

HORACE *SATIRE* 2.6: A COMMENTARY AND COMPANION



WRITTEN AND EDITED BY PREPARED BY THE MEMBERS OF LATIN 541:
ROMAN SATIRE
FALL 2014
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS

TRISTAN JONES
BRENDAN LANDELL
TORI LEE
JOSEPH MORGAN
THOMAS NICHOLS
VERGIL PARSON
JOSHUA ZACKS

SUPERVISED BY PROFESSOR CATHERINE KEANE

Contents:

Commentary on the poem.....	1
Horace's <i>Satires</i> : A Starting Point for Patronage.....	19
The Place of <i>Satires</i> 2.6 in Book 2.....	22
Pedestrian Muse.....	25
The Sabine Farm in Horatian Verse.....	28
The City/Country Dichotomy in Roman Satire.....	31
<i>Ab ovo ad mala</i> : The Place of Food in Roman Satire.....	34
The Animal Fable in Greco-Roman Literature.....	37
WORKS CITED.....	40



NB: The notes refer to the Oxford text of Wickham (2nd ed., ed. Garrod, [1901] 1989).

1 Hoc: “all this here” (Morris). H. is writing in the Sabine farmhouse that Maecenas awarded him presumably following the completion of *Satires* 1. *Modus agri* and *hortus ubi...* (2-3) tell us about the farm for which he prayed. *Hoc*, on the other hand, tells us that it is right here. Think of H. motioning with his hand to indicate the view. For another possible description, compare with *ergo ubi me in montis et in arcem ex urbe removi* (16) (16n.). There, by making it a “castle” set apart from the city, Horace creates a dichotomy between town and country (cf. *S.* 2.6.79-116). For a reference to the farm and the genre of satire, compare *quid... saturis Musaque pedestri* (17). For yet another description of the property, cf. *Ep.* 1.16.4-16. **votis:** “prayers” or “longings” (*L-S* s.v. B1). Consider Morris’s “was one of the things for which I made my vows.” Also, compares with *S.* 2.1.30-33, where H. says of his satiric forefather Lucilius that he disclosed his life’s secrets in his writing and thus his life, as expressed in his satires, lay open like the votive tablets on which Romans would write out their prayers. Morris notes “personal feeling” in 77-117 reminiscent of the end of *S.* 1.6. Compare with *votis* (*S.* 2.6.59-64), where H. again contrasts town and country by saying what he prays for now. **modus...magnus:** Compares with *ut magnum* (*S.* 1.4.10) and *ut multum* (*S.* 1.4.13). Lucilius writes two hundred verses an hour “as though it were a big deal,” while H. “couldn’t care less” how much he writes (Gowers). Also cf. *est modus in rebus* (*S.* 1.1.106). Is H.’s “not so big measure of land” an image of the stylistic preferences of the Greek poet Callimachus (who disliked the wordy style of epic) inspired in him (Harrison 2007, 245)? Also, cf. *paulum silvae* (3) and *quid multa?* (83).

2 iugis: nominative or genitive (Greenough), hence modifying either *fons* or *aquae* (with *aquae*: cf. *Ep.* 1.15.16). Compare Rudd’s ([1973] 1987) “a spring that never fails” to Fuchs’s (1977) “a spring whose waters never cease” (also, cf. *OLD* s.v. *iugis* b.). If *iugis* goes with *fons*, there is interlocking with *aquae* in between. If with *aquae*, the pair in the middle balances *vicinus... fons*, the pair on the outside (Morris). If, however, H. is drawing an analogy between the farm’s flowing water and his poetic muse, it may be better to put *iugis* with *fons*, which can mean “source.” This would emphasize the spring’s constancy. Thus, as a reliable source of water is to one’s daily life, so is constant inspiration to H.’s writing. Then again, H. often gets bored in the country (cf. *S.* 2.7.28-29).

