, and Horace's affectionate nod to Vergil's poetry via his mini-eclogue paves the way for the more explicit statement of the impact of their friendship later in the poem (1.5.40). I shall return to this statement of friendship in a different context below; for now the key point I would like to make is that both texts, written in the long wake of Caesar's death, share a critical perspective on the political realities of the day and on the role of personal relationships—of friendship—in this changing context.<sup>18</sup> It is here that Horace's use of the *Eclogues* takes on deeper meaning.

Pastoral is often seen as an escapist genre, "an unfulfillable longing for a simpler life" that "thrives on a series of removes from reality," set in "a pretty, fictional world into which one may escape from the real world now and then in imagination. It is not a program of reform or conversion of that world" (Betensky 1976: 4; Putnam 1995–1996: 310; and Coleman 1977: 1

<sup>16</sup> Sweet wine promised by Menalcas: *Ecl.* 5.71.

<sup>17</sup> Willow as musical instrument: *Ecl.* 1.55; as goat treat: *Ecl.* 1.77–8, 3.83.

<sup>18</sup> See Classen 1973, for whom the poet's private and genuine (*herzliche*, 246) friendships contrast with the politically motivated friendships alluded to in *aversos amicos* (1.5.29).

respectively). As Quintilian says in the epigraph to this essay, the rustic and pastoral muse not only abhors the forum but even the city itself (*Inst.* 10.1.55). He refers here both to pastoral's setting and to its content. In order to make transparent its complete retreat, the pastoral mode incorporates awareness of a life and livelihood that is alien to the countryside; Theocritus's few political idylls, for example, contextualize the rustic poems as such. Vergil integrates the other world into his rustic poems in a very different way, by holding town and country in tension within individual poems (Tityrus's visit to Octavian in *Ecl.* 1, or the dedication to Varus in *Ecl.* 6).

Pastoral's escapism aligns with Epicurean notions of a better, simpler world, sheltered from the ills and pressures of modern life. Lucretius himself most often uses the pastoral mode to evoke the simple beauties of the animal world, uncorrupted by such social ills as ambition and fear of death (Betensky 1976), but it may also describe the ideal human condition, as in this famous passage in Lucretius's second book that contrasts the refined and, to Lucretius's mind, extravagant pleasures of the Phaeacian palace (Gordon 1998: 194–95) with the simpler pastoral social ideal (Lucr. 2.20–33):

ergo corpoream ad naturam pauca videmus	20
esse opus omnino, quae demant cumque dolorem,	
delicias quoque uti multas substernere possint.	
gratius interdum neque natura ipsa requirit,	
si non aurea sunt iuvenum simulacra per aedes	
lampadas igniferas manibus retinentia dextris,	25
lumina nocturnis epulis ut suppeditentur,	
nec domus argento fulget auroque renidet	
nec citharae reboant laqueata aurataque templa,	
cum tamen inter se prostrati in gramine molli	
propter aquae rivum sub ramis arboris altae	
non magnis opibus iucunde corpora curant,	30
praesertim cum tempestas adridet et anni	
tempora conspergunt viridantis floribus herbas.	

And so we see how few things our physical selves actually require—such things as diminish discomfort, and thus render many delights. Nature herself does not require anything more pleasing now and then, even if there are no golden statues of youths carrying fiery torches in their right hands scattered throughout the household, to light up the evening feasts, if the house doesn't gleam with silver and shine with gold, if the strains of the cithara don't make the gilded and coffered spaces resound, when, nevertheless, lying on the soft grass together next to a stream of water under the branches of a tall tree, people restore their bodies pleasantly enough using no great resources, especially when the weather smiles and the season sprinkles the green grass with blooms.

Vergil's own pastoral text is laced with Epicurean sentiments; the opening of his first eclogue portrays Tityrus enjoying just the sort of lovely day that Lucretius describes. The rest of Vergil's collection follows suit. It is important to note that Vergil's text filters Epicureanism through allusions to both Lucretius and Philodemus, and through engagement with the broader Neapolitan Epicurean tradition.<sup>19</sup> One might note here that Philodemus was far more entwined in Roman circles of power than was Lucretius; unlike Memmius's acquaintance Lucretius, Philodemus rubbed elbows with great political men (Piso) and with other poets who rubbed elbows with great political men (Varius Rufus, Plotius Tucca, Vergil, Quintilius Varus, and perhaps Horace).<sup>20</sup> Lucretius's and Philodemus's contemporary and very different lives and literary works compel us to recognize the complexity of and debate within the Garden, particularly when applied to the Roman cultural context whose traditions demanded levels of civic and political participation that posed challenges to Epicureanism's *ataraxia*.

The town-and-country tension that pervades the *Eclogues* may be seen as connected to the dilemma of Roman Epicureanism. Vergil's shepherds sometimes find it impossible to conform to Quintilian's pastoral standard and "abhor the business of the forum and the city" (10.1.55). Tityrus, for example, must visit Rome to plead for concessions. He cannot maintain the distance from politics that traditional Epicureanism encourages. His resolution to this Epicurean crisis is to elide Octavian and Epicurus, to imagine an *ataraxia* that depends upon or results from some relationship with the world of politics. For his friend Meliboeus, who cannot thus engage with the triumvir, the Epicurean lifestyle is at best a salve. A similar dynamic emerges in *Ecl.* 9, in which song and fellowship prove to be for Moeris and his friend Lycidas mere consolations, *solacia*, (*Ecl.* 9.18) that ease, but not completely, a tough road: *cantantes licet usque (minus uia laedit) eamus* (9.64). Horace describes his lazy path to Brundisium with similar language: *minus est gravis Appia tardis* (1.5.6). This line, the reader will recall, both pokes fun at Lucilian protraction and hints at Horace's own lazy (Phaeacian/Philodemian) brand

<sup>19</sup> Studies are many. For a sample, see Davis 2004; Breed 2000; and VanSickle 2000 for *Ecl.* 1; Hardie 1998: 10–13 for *Ecl.* 3–6; Frischer 1975: 195–260 for *Ecl.* 7; and Frank 1920b for a pervasive Neapolitan influence on the text. Ancient readers saw it too: Servius *ad Ecl.* 6.13 indicates that Siro, whose nickname was Silenus, stands behind the poem's protagonist, but cf. Gigante 2004, who argues that Epicureanism did not find strong voice in Vergil's poetry until the *Georgics*.