3 silvae: Compare with *feris... silvis* (92), when the town mouse questions his host’s rustic lifestyle. H. also mentions the wood in *Carm.* 1.22.9, 3.16.29, *Ep.* 1.14.1, and 1.16.5 (Morris). When he confronts the wolf in the woods in *Carm.* 1.22, the wolf could signify the genre of invective poetry and the woods that of lyric poetry. H.’s driving out of the wolf would then mean that he has ceased writing invective, as he did in his *Epodes*, and taken up lyric (Davis 1987, 78). **super his:** compare Greenough’s “in addition to this,” which is ablative, but would be accusative in prose, with Morris’s “above these.” For Morris, it compares with *super*

foco and *Pindo* in *Carm.* 1.9.5 and 1.12.6, respectively, in which *super* denotes location. If the woods represent the genre of lyric, however, Greenough's rendering would underscore that the woods, and thus lyric, are distinct from other parts of the property. Then again, Morris's "above" could denote the superiority of the lyric genre. **foret:** Subjunctive because the *ubi* clause containing it still records details of H.'s prayer. Can be translated "is," if seen from the perspective of H.'s original prayer at the time he first prayed it: "[Please, I beg you,] a measure of land where there *is*..." Note that *in votis* is "similar" to the construction *votum est*. *Votum* comes from the internal accusative of *voveo*. Hence *votum est* can be rendered "it is (my) wish (to)" (*OLD* s.v. 3c) or "there is a wish I wish that..." **auctius:** "abundantly and then some." The positive form of the adjective *auctus* means "increased," be it in size, number, power, or strength (*OLD*). Hence, even before one makes it comparative (or into a comparative adverb, as it appears here), it has the sense of exceeding something else in comparison. *melius* (4) underscores this increase further and *amplius* (4), while in a different context, echoes it again. If, however, a modest tract of land represents H.'s preference for a restrained Latin style, then how Callimachean is this estate, if by giving it the gods have done *auctius*? Compare with H.'s prayer for *pingue pecus...praeter ingenium* (14). Conversely, Horace could just be grateful. *Augeo* also means "bless" (*L-S* s.v. Ib).

4 di: compare with *deos* (52) (52n.), which refers to Maecenas and his statesmen. If Maecenas is one of the "gods" who did well by H., to whom do *dis* (22) and *deum* (65) (65n.) refer? Also, cf. *Maia nate* (5), *Hercule* (13), and *Iane* (20).

4-13 oro...oro: Consider the next eleven lines an enormous and chiasmic (Apodosis-Protasis-Protasis-Protasis-Apodosis) logical conditional. The uses of *oro* at beginning and end are parallel apodoses. The three uses of *si* outside of quotes mark the protases. To summarize, "I ask nothing more, except that (4-5)... If I have neither made (6)... nor am about to make (7)... If I beg nothing (8)... If this which is here delights... I entreat you (13)."

5 Maia nate: Mercury, Maia's son (13n.). God "of eloquence; the bestower of prosperity; the god of traders and thieves..." (*L-S* s.v. *Mercurius* I). Compare *S.* 2.3.68, where Mercury is associated with prosperity, with *Carm.* 2.7.13, where he pulls H., in a cloud, from the battlefield at Phillipi, reminiscent of Aphrodite with Paris or Aeneas. Also, cf. *Carm.* 2.17.29. In the latter two, he seems more the god of eloquence or poets (Greenough) **nisi ut:** "with the exception, that." *Nisi* excludes or restricts something in the leading statement and is often used with negatives like *nil* (4). Moreover, with *ut*, what follows often unpacks a preceding substantive (*G* chs. 591 r.3 and 557 n.2). Hence, *propria... faxis* discloses the content of *oro* (4). **faxis:** "you make." Pre-classical second person perfect subjunctive (identical to future perfect) of *facio* (cf. *S.* 2.3.38). "*Faxo, faxim* (where later writers use *fecero, fecerim*)" (*OLD*). For Morris, "a sigmatic aorist optative."

6 si: note the first of our protases. **feci...rem:** *Rem facere* can mean "to make money" (*L-S* 1879 s.v. *res* IIB). For Greenough, *ratione mala* is "any base means prompted by avarice." Compare with *mala me ambitio perdit* (18). While *ambitio* denotes H.'s busy public life in Rome (which he begins describing at 23) and not acquisition, compare *aut ob avaritiam aut misera ambitione laborat* (*S.* 1.4.26). Horace's labors in Rome help him maintain his relationship with Maecenas, who gave him the farm. Does his work in town, then, undermine his claim here that he has never been acquisitive? Also, cf. *S.* 2.3.176-78.

7 vitio culpave: Palmer compares *vitium* here with *pinguem vitii albumque* (*S.* 2.2.21) and renders *culpa* in the juridical sense of "neglect" ([1883] 1889). As a juridical term, *culpa* can mean "remissness" (*L-S* s.v. IB).