<sup>20</sup> See Sider 1997: 21–23 for Philodemus's connection to political men, and Fowler 1989 for Lucretius's isolation from them (perhaps even from Memmius) as mirrored by his philosophical isolationism in the *De rerum natura*.

of *ataraxia*. Horace's and Vergil's easier roads, when read with an ear alert to Epicurean subtext, test the relationship between avoidance and involvement, probing but not solving the Roman Epicurean conundrum: how does *ataraxia* fit into the arduous system of Roman values? Is it a comfortable symbiont of political involvement, even an acceptable pretext for dependence rather than action, or is it the best we can do when those values fail?

The presence of Vergilian pastoral and of Epicurean philosophies and philosophers in the background of Horace's satire opens broader questions about the relationship between poetry itself and politics; is poetry engagement or escape? Consider Horace's description of Maecenas when the latter arrives to join the traveling party (1.5.27–29):

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

Here Maecenas, that finest man, and Cocceius were to meet us, sent on a mission about weighty affairs, each of them ambassadors in the habit of reconciling estranged friends.

The weighty affairs are, of course, triumviral politics, and the friends at odds are Octavian and Antony, who will try to resolve their differences with the help of their legates at a summit in Tarentum in 37 B.C.E.<sup>21</sup> Scholarly consensus interprets this passage as one of many instances in this poem in which Horace underplays contemporary political realities, a posture that thwarts or even lowers our expectations of the poet and his work (Gowers 1993; Freudenburg 1993: 204–05) and subtly palliates the idea of the new order by yoking it to such comfortable notions as friendship (DuQuesnay 1984; Kennedy 1992: 33; Oliensis 1998: 27–29). Literary pedigree is not far off, though, for Horace's description of Maecenas's mission—a description so perplexing for its lack of specificity—evokes Horace's own description from 1.4 of Lucilius's poetic technique (1.4.6–8):

hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus,  
mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque; facetus,  
emunctae naris, durus componere versus.

Lucilius hangs entirely from here, following these guys, only with the meter and feet changed; witty, of keen nose, rugged in composing verse.

<sup>21</sup> Scholarly consensus now considers this poem's diplomatic subject to be the *pax Tarentina* of 37 B.C.E.; see Freudenburg 2001: 53n59; but cf. Gowers 1993: 49–50 for an argument that Horace deliberately conflates all the possibilities.

Lucilian satire here butts up against triumviral politics. *Componere* appears in the same form in the same *sedes* in both passages. In the journey passage the verb suggests reconciliation. The description of Lucilius turns our eye to *componere* as poetic composition. The similarity of their accusatives—*aversos amicos* in the journey and *versus* in the description of Lucilian poetry—further facilitates reading these passages in concert.<sup>22</sup> Together these passages bring into alignment resolving political differences with composing poetry. *Componere* also takes on Epicurean overtones, for *compositio* translates σύνθεσις (arrangement), one of the features so valuable in good poetry as theorized by Philodemus.<sup>23</sup> In Philodemus's view *synthesis*, far from being simply an aesthetic value, adds actual meaning to a poem's ideas and acts together with content to create poetry of quality.<sup>24</sup> Satire 1.4 plays on and up the idea of composition as it interrelates with thought. Lucilius has the thought—the lively ability (styled as *libertas*, 1.4.5, more on which later)—to attack contemporary society's targets, and he frames this thought with a rugged compositional technique (*durus componere versus*, 1.4.8). But Horace's Philodemian sensibility sees Lucilius's ruggedness as a flaw which he immediately points out: *nam fuit hoc vitiosus*, "for he was defective in this regard" (1.4.9). Tellingly, these same two traits—rugged composition wedded to old-fashioned *libertas*—underpin Republican Stoic compositional theory (Freudenburg 1993: 145–50, 156–57), and *durus componere versus* also smacks of the Atticizing tradition. It is wise here to recall Horace's traveling companion Heliodorus. So, in 1.5, Horace describes Maecenas in terms that subtly endorse the Epicurean approach to poetry while rejecting Lucilian invective, Stoic composition, and Atticizing ruggedness—with, perhaps, the latter's most notorious contemporary pupil Octavian.

I would like here to suggest an additional intertext that, to readers who share Horace's interest in philosophy, complicates this dynamic and nuances its diagnosis of Epicureanism: Tityrus's confession of his innocence before his first visit to Rome (*Ecl.* 1.22–23):

sic canibus catulos similis, sic matribus haedos  
noram, sic parvis componere magna solebam.

I knew that puppies were like dogs, and that kids were like their mothers. I was in the habit of comparing great things to small in this way.

<sup>22</sup> Both *versus* and *aversos* come ultimately from the Latin *verto*.

<sup>23</sup> See, e.g., Cicero *Orat.* 201 and Quintilian *Inst.* 9.4.1 for the use of the word *compositio* to discuss what Aristotle called σύνθεσις.

<sup>24</sup> See Phil. *On Poems* 5 col.xii (xv) 1–17 and the discussions in Porter 1995: 102–17; Janko 1995: 90–91; Oberhelman and Armstrong 1995; and Freudenburg 1993: 139–45.