9-10 accedat...monstret: optative subjunctives. *O si*: “oh if;” Gildersleeve (ch. 261) calls this an “elliptical” conditional with no apodosis intended. Remember these are the *horum* of *si veneror stultus nihil horum* (8). Hence they are prayers he claims he does not pray. Compare with *quando... quando... quando...* (59-64) that comprise his current *votis* (60-64n). Moreover, note that *mihi monstret* (10) echoes *mihi munera* (5), as *custos mihi maximus adsis* (15) echoes 10 in turn (see 14 -15n.) Each *mihi* makes the second long syllable of a dactylic fourth foot and each time there is alliteration with the word following. The true prayers of 5 and 15 effectively sandwich 10, H.’s “non prayer.” Does H. want us to associate him also with the prayers he says he is not praying?

10 quae: after *si*; i.e., *aliquae* or *aliqua*. For the latter, see Palmer. **illi:** dative as *mihi* is dative.

11-12 thesauro...aravit: order of events: (*erat*) *mercennarius, qui, (cum) thesauro invento (a mercenario), mercatus (est) agrum, (sic) mercennarius (nunc dominus) aravit illum ipsum (agrum, quem araverat cum mercennarius et non dominus)*.

12-13 dives amico Hercule: *dives* with *mercennarius*, *amico* in apposition with *Hercule*, ablative of cause. **Hercule:** Porphyrio relates a folk-story in which the hired man prays to Hercules, who brings him to Mercury and has Mercury show him the treasure. Mercury, however, predicted to Hercules that the man could never be happy and was proven right after he bought the same field with the treasure and persisted (*perseveravit*) in the life he had led before (Morris. As Morris notes, H. leaves out the moral of the story. Picking up the question asked earlier (9 and 10n.), H. does resemble the *mercennarius* in that he has just come into property. *S.* 2.6 follows 2.5 in which Teiresias counsels Odysseus to restore his fortune by pimping Penelope out to an old man to obtain an inheritance (*S.* 2.5.75-76). Is that supposed to tell us something about how H. came by his farm (Keane 2006, 117)? Does his current situation resemble that of the *mercennarius* after he bought the property? Conversely, for *aro* in a nobler context, cf. *Cic. Ver.* 2.3.11.

13 si...oro: “If what is present (*hoc*) delights my grateful soul” (Greenough). The final protasis and apodosis of our giant conditional. H.’s contentment with the farm would be in keeping with his claim that he has not been avaricious (6), will not be neglectful (7), and is not being nitpicky (8-9). Such “good behavior” would justify his receiving what he asks for in the apodosis (14-15). On the other hand, the meaning of *gratum* is debatable. It could also modify *quod* and mean, “received with thanks” (Palmer). Also, cf. *Carm.* 1.10.20, where H. calls Mercury *gratus*.

14-15 pingue...cetera praeter ingenium: *praeter* means “except.” Therefore *cetera* must be the object, with *pecus*, of *facias*. H. puns on *pingue*, which modifies both *pecus* and *ingenium* (the pun’s “punchline”). **facias...adsis:** subjunctives with *oro*. With “beseeching” verbs, “when the idea of wishing is emphatic, the simple Subj., without *ut*, is employed” (*G* ch. 546 r.2). The subjunctive can be used for the imperative (called jussive for the second and third persons), but only of an unspecified interlocutor. Gildersleeve (ch. 263) writes, “In the Classical period such usage [of a definite you] is rare and usually open to other explanations...” For a different reading, *AG* §439a adds this qualification: “The Second Person of the hortatory subjunctive [i.e. jussive] is used only of an *indefinite subject*, except in prohibitions, in early Latin, and in poetry.”

16-17 ergo...pedestri: a strange transition from H.’s praise of the gods. *Ergo* denotes logical consequence, but none is readily apparent following H.’s prayer. It may suggest that H. speaks because he is “thus contented and thankful” (Greenough). These lines could also suggest

an irony: H. is removed to lofty mountains but his muse remains “ground-level” (Freudenburg 2006, 7). Regardless, following on 3-4 *Auctius atque/ di melius facere*, H. acknowledges here that his poetry flows from his personal situation and experience.

16 in montis...removi: H. has moved from the city to the mountains to his retreat (*arcem*). The line, however, moves from the remote mountains to the more remote citadel to the city from which H. originally fled. This motion occurs twice elsewhere in the poem. Lines 23-58, composed in the country and after H.’s escape, place H. back in the city attending business. The mouse fable, likewise, ends with the mice still in the city, and the poem likewise ends back at Rome.

montis: mountainous areas, due to their roughness, tend to produce *fidelis et simplex* men (Cic. *Planc.* 22). Gowers sees in reference to the *montis...notos* in H.’s journey to Brundisium (S. 1.5.77), the “story of how Horace emerged from his homeland” (2009, 52). In this reading, S. 2.6 tells both the flight from the city and the flight to the city, both of which are integral to H.’s self-presentation.

17 quid prius illustrem: a difficult phrase. In his later poetry, H. uses *prius* or a cognate to mean “better” (e.g. *Carm.* 4.10.4; *Saec.* 51). Freudenburg’s translation of “first” in Freudenburg 2006 is dependent on *ergo* of 16 introducing new compositional circumstances that invalidate H.’s previous poetic ethic. Greenough’s gloss as “‘rather’ i.e. than the pleasures of my country home” depends on *ergo* reinforcing the unified poetic persona from which comes the *volis* of 1 and the *saturis* of 17.

saturis musaque pedestri: Greenough takes these as ablatives of comparison with *prius* (“rather”). Another intriguing option is to take this with *prius* “better.” “What would I celebrate better than satires and the pedestrian muse?” H. comments here that with his distance from the city he is able to better elucidate urban impulses, in much the same way that Cervius tells his mousey tale from H.’s country retreat. The *musa pedestri* could refer to a prosaic sort of poetry. The term is complicated; see “Pedestrian Muse.”

18 ambitio: this originally referred to canvassing for votes in the Republic. H. uses it to refer to the physical “going around” involved in a client’s life at Rome. It is tempting to take *ambitio* as vice *per se*; the other ailments (the *Auster* and *autumnus*) are physical. *ambitio*, therefore, most likely refers to the physical and mental strain associated with getting ahead in the Roman social rat race.

plumbeus: frequently used in comedy, e.g. Ter. *Hau.* 877. Matching *gravis* in 19. These words connote lowness, which fits with H.’s “pedestrian” Muse and current removal from the oppressive city to the lofty mountains.

18-19 Auster...autumnusque...acerbae: the alliteration reinforces the unpleasant and lethal aspects of the hot months in Rome.

19 Libitinae quaestus: *quaestus* can mean both “profit” and the “way of attaining profit” (*OLD* s.v. 2 and 1, respectively). Here and at *Carm.* 3.30.7, H. describes death as a physically acquisitive process. This may reference Greek punning on Hades/Pluto as *πλοῦτος* (rich). For one instance of the pun, see Soph. *OT* 30.

20 Matutine pater: an abrupt transition. The following words associate this figure with Janus and Greenough suggests this is a “half humorous invocation used merely to express the morning itself.” The “father of the morning” may perhaps be the sun, and therefore perhaps Apollo as the sun god. Apollo was also the god of (lyric) poetry. H. thus makes a humorous comparison between the god of poetry and the god of the business day. See also 43-46n.

21-22 unde...instituunt: “From whom men established the first labors of works and life.” *Labor operum* is an unproblematic hendiadys (see another example at Verg. *A.* 1.455). The combination of *operum* and *vitae*, however, indicates two different spheres. Their conflation by H. begins the section on the all-consuming nature of business at Rome. **instituunt:** properly

“construct, found, organize.” Not necessarily “begin.” Emphasizes the human construction of work and society.

22 sic dis placitum: an ironic statement, given the very human organization of works and life and the general unpleasantness associated with the early morning duties of a Roman client. **carminis:** H. has denied that his satires are poetry (S. 1.4.39-42). What, then, is the strength of *carminis*? S. 1.4 may come off as tongue in cheek (Freudenburg 1993, 124), but how do we read such a programmatically obvious word in 2.6? Contrast this with *votis* in v.1; H. has been classifying in this satire the types of speech acts in which he has been dabbling.

23 principium: the enjambment of this word parallels the enjambment of *instituunt*. Just as the “morning father” is the source of works for humans, he will be the source for H.’s poetry. H. signals, therefore, a kinship of his (satiric) poetry with the events of workaday life.

Principium also literalizes itself, “beginning” the line in which H. begins his Roman exposé.