Like Maecenas and Cocceius in Horace's poem, Tityrus was "accustomed to putting things together" (*soliti/solebam componere*, respectively).<sup>25</sup> *Soleo* in both cases points to a former naivete or misguidedness. Tityrus even calls himself a fool because of it (*stultus*, *Ecl.* 1.21), and Brundisium was, after all, the second summit brokered by Maecenas. Here, too, we see these two texts—the *Satires* and the *Eclogues*—struggling with questions of escape and engagement. Tityrus recognizes the limitations of his former idyllic perspective in two ways. First, there are qualitative, not merely quantitative differences between his pastoral world and Rome. Second, such innocence, be it pastoral or Epicurean, cannot remain intact in the violent politics of triumviral Rome. Horace's description of Maecenas and Cocceius as *soliti aversos componere amicos* similarly exposes the uncomfortable prospect that Epicurean friendship camouflages but does not eliminate politics; the prior failure housed in *soliti* is foreboding indeed. Horace's and Vergil's texts are thus not so far apart in their disheartening take on Epicureanism's ability to resolve or remediate.

A passage near the end of Horace's poem brings these difficulties to a head. After finding a local phenomenon and tourist attraction to be bunk, Horace winds down his poem on a skeptical note about the gods' interaction in earthly affairs (1.5.101–03):

... namque deos didici securum agere aevum,  
nec si quid miri faciat natura, deos id  
tristis ex alto caeli demittere tecto.

For I have learned that the gods live their lives free from care, and if nature should happen to create some miracle, the sober gods don't send it from the high dome of heaven.

Horace here merges a passage from Vergil's fourth eclogue with two snippets of Lucretius that deny the existence of involved gods (*Ecl.* 4.7, *Lucretius* 5.82–83=6.58–59 and 2.1153–54):

iam nova progenies caelo demittitur alto.

Now a new child is sent down from high heaven.

nam bene qui didicere deos securum agere aevum,  
si tamen interea mirantur...

<sup>25</sup> TLL suggests a semantic overlap between these two uses of *componere*; both 1.5.29 and *Ecl.* 1.23 fall under the rubric II.C: "*praevallet notio coniunctionis, collationis duorum, diversorum*." *Ecl.* 1.23 is found at II.C.1 as a synonym for *comparare*, and 1.5.29 is found at II.C.2 categorizing usage "*de discordibus*." *Componere* as composition is not far off: II.B, *de oratione, scriptis sim* (Hofmann TLL 2129.68, 2130.09, 2123.80 respectively).



For there are those who have learned well that the gods live their lives free from care, but if something miraculous should happen....

haud, ut opinor, enim mortalia saecula superne  
aurea de caelo dimisit funis in arva...

Hardly, as I think, did some golden rope from heaven send down to earth the ages of men from above...

Vergil's fourth eclogue celebrates the hope of a new peace granted by the treaty of 40 B.C.E. when Antony married Octavia. Vergil's golden-age child savior already redacts Lucretius's golden rope, transforming Lucretius's perspective in a manner at once more hopeful and more cynical: in the eclogue there is help from "above," and/but that help comes from powerful men in this human world. Horace's poem is also about a treaty and the renewal it will bring—here, the second renewal after the second breakdown of friendly relations. Whereas Vergil was hopeful about the outcome of the compromise of 40 B.C.E., Horace now knows better (*didici*, 1.5.101), and he tempers Vergil's optimism by reasserting Lucretius's distant potentates, the gods. Horace's reworking of Vergil through Lucretius thus casts Horace as the sadder but wiser poet.<sup>26</sup>

The confluence of Vergil and Lucretius at the end of the fifth satire may be read as an encapsulation of the Epicurean dilemma, mentioned above, that Horace, like Lucretius and Vergil, probes throughout this poem: do Epicureanism and its pleasures (poetry, friendship) result from—indeed, rely on—the great deeds of great men? Or, are they only a retreat—indeed, the only viable retreat—from the ills those men bring about? Can Epicureans coexist with the world, or must they run from it? It is difficult not to see in Horace's golden rope an indictment of Vergil's longed-for golden child as fantasy. Other thwarted expectations in the poem—Horace's wet dream (1.5.82–85) and the poem's premature ending at Brundisium, not Tarentum (1.5.104)—similarly sink the reader's hopes. Yet neither is it possible to see Horace sticking his head in the sand; he is, after all, a part of Maecenas's mission. Horace refuses to let us use his poetry as proof either way; he leaves the dilemma intact, allowing only the troubling conclusion that (his) art, like Epicureanism itself, is both unveiler and veil.

<sup>26</sup> See Zetzel 2002 with additional articulation in Zetzel 1980; and cf. Knorr 2004; Reckford 2001; and Putnam 1995–1996: 310 for this intertextual nexus; and Dufallo 2000: 584–85 for a similar conclusion about Horace's programmatic satire 1.1. Van Rooy 1973 assigns chronological priority to Vergil's collection but stops short of suggesting the thematic implications on Horace's text.

## HORACE'S FORTHRIGHT FRIENDS: LIBERTAS REEXAMINED

Friends, verses, reconciliation, poetic composition—the growing presence of these themes, in the company of Philodemus, Lucretius, Vergil, and Lucilius, invites the reader to interrogate the role of satiric verse in teasing out these matters. Given the persistent echoes of the Epicurean tradition examined so far in the Journey to Brundisium, and given the care with which the poet has interwoven the works of other poets into his personal narrative, is it a surprise to read Horace's heartfelt relief<sup>27</sup> at the arrival of his poetic friends (1.5.39–44)?

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

40

The next day rose most agreeably; for at Sinuessa Plotius, Varius, and Vergil too joined up with us; such sincere souls the earth has never born, and no other is closer to them than me. O, what embraces there were, and such great pleasures! I would compare nothing with a good friend, so long as I was in my right mind.