Romae: can be taken as locative with *rapis* (cf. Greenough). It may also be a locative with *principium*. **sponsorem me rapis:** a *sponsor* was a sort of bondsman (cf. 35). Presumably H. is being dragged to court by a connection to stand as surety in some lawsuit. H. chooses to ignore the nexus of dependencies integral to life as a little fish in the Roman pond. He instead focuses on divine determinism: it is ordained that he be dragged early in the morning to court on someone else’s business. The impersonality of this line simultaneously obfuscates how active H. must have been in his social scene and contributes to the clockwork grind of urban bustle. The only human connection of H.’s at Rome dealt with at any depth is Maecenas.

24 ne prior...urge: H.’s friend doesn’t say this because that would be gauche. The god of morning business warns H. because this is one of the unwritten rules of *officium* at Rome.

prior: “Better” because “earlier.” (See our note on 17.)

26 interiore...gyro: the winter days are shorter, as if the sun makes a smaller circuit in the sky. The “closer turning” encloses *diem*; H. must still accomplish all his social obligations but in fewer daylight hours. These winter inconveniences contrast with the death-dealing heat of 18-19.

ire necesse est: again, H. does not provide a (human) locus of compulsion. Just as the god “snatches” him, here impersonal necessity compels him. How does this harmonize with satire’s tendency to name names? Can H. satirize nebulous institutional practices?

27 “After the thing which hinders me by diktat clearly and markedly” The *quod* is the legal business for which H. is a *sponsor*. *Clare* and *certum* are both adverbial. *Locuto* is the judicial decision. **obsit:** H. is hindered by the courts, and he will be impeded by the crowd on his way to Maecenas. Rome, to H., is a place of impediments. We might ask, impediments to what? It is unclear whether H. is kept from poetry or simply from *otium*.

28 luctandum...tardis: a line replete with elision; each word hurries into the next one, representing H.’s jostling into the sluggish crowd. **luctandum...facienda:** gerundives of obligation add to the impersonal atmosphere of Rome. H.’s struggle is repeated by many; presumably many individuals like H. struggle in the crowd. These individuals like H., in fact, makes up the crowd. **tardis:** those not struggling, not participating in the rat race are the sluggish. (The word implies slowness of body and mind; *OLD*). H.’s Rome has two types of people: the combative participants and the saps who are perhaps *tardis* because they cannot hear the call of Janus who *urges* H. H., for his part, cannot even consider not responding to the call, cannot be part of the slow in the city. Compare H.’s scorn in a different context: *odi profanum volgus et arceo* (*Carm.* 3.1.1).

29 A heavily spondaic line, consisting of all long syllables until *agis*, symbolizing the vehemence of the complaint, the morass of the crowd, and H.’s quick going about of his

business. At 36, H. uses a similarly heavy line to emphasize the tediousness of his professional obligations. **quid vis, insane:** a satiric question, echoing *S.* 1.1.1's *Qui fit, Maecenas?* H. has, in the past, concerned himself with what people want and what they should want. Satire is supposed to be therapeutic and make people healthy (*sane*). Here, H. has been caught and caught up in the scrabble at Rome, and a member of the crowd calls him out and *notes* him to the rest of the crowd. **improbis urget:** *improbis* fits best as the person calling H. out, otherwise *urget* is left without a clear subject. *urget* picks up the *urge* of 24. Both Janus and the irate pedestrian provide a sort of hostile motivation. H. must act quickly or suffer the consequences.

30 tu pulses omne quod obstat: "Would you bowl over all that stands in your way?" An intriguing question. Would H.?

31 recurras: "run back." H. is not running to Maecenas but back. His day did not start with Maecenas, so we can wonder at the use of *recurras*. From the perspective of the angry crowd member, H. is associated with Maecenas and so is naturally going *back*, back to a place of privilege and exclusion to which the passed-by is not privy. H. belongs with Maecenas.

32 hoc...non mentiar: H. admits taking a guilty pleasure in the implications of this last question leveled at him by a member of the *turba*. It pleases him to hear others speak of his friendship with Maecenas despite the scathing tone of the complaint (Fraenkel 1957, 142). **hoc:** The last of the *iratis precibus* of the *improbis* at 29-31, specifically the mention of his friendship with Maecenas (Morris) *contra* Wickham, who interprets *hoc* as the visit to Maecenas's house narrated in the following lines. **melli est:** "this is honey to me" *melli* is a predicative dative; sc. *mihi*. Honey was associated with eloquence by the Greeks and specifically with poetry by Horace, father of the Latin lyric tradition (cf. *Il.* 1.249, *Pi. O.* 10.98, *Hor. Ep.* 1.19.44). This simile aligns the ironically sweet complaints of the *improbis* with H.'s poetry, likening the *improbis* to a poet, though not a satirist, whose metaphorical product is *acetum*, vinegar (cf. *OLD acetum* 1b). Aphaeresis joins these words metrically. **non mentiar:** "I will not deny it," although inconsistent with H.'s negative portrayal of the city at 2.6.51-58 (Morris).