Four aspects of these lines stand out to the reader attuned to Epicurean themes. First, the lines pay general homage to one of the cardinal principles of Epicureanism: friendship. Second, Horace's friends meet him at Sinuessa, evidently coming to join him from Siro's Epicurean school in Naples. Third, Horace's list of *animae candidiores* matches the list of poetic addressees Philodemus names twice, and in the same order, in *On Vices* and *On Flatterers*, with only one minor change: Philodemus's lists include Varus.<sup>28</sup> Based on these three aspects, the main point of recent scholarly debate vis-à-vis

<sup>27</sup> Fraenkel 1957: 111–12 argues for the sincerity implied in the superlatives; Freudenburg 2001: 53–54 sees exaggeration and obsession.

<sup>28</sup> PHerc. 253 frg. 12 and PHerc. 1082 lines 21–22, respectively. Varus is later described by Horace as a friend's toughest critic (*Ars* 434–38). Though *animae* seems an odd word choice in the context of an Epicurean sentiment, it is attested as a metonym for “person” by the mid-first century B.C.E.; see, e.g., Cicero *Fam.* 14.14.2: (*vos, meae carissimae animae...*).

these lines has been how formally Horace was aligned with Philodemus and his group of friends.<sup>29</sup>

The fourth aspect the Epicurean reader will notice is the word Horace uses to describe his friends. They are *candidiores*: bright, clear, unambiguous. The word *candidus* is laden with aesthetic connotations pertinent to our inquiry. At *Orat.* 53, Cicero uses the adjective to describe a “pure and clear speaking style” (*puro et candido genere dicendi*) in contrast to the harshness of the Atticizing school. Two notes on this. First, recall that Horace’s traveling companion Heliodorus/Apollodorus was an Atticist, and that Horace elsewhere rejects this rugged style. Second, in this paper’s epigraph Horace is himself called *purus* by Quintilian, who was no doubt familiar with the terms of this rhetorical debate.<sup>30</sup> The word has Epicurean implications as well, and its mention in connection to a known cadre of Epicurean friends resonates with an emerging Epicurean dialogue about frankness as an indispensable part of friendship (DeWitt 1935: 314). Sometime in the mid-first century Philodemus published a treatise *On Frank Speaking* (Περὶ παρρησίας), epitomizing Zeno’s recent lectures on the same theme.<sup>31</sup> Though the treatise remains fragmentary, some guidelines it proposes are clear. Throughout the treatise Philodemus emphasizes the kind intentions of the critic, who will adapt his criticism to the situation: harshness when needed, but more often, softness or chiding, criticism of the self as a model of tolerant acceptance and, at times, as a way to illuminate others’ failings.<sup>32</sup> Yet Philodemus’s softness should not get carried away; for above all, flattery is the enemy of frank speaking and of friendship.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>29</sup> See Sider 1997: 21–23 for a full discussion of the problems and opportunities posed by the lists of addressees. Despite Tsakirapolous-Summers’s 1998 argument that Horace never studied under Philodemus, general sentiment endorses a strong if informal connection between the two, even if the evidence all comes from Horace. Oberhelman and Armstrong 1995: 235–36 take a middle view that there was a personal but not formal acquaintance between the men. Gigante 2004: 88 argues – improbably, in my mind – that Philodemus copied Horace’s list and added Quintilius (Varus).

<sup>30</sup> Horace himself calls Maecenas’s house purer than others at 1.9.49.

<sup>31</sup> Zeno of Sidon was head of an Epicurean school in Athens; he delivered his lectures in 78 B.C.E. Less secure are the date of Philodemus’s treatise and the amount of Philodemian innovation. Clay 1998 makes a compelling case that the treatise reflects Philodemus’s ideas as much as Zeno’s lectures.

<sup>32</sup> E.g., Olivieri frg. 7 (on appropriate harshness), 8 (on the softer approach), and 81 (on pointing out one’s own errors).

<sup>33</sup> E.g., Olivieri 93 N2. DeWitt 1935 expands the list of enemies of παρρησία: “disimulation, cant, pretense, flattery, adulation, assentation, and the like” (312–13).

These tenets stand in stark contrast to the tenets of Lucilian satire. In 1.4.1–5 (and cf. 1.4.103–05), Horace styles Lucilian *libertas* as the ability to engage in personal attack of named others, unimpeded by decorum or fear of reprisal. In the competitive politics of the Roman Republic, *libertas* was the special prerogative of those, such as the aristocratic elite, who enjoyed the power of self-determination. All others who spoke freely committed the legal and social taboo of *licentia*.<sup>34</sup> It complicates the picture somewhat to note that *libertas* is also the Latin translation for παρρησία (Quintilian *Inst.* 9.2.27) and the later-bestowed Latin title of Philodemus's treatise: *de libertate dicendi*. These two opposed understandings of *libertas*, the Lucilian and the Philodemean, reveal the difficulty inherent in this tangled concept, whose meaning—always contingent on the status of the speaker—became, in the upheaval of the Republic's violent death, a Gordian knot to be severed only by the knife of the Princeps. One must tread lightly in the 30s B.C.E. *Candidus* was a prudent choice.

Horace uses *candidus* two other times in *Satires* 1. At 1.10.86, he appeals to the candid Furnius as one of the friends whose opinion of his poetry matters to Horace. Poetry, friendship, and frankness meet. More tellingly, in 1.2 Horace uses the adjective to describe the charms of a ready mistress in a passage that alludes to a lost Philodemean epigram (1.2.120–24):

illam 'post paulo sed pluris si exierit vir' 120  
 Gallis, hanc Philodemus ait sibi quae neque magno  
 stet pretio neque cunctetur cum est iussa venire.  
 candida rectaque sit; munda hactenus, ut neque longa  
 nec magis alba velit quam dat natura videri.

The girl who says “a little later” or “it will cost you more” or “only if my husband goes out,” this girl is for the *Galli*, says Philodemus, but he says the girl for him is one who neither costs too much nor delays when she's summoned. Let her be fair and stand tall; elegant only to a point, such that she wishes to appear neither taller nor paler than nature allows.

While the paraphrase of Philodemus seems to stretch only through 1.2.122, it is possible that Horace's list of desirable qualities also comes from Philodemus, especially since the lesson to be learned from 1.2.123–24 is the very Epicurean one of living within limits (*quam dat natura*). Even if *candida* is not Philodemean, the list follows so closely upon and is so closely connected thematically to the Philodemean intertext that it can be understood in terms of

<sup>34</sup> See the recent discussion in Miller 2005: 7–12; and see also Braund 2004 for the tension between *libertas* (sanctioned) and *licentia* (forbidden) that Roman satire exploits.

Epicurean ethics. The candid girlfriend in fact appears in Philodemus's extant *Epigrams* 3 (Sider 1997), taking the speaker (presumably Philodemus) to task when he slips from Epicurean *ataraxia* into modes of fear and despair and thus "committing philosophy obliquely" by modeling Epicurean *παρρησία* in action (Sider 2004). Horace's candid girl, contextualized within a discussion of Philodemian poetry, evokes the practice of *παρρησία* in personal relationships.<sup>35</sup>

On occasion Horace, too, commits philosophy obliquely. Horace's *Satires* are replete with references to and/or displays of Philodemus's parresiasitic guidelines.<sup>36</sup> The Journey to Brundisium's investment in autobiography can be seen as a pedagogical tool to illustrate *παρρησία* in action. Consider, for example, the wet dream Horace says he had near Trivicum (1.5.82–85):

hic ego mendacem stultissimus usque puellam  
ad mediam noctem exspecto: somnus tamen aufert  
intentum Veneri; tum immundo somnia visu  
nocturnam vestem maculant ventremque supinum. 85

Here I like an idiot waited all the way to midnight for a girl who swindled me:  
but sleep finally carried me off, focused on sex; then dreams full of dirty images  
stained my bedclothes and my belly.

Horace's wet dream evokes a description in Lucr. 4.1030–36 of the same phenomenon. While the didactic poet there gives a physiological account of how dreams, wet dreams especially, enter the sleeper's mind, he uses the description more generally to persuade his audience of the deception inherent in erotic desire. Lucretius would condemn the expectation and desire that leads to such dreams, but Horace in 1.5 openly confesses his own failure in this respect.<sup>37</sup> Immediately after Horace's wet dream the party moves to a town impossible

<sup>35</sup> The *candida* of 1.2.123 also partakes of a literary debate. As Freudenburg 1993: 196–97 notes, the words used to describe her (*candida, recta, munda, longa*) are buzz-words of first-century B.C.E. literary criticism, so Horace describes the perfect woman AND the perfect poem; other sorts (of women/poems) are for the Gauls—or Galli—or Galluses. See Felgentreu 2005 for further anti-Catullan, anti-Neoteric nuance in Satire 1.2. Hooley 1999 reads Horace's discourse(s) on love, including the Philodemian intertext, as a commentary on constructions of discursive authority.

<sup>36</sup> DeWitt 1935: 313; and see also Michels 1944. Cucchiarelli 2001: 104 explicitly calls Lucilian *libertas* "*ira*," an equation that makes clear the difference between his satiric honesty and Philodemus's kindly forthrightness. Quintilian *Inst.* 10.1.93, quoted at the head of this essay, notes the *acerbitas* that grows from Lucilius's *libertas*.

<sup>37</sup> Reckford 2000: 544–45 interprets Horace's wet dream as a gloomy recognition that our political hopes are illusory and elusive; like the wet dream, so too is the treaty.

to name in Latin verse: *oppidulo quod versu dicere non est* (1.5.87). This also looks to Lucretius, who famously complains that Latin is too poor to express the ideas he must express (*difficile inlustrare Latinis versibus esse*, Lucr. 1.137), but concludes that the pleasure of friendship encourages him to press on, so that he lies awake nights thinking of new ways to express the beautiful truth (Lucr. 1.140–45). Horace’s weaving together of these two Lucretian passages about nighttime activities—the one on the dangers of desire and the other on friendship as the context for seeking the truth—offers a snapshot of the frank friend in action: committing philosophy not directly, like Lucretius, but obliquely, like Philodemus.

In the context of Epicurean friendship (*nil ego contulerim iucundo sanus amico*, 1.5.44),<sup>38</sup> and the use of the adjective *candida* in a Philodemian context at 1.2.123, Horace’s specific characterization of his friends as “candid” suggests that these relationships are founded on the gentle frankness Philodemus describes in his treatise and displays in his epigrams. Moreover Horace’s ventriloquism of Odysseus at this poem’s beginning casts us, his readers, as audience members at an Epicurean banquet—precisely the milieu for frankness and for oblique philosophizing. In this way the Journey to Brundisium fits even more tightly together with the theoretical 1.4. There, Horace tells us how to carry out satire. Here, he shows us.

Why “carry out” satire rather than “write” satire? Horace often frames his departure from Lucilius as an aesthetic choice; recall that in 1.4 while noting Lucilius’s *libertas* Horace criticizes his predecessor’s rugged verse technique (*durus componere versus / nam fuit hoc vitiosus*, 1.4.9–10 and cf. 1.10.1–3). His departure, however, is certainly more than an aesthetic choice. To speak satire is to speak with frankness. Yet critic after critic has lamented that the Journey to Brundisium offers anything but straightforwardness; rather, the poem at best politely ignores or at worst obfuscates the very topic its readers would find most pressing: the diplomatic mission at its heart.<sup>39</sup> One explanation for Horace’s failure to deliver is his refusal to play at old-fashioned satire’s game, that is, his refusal to participate in the culture of high-stakes aggression—both verbal and physical—that unraveled the Republic (Schlegel 2005).

Another explanation for his failure to deliver is that he can’t; Lucilian *libertas*, the bluntness that stems from political freedom and social status, is simply too dangerous in the new and evolving political order (Freudenburg

<sup>38</sup> For this line as Epicurean sentiment see DeWitt 1939: 134, and cf. 129.