32-34 The external distractions of the crowd are replaced with internal worries personified flitting about H.'s head. A bucolic diaeresis at 32 (...*mentiar./ at...*) marks this sharp transition. While the bucolic diaeresis occurs frequently in *S.* 2.6, diaereses are otherwise avoided. **at...atras:** alliteration of "at" stresses the foiled expectations of ease upon arriving at the Esquiline, elevated above the dense throng crowding the city center. **atras:** "funereal"; *OLD* s.v. 7; cf. *S.* 1.8.8-13. It is curious that, despite the presence of the salubrious Gardens of Maecenas (whither H. is hurrying), the Esquiline remains grim: "something of the old gloomy associations still hangs about it" (Wickham). The adj. precedes *Esquillas* for satiric effect: H. bustles off to the Esquiline, but a wave of anxiety hits him before he arrives. He exchanges the press of the crowd for the dread of official responsibilities.

33 ventum est: literally "it was come" (*impers.*), translate "I arrived."

33-34 aliena...latus: this sentence is tinged with military metaphor: "a hundred external concerns leap through my head and around my flank." These hundred foreign anxieties execute a flanking maneuver on the unsuspecting H. **centum per caput et circa saliunt:** alliteration of "c" accompanied by consonance of "p" and "t" distinguish this sentence with a martial beat. **centum** poetic exaggeration, contributing to the military metaphor by evoking the hundred-man *centuriae* of a legion.

34-39 H. lists three of the hundred concerns assaulting his mind. Until the swift exchange of 39, it is unclear whether these reminders are purely internal or the spoken memoranda of other individuals present at the house of Maecenas conducting business. *Aliena* suggests the latter view

(Greenough). Repetition of *orabat...orabant* (35, 37) reflects the high station conferred upon H. by his relationship with Maecenas. Note that H.'s correspondence is conducted through Maecenas' house, not his own. The terms *aliena negotia*, *reverti*, and *re communi* perhaps indicate that H. has retained his position as *scriba quaestorum* (Greenough). Shifts in dialogue between individual *negotia* and between speakers at 39 are punctuated by caesurae, diaereses, or line breaks. A bucolic diaeresis begins the series at 34 (...*latus./ ante...*).

34-35 Roscius seeks a meeting with H. in the Forum. **ante secundam:** "before the second hour" i.e. before 7 in the morning during the winter months (Morris). **Roscius:** an unknown acquaintance of H.'s (Wickham). **orabat:** epistolary imperfect, with the tense relative to the time of reading, perhaps indicating written messages read aloud (Greenough). **ad Puteal cras:** distinguished by a bucolic diaeresis, as if added to the memorandum as an afterthought. Likely the Puteal Libonis (cf. *Ep.* 1.19.8) in the Forum Romanum, situated adjacent to the praetor's tribunal, perhaps indicating that Roscius sought H.'s services as an advocate in a judicial matter; for use of *adsum* cf. *S.* 1.9.38 (Greenough; Wickham). Banking transactions were also known to take place in the second hour, suggesting an alternative interpretation: cf. *Cic. Quinct.* 6.25.

36-37 The *decuria scribarum* seeks H.'s presence at a meeting. **de re communi...** **magna atque nova:** note the elision joining *magna* and *atque*. *nova* follows close on the heels of *magna*, simulating words hastily spoken. The *scribae* stress the importance and novelty of the matter in which they require H.'s assistance, implying that he no longer frequented their meetings on a daily basis. This indicates that H. only nominally held the post of *scriba* by this point in his career (Greenough; Morris). *Contra* Wickham, who suggests *communi* is to be read "common to them and to you," which would imply a distancing of H. from this office, strengthened further by the classification of this request under *aliena negotia* (Wickham).

37 Quinte: distinguished by a bucolic diaeresis; the only reference to H.'s *praenomen* in his extant works. Use of the *praenomen* indicated intimate familiarity, which suggests that the *aliena negotia* were intended as a soliloquy (Wickham), *contra* Greenough and Morris.