<sup>39</sup> At the extremes are Oliensis 1998 (deferential Horace) and Gowers 1993 (deliberate obfuscation). Other efforts (Welch 2001) have located Horace between the two extremes for generic rather than political reasons. The most recent entry into the debate is Schlegel 2005: 59–76, who does not lament but celebrates Horace’s refusal to engage (or let us engage) in political gossip.

2001: 51–58). A study of the god *Liber* confirms that the verbal “freedom to” that had flourished in the mid-Republic, as indicated by the dedication all over Italy of statues to the satyr Marsyas, had, in the increasingly tense later Republic, become “freedom from.”<sup>40</sup> Political *libertas* in Horace’s era was corseted into the contours of social candor, a tenet of friendship rather than politics.<sup>41</sup> In fact, Horace would avoid the Marsyas statue, that locus of old-fashioned *libertas*, at 1.6.120. Παρρησία underwent a similar transformation in Greek discourse; what began as the democratic right to address the Athenian assembly became, in the era of Hellenistic monarchs and patrons, the obligation to speak without flattery (Sider 2004: 90–91; Konstan *et al.* 1998: 3–5). Philodemus in fact notes the difficulty of speaking frankly to those who are illustrious or in positions of power, who tolerate poorly frank criticism.<sup>42</sup> I return briefly to Horace’s wet dream/unnamed town and their Lucretian intertexts. By connecting ineffability with sexual frustration, this sequence exposes language as a desire unfulfilled. Horace’s oblique philosophizing is not the preferred method, but the alternative to which one must turn when direct speech is not possible. Friendly candor is simply periphrasis in not-too-convincing disguise, the low growl of a muzzled dog.

The larger point I wish to make here is that Philodemus’s treatise on παρρησία, and Horace’s satiric take on it, speak not only to the Epicurean philosophical tradition but to Roman political realities as well. Candor is one thing among friends; it is another among men of status and power such as Maecenas.<sup>43</sup> Horace’s point is delicate indeed. The candor he lauds in his friends necessarily partakes of both the philosophical and political traditions. What is more, just as he did with the phrase “*soliti componere aversos*,” Horace

<sup>40</sup> Wiseman 2005: 65–69. Wiseman’s work suggests that the perceived derivation of “satire” from “satyr” might be more strongly connected than previously thought to the social and political developments of Rome’s early Republic. One thinks also of the “freedoms” expressed by Franklin Roosevelt in his State of the Union address in 1941, and the transformation of government’s role that they encapsulate; two are “freedoms of” and two are “freedoms from.”

<sup>41</sup> DuQuesnay 1984: 29–31; and see also Cucchiarelli 2001: 84–85 and 103–10. Kennedy 1992: 32 shows that *sanus* also operates also as a political term, opposed to the *furor* of civil war.

<sup>42</sup> Olivieri 22b.10–13 and see also Clay 1998: 118, who frames the discussion in terms of the “theme of the philosopher and his ambiguous and dangerous relation to the powerful.”

<sup>43</sup> Henderson 1993 and Welch 2001 comment on this difficulty in 1.9. Ruffell 2003: 37–38 examines Horace’s sticky position vis-à-vis Maecenas, and see 35–40 for an excellent broader discussion of the shifting political and literary dimensions of Horace’s *libertas*. See also Hunter 1985.

adds to the political and the philosophical discourses, through the indirect suggestion of Lucilian *libertas*, questions of literary aesthetics and ethical value. While eschewing Lucilian *libertas*, he keeps it firmly before our eyes, even in his journey tale, as a specter that haunts his every step. Philodemean *παρρησία* is not a cure or even a balm, merely the poet's timid, haunted response.

## CONCLUSION

What, then, are we to make of the fact that Vergil is one of Horace's candid friends? I return to the sustained echo of Vergilian pastoral that leads up to Vergil's entry into the traveling party. Horace's intertextual nod to Vergil's pastoral poetry—and behind Vergil to the traditions of Epicurean philosophy, triumphal politics, and satiric precedent—constitutes a conversation about the didactic value of two modes of poetry (pastoral and satire) in the context of the crumbling Republic. While Vergil's world presents the hope that elegantly composed song can cement friendships and sustain them through hardship, set apart from the city's pressures in the idealized retreat of the Italian countryside, Horace's eye sees lazy men (*piger*, 1.5.19), drunks (*prolutus*, 1.5.16), hotheads (*cerebrosus*, 1.5.21), and men more prone to hurl insults at each other than to sing songs together (*convicia ingerere*, 1.5.11–12). In direct contrast to the *Eclogues*, social strife is not a problem inflicted upon the innocent countryside from the dynasts at Rome. Rather, this strife is the result of a pervasive moral decay from the bottom up, of the sort that already has a firm grip on Rome. We cannot run away from it nor can we, as doctors, medicate it, for it is everywhere, and it is us.

We have here two extremes of the pendulum: Epicurean friendship as Arcadian retreat, or Lucilian *libertas* as bitter tonic, no longer tenable in Rome's current political context.<sup>44</sup> Horace's fifth satire falls predictably somewhere in between, settling into the realm of Philodemian frankness: willing to criticize but only gently, and willing at times to be the object of censure. Alongside its mild and humorous reminders of society's ills and his own, the Journey to Brundisium offers a glimpse of a better world that *might* take hold, were but honest friendship and thoughtful literature the rule rather than the exception. Satiric self-scrutiny and candor with one's friends *might* turn one from a Meliboeus into a Tityrus, or transform Italy, via the bay of Naples, into a new Arcadia. Unfortunately, Horace fails to get there in this poem; he leaves us at Brundisium some miles from our final destination. While some read-

<sup>44</sup> I disagree with Michels 1944 that Lucilius seems to aim at nothing other than the laugh.



ers see the poem's ending as disappointment *tout court*, a wet dream rather than real fulfillment,<sup>45</sup> Horace places responsibility for a happy ending on his readers. We must finish the journey for ourselves.

In the preceding pages I hope to have shown that Horace's Journey to Brundisium offers a more complex intertextual tapestry than has been previously noted. Taken individually, the various strains of the Epicurean tradition that sound in Horace's poem may be faint, but taken together they form a strong counterpoint to Rudd's "evening with slides" (1966: 60). I do not claim that Horace's poem, or even the wider book of *Satires*, seeks to convert its readers to any form of Epicureanism, or even that its outlook is predominantly Epicurean.<sup>46</sup> This position is ever more difficult to sustain given our increased understanding of the philosophical complexity of Horace's works. Yet I also do not believe Horace's Epicurean sentiments are casual,<sup>47</sup> nor, more seriously, that Epicureanism is too dogmatic or doctrinal to permit it to play nicely with other philosophical traditions. I merely suggest that if one imperfect twenty-first century reader can hear echoes of a complex Epicureanism, how much more available would that reading be to a contemporary audience of the *Satires* who had seen the *Eclogues* behind them even before Horace states it in 1.6, whose text of Lucilius was not fragmentary, whose lives were touched by questions of identity in war and peace, and in whose recent memory<sup>48</sup> Philodemus was alive and speaking frankly.

#### WORKS CITED

Armstrong, D., Fish, J., Johnston, P. A. and Skinner, M. eds. 2004. *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans*. Austin, TX: University of Texas.

<sup>45</sup> For Gowers 1993: 60–61 it is also disappointing to his readers, who want the poet armed and ready. "As a satirist he is disarmed, unable to fulfill his proper function. The journey poem is a chart full of circumspections, suggesting all the constraints that have led modern satire to be rerouted" (61).

<sup>46</sup> Solomon 1998, exploring other Epicurean dimensions of the poem, expresses similar caution about Horatian dogmatism, and see Rudd 1993 for the same caution expressed about Cynicism in the *Epodes*.

<sup>47</sup> Turpin 1998 dismissed the Epicurean persona who voices 1.1–3 as insincere not because of the other traditions present, but because the Epicureanism expressed isn't impressive; for Turpin, this persona is meant to be the butt of a sustained joke.

<sup>48</sup> Philodemus's death cannot be securely dated, but he almost certainly lived beyond 40 B.C.E. and perhaps even into the twenties; see Sider 1997: 11–12 for sources and arguments. Gigante 2004: 88, since he believes Philodemus's four-name dedications elaborate Horace's three-name list of friends, implies Philodemus was alive and writing after the publication of Horace's *Satires* in 35 B.C.E.

- Betensky, A. 1976. "A Lucretian version of Pastoral." *Ramus* 5: 45–58.
- Braund, S. M. 2004. "Libertas or Licentia? Freedom and Criticism in Roman Satire." In Sluiter, I. and Rosen, R. M. eds. *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill. 409–28.
- Breed, B. 2000. "Imitations of Originality: Theocritus and Lucretius at the Start of the *Eclogues*." *Vergilius* 46: 3–20.
- Brown, P. M. 1993. *Horace Satires I*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips.
- Classen, J. C. 1973. "Eine unsatirische Satire des Horaz?" *Gymnasium* 80: 235–50.
- Clay, D. 1998. "Philodemus on the Plain Speaking of the Other Philosophers." In *Paradosis and Survival*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan. 105–20.
- Coleman, R. 1977. *Vergil's Eclogues*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Connors, C. M. 2005. "Epic allusion in Roman Satire." In Freudenburg, K. ed. *Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 123–45.
- Cucchiarelli, A. 2001. *La Satira e il Poeta Orazio tra epodi e sermoni*. Pisa: Giardini.
- . 2002. "Iter satiricum. Le voyage à Brindes et la satire d'Horace." *Latomus* 61: 842–51.
- Davis, G. 2004. "Consolation in the Bucolic Mode: The Epicurean Cadence of Vergil's First *Eclogue*." In Armstrong, D., Fish, J., Johnston, P. A. and Skinner, M. eds. *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans*. Austin, Tx.: University of Texas. 63–74.
- DeWitt, N. 1935. "Parresiastic Poems of Horace." *CP* 30: 312–19.
- . 1939. "Epicurean Doctrine in Horace." *CP* 34: 127–34.
- Dufallo, B. 2000. "Satis/Satura: Reconsidering the 'Programmatic Intent' of Horace's *Satires* 1.1." *CW* 93: 579–90.
- Dugan, J. 2001. "Preventing Ciceronianism: C. Licinius Calvus's Regimen for Sexual and Oratorical Self-Mastery." *CP* 96: 400–28.
- DuQuesnay, I. M. leM. 1984. "Horace and Maecenas: The Propaganda Value of *Sermones* 1." In Woodman, A. J. and West, D. eds. *Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 19–58.
- Ehlers, W. 1985. "Das 'Iter Brundisium' des Horaz (Serm. 1,5)." *Hermes* 113: 69–83.
- Felgentreu, F. 2005. Review of Knorr, O. *Verborgene Kunst. Argumentationsstruktur und Buchaufbau in den Satiren des Horaz* (Hildesheim 2004). *BMCR* 2005.09.12.
- Fowler, D. P. 1989. "Lucretius and Politics." In Griffin, M. and Barnes, J. eds. *Philosophia Togata I. Essays on Roman Philosophy and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 120–50.
- . 1997. "On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies." *MD* 39: 13–34.
- Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frank, T. 1920a. "Heliodorus-Apollodorus: Horace *Serm.* i. 5. 2" *CP* 15: 393.
- . 1920b. "Vergil's Apprenticeship. II." *CP* 15: 103–19.
- Freudenburg, K. 1993. *The Walking Muse: Horace and the Theory of Satire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2001. *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frischer, B. 1975. *At Tu Aureus Esto. Eine interpretation von Vergils 7 Ekloge*. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag.
- Gale, M. 2000. *Virgil on the Nature of Things*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Gigante, M. 1995. *Philodemus in Italy. The Books from Herculaneum*. Trans. D. Obbink. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- . 2004. "Vergil in the Shadow of Vesuvius." In Armstrong, D., Fish, J., Johnston, P. A., and Skinner, M. eds. *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans*. Austin, Tx.: University of Texas. 85–99.
- Gordon, P. 1998. "Phaeacian Dido: Lost Pleasures of an Epicurean Intertext." *CA* 17: 188–211.
- Gowers, E. 1993. "Horace *Satires* 1.5: An Inconsequential Journey." *PCPS* 39: 48–66.
- Grimal, P. 1993. "Recherche sur l'épicurisme d'Horace." *REL* 51: 154–60.
- Hardie, P. 1998. *Virgil. Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics* 28. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Henderson, J. 1993. "Be Alert (Your Country Needs Lerts): Horace, *Satires* 1.9." *PCPS* 41: 101–47.
- Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hooley, D. 1999. "Horace's Rud(e)-imentary Muse: Sat. 1.2." *Electronic Antiquity: Communicating the Classics* 5 (scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/EIAnt/V5N2/hooley.html).
- . 2003. Review of Cucchiarelli, A. *La Satira e il Poeta* (Pisa, 2001). *BMCR* 2003.04.14.
- Hunter, R. L. 1985. "Horace on friendship and free speech." *Hermes* 113: 80–90.
- Janko, R. 1995. "Reconstructing Philodemus's *On Poetry*." In Obbink, D. ed. *Philodemus and Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 69–96.
- Keane, C. 2006. *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kennedy, D. 1992. "'Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan': Reflection on Terms of Reference." In Powell, A. ed. *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*. London: Bristol Classical Press. 25–57.
- Knorr, O. 2004. *Verborgene Kunst. Argumentationsstruktur und Buchaufbau in den Satiren des Horaz*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Konstan, D., Clay, D., Glad, C. E., Thom, J., and Ware, J. eds. 1998. *Philodemus On Frank Criticism*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1995. *Horace. Behind the Public Poetry*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Michels, A. K. 1944. "ΠΙΑΠΠΗΣΙΑ and the Satire of Horace." *CP* 39: 173–77.
- Miller, P. A. 2005. *Latin Verse Satire. An Anthology and Critical Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Narducci, E. 2002. "Orator and the definition of the ideal orator." In May, J. ed. *Brill's Companion to Cicero. Oratory and Rhetoric*. Leiden: Brill. 427–44.
- Oberhelman, S. and Armstrong, D. 1995. "Satire as Poetry and the Impossibility of Metathesis in Horace's *Satires*." In Obbink, D. ed. *Philodemus and Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 233–54.
- Oliensis, E. 1998. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olivieri, A. 1914. *Philodemi Περὶ παρηγορίας libellus*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Porter, J. 1995. "Content and Form in Philodemus: The History of an Evasion." In Obbink, D. ed. *Philodemus and Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 97–147.
- Putnam, M. 1995–1996. "Pastoral Satire." *Arion*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Series 3.2/3: 303–16.