38 imprimat...tabellis: a request that H. present documents for Maecenas to sign. Note the central position of Maecenas in this chiasmic line mirroring his role at the center of this network of clients. **cura:** sc. *ut* + juss. subj.; colloquial, paratactic alternative to the imperative (*AG* §449c). **signa:** documents were sealed with wax, upon which one would imprint his official seal using a signet ring. In 31 BCE, Maecenas was acting as Octavian's primary agent in Rome while he dealt with matters in the East following the battle of Actium. *Signa* therefore likely refers to Octavian's official seal. Cf. *Dio* 51.3 (Morris; Wickham).

39 H. narrates his exchange with an indefatigable petitioner, simultaneously stressing his reputation in the eyes of the client and the impossible situation of negotiating with one who will not take no for an answer. **dixeris:** potential subj. (*AG* §447.2, *contra* Greenough). **experiar:** as an escape tactic, H. questions his ability to achieve what the client requests. **si vis, potes:** present general condition; stresses the petitioner's confidence in H. as an intermediary, foiling his escape attempt. This statement begins the transition to H.'s relationship with Maecenas narrated at 40-58. **addit et instat:** distinguished from the client's words by a bucolic diaeresis; the client presses H. further. The consonance of repeated "d" and "t" contributes to the urgency of the client.

40-58 A description of the relationship between H. and Maecenas, its beginning and current state; cf. *S.* 1.6.45-64. H. dismisses the popular rumor that Maecenas confides his secrets in him.

40-42 septimus...numero: it has now been nearly eight years since Maecenas took H. under his wing. If this occurred in 38 BCE, then *S.* 2.6 can be dated to 31 BCE, contemporary with a disturbance on the Dacian frontier (53) (Greenough).

42-46 dumtaxat...aure: H. qualifies the extent of his intimacy with Maecenas: only so much as would allow for discussion of such trivial matters as the time of day, gladiatorial combat, and the weather. A rare feminine caesura follows *dumtaxat*. The pause reflects H.'s haste in appending a disclaimer to the preceding statement prior to explaining himself. *quem* and *cui* both refer to H. (*me*) introducing a relative clause of characteristic governed by subj. *vellet*: "as one whom, while making a journey, he would wish to raise up with his carriage and in whom he would wish to entrust trifles."

42 raeda: abl. of means.

43 concredere nugas: this is an ironic phrase: one normally confides secrets, not trifles.

44 hoc genus: acc. obj. of *concredere* in apposition to *nugas*: translate "trifles of this sort" (Greenough); introduces a list of *nugae*. Once again, caesurae, diaereses, and line breaks are exploited to separate the three pieces of dialogue from H.'s narration and from each other. Structurally, each *nuga* in the list exceeds that which precedes it in length and complexity, forming a tricolon crescens. The list is preceded by a diaeresis following *genus*. **hora quota est?** anaerisis shortens this question still further. A masculine caesura separates it from the second *nuga*. **Thraex...par?** "Is the Thracian Hen pitted against the Syrian?" A *thraex* was a type of light-armed gladiator with a round shield and curved sword. The nickname Gallina likely stems from the conspicuous crest of the Thracian's helmet. A gladiator of this type was usually pitted against the heavily-armed *mirmillo*, which we may assume is represented by Syrus, the ring name of our second contender (cf. *Cic. Phil.* 3.12 and *Suet. Dom.* 10) (Greenough; Wickham).

45 "Morning frosts gnaw at men ill-prepared (for them)." The final *nuga* in the series exceeds the others in length but diminishes in its capacity as smalltalk: this is a statement lacking any expectation of a response. This statement's implications are unclear: is this a scornful comment on the shivering masses hurrying about their daily business without ample protection from the elements or is it a banal complaint about a particularly chilly morning? This hinges on whether *parum cautos* denotes H. and Maecenas or the nameless masses. **matutina frigora:** the adj. is derived from the old Italic dawn-goddess Mater Matuta. This colloquial use of *matutinus* contrasts with the formulaic invocation of *Matutine pater* at 20. The effect is a trivialization of H.'s earlier complaints (25-26) in the words of Maecenas. **frigora mordent:** Note the bucolic diaeresis.