- Reckford, K. 2000. "Only a wet dream? Horace Satire 1.5." *AJP* 120: 525–54.
- Richlin, A. 1983. *The Garden of Priapus. Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rudd, N. 1966. *The Satires of Horace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . "Horace as Moralist." In Rudd, N. ed. *Horace 2000: Essays for the Bimillennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 64–88.
- Ruffell, I. A. 2003. "Horace, popular invective, and the segregation of literature." *JRS* 93: 35–65.
- Sallmann, K. 1974. "Die seltsame Reise nach Brundisium. Aufbau und Deutung der Horazsatire 1,5." In Reinhardt, U. and Sallmann, K. eds. *Musa Iocosa. Arbeiten über Humor und Witz Komik und Komödie der Antike*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag. 179–206.
- Schlegel, C. 2005. *Satire and the Threat of Speech*. Madison, WI.: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Sider, D. 1995. "The Epicurean philosopher as Hellenistic poet." In Obbink, D. ed. *Philodemus and Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 42–57.
- . 1997. *The Epigrams of Philodemus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2004. "How to commit philosophy obliquely: Philodemus's epigrams in the light of his *Peri Parresias*." In Fitzgerald, J. T., Obbink, D., and Holland, G. S. eds. *Philodemus and the New Testament World*. Leiden: Brill. 85–101.
- Solomon, D. 1998. "Horace the fair weather Epicurean in *Satire* 1.5." Paper presented at the conference on "Intertextuality in the Ancient World." Yale University, April 11–12, 1998.
- Tennant, P. M. W. 1991. "Political or Personal Propaganda? Horace *Sermones* 1.5 in Perspective." *Acta Classica* 34: 51–64.
- Tsakiropoulis-Summers, A. 1998. "Horace, Philodemus, and the Epicureans at Herculaneum." *Mnemosyne* 51: 20–29.
- Turpin, W. 1998. "The Epicurean Parasite: Horace, *Satires* 1.1–3." *Ramus* 27: 127–40.
- Van Rooy, C. A. 1973. "Imitatio of Vergil, *Eclogues* in Horace, *Satires*, Book I." *Acta Classica* 16: 69–88.
- Van Sickle, J. B. 2000. "Virgil vs. Cicero, Lucretius, Theocritus, Plato, and Homer. Two programmatic plots in the first Bucolic." *Vergilius* 46: 21–58.
- Welch, T. S. 2001. "*Est locus uni cuique suus*: City and Status in Horace *Satires* 1.8 and 1.9." *CA* 20: 165–92.
- Wickham, E. C. 1991. *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wiseman, T. P. 2005. *The Myths of Rome*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Zetzel, J. 1980. "Horace's *Liber sermonum*: The Structure of Ambiguity." *Arethusa* 13: 57–77.
- . 2002. "Dreaming about Quirinus: Horace's *Satires* and the Development of Augustan Poetry." In Woodman, T. and Feeney, D. eds. *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 38–52.