46 H. further undercuts his relationship with Maecenas with this hint of distrust. M. confides in H. only those things which will cause no harm in slipping from H.'s loose lips. **rimosa deponuntur in aure:** H.'s ear is a "cracked" deposit box, unable to contain secrets placed there. A common metaphor applied to entrusting secrets (cf. *Ep.* 1.18.70; *Carm.* 1.27.18; and *Pl. Trin.* 145) (Greenough).

47-48 A shift in focus to the envy of the people at H.'s friendship with Maecenas, recalling the pleasure he alluded to upon hearing himself linked with Maecenas at 30-32. **per totum hoc tempus:** *i.e.* the whole length of H.'s relationship with Maecenas. **noster:** "our friend," colloquial; H. shifts to referring to himself in the third person.

48-49 H. and Maecenas attend the games and exercise together, attracting the attention of the crowd; cf. *S.* 1.5.48-49 and 1.6.126. **spectaverat...luserat:** plupf. situates these events temporally in *hoc tempus* of 47. **una:** adverbial: "together (with Maecenas)." **campo:** the

Campus Martius, where Rome's training and exercise facilities were located. **omnes:** sc. *inquiunt* (Greenough).

50 A nicely framed line, with *frigidus* and *rumor* on either end. **frigidus:** Opens the segment with a frightening, chilling feel, as being bad news (Greenough); however, the fright is overstated, since none of the action is truly scary. The irony contributes to Horace's satirical tone.

a Rostris: i.e., from the *Rostra*, where news would be disseminated in the Forum to the watching crowds. Named after the beaks of ships (*rostrum*, -i, n.) that adorned the platform after the victory at Actium in 31 B.C.E. **per compita:** "By the street corners," where the next largest assemblies of men would be collected (Greenough). Also cf. *S.* 2.3.25-26 (Morris).

50-58 H. is not conducting any of the whirlwind of action around him, but rather everything happens to him, much to his chagrin. Rumor flows (*manat...rumor*, 50), assorted people consult (*quicumque...consultit*, 51), the crowd marvels (*mirantur*, 57). H., however, responds to inquiries only in fragments: *nil equidem; at omnes di exagitent me, si quicquam*. The only verb attached to H. is a participle, *iurantem*.

51 quicumque: "Further explaining the *invidia* [of l.48], but at the same time showing that the real state of the case was different from that supposed by the envious crowd" (Greenough). **o bone:** "My good friend," although *bone* is weaker than in its original usage (Greenough). **consultit:** "Pour être rassuré ou savoir le parti à prendre; n'est pas synonyme de *interrogat*" (Plessis and Lejay).

52 deos: should be translated literally, as "gods," although it probably refers to the statesmen whom the crowd assumed H. knew due to his association with Maecenas (Greenough). Slangy (Morris gives 'the bosses,' 'The Big Four'). Stronger than the *reges* that Horace often uses to refer to great men (Palmer).

53 numquid: formally expects a negative answer, but used colloquially, as here, does not. There is no corresponding English form of the interrogative adverb. Greenough gives "You haven't...have you?" while Morris offers "Have you heard anything about the Dacians?" **Dacis:** in 31 B.C.E., after the battle of Actium, Italy feared an invasion from the Dacians, who had supported Antony. The province was comprised of Transylvania, the Banat, and Oltenia (regions of Romania), as well as part of Hungary. It was annexed by Trajan in 106-107 C.E. Cf. *Carm.* 3.6.13 for the Romans' fear of the Dacians: *Paene occupatam seditionibus delevit urbem Dacus et Aethiops* (Palmer). **nil equidem:** "not at all"; lends a casual, conversational tone. H. is the speaker here.

54-55 at omnes...quicquam: H. is the speaker here. **ut tu semper eris derisor:** "How you will always be such a mocker!" Palmer provides "What a mocker you will always be," and Morris gives "How determined you are to prove yourself a mere jester." Plessis and Lejay write that *eris derisor* "n'est pas un simple périphrase de *deridebis*, mais comporte une nuance malveillante, entraînée par la situation du *derisor* de profession dans les maisons riches, cf. *Ep.* 1.18.11." *Ut* here is an exclamatory "how!" of disbelief. **eris derisor:** *eris* is literally inside the word *derisor*. The repetition of the sound and the word emphasizes that this is part of the speaker's identity, as does the masculine caesura that follows the phrase.

55-56 promissa...daturus: this refers to the lands allotments that Augustus promised to give to veterans (Greenough). **si quicquam:** "If (I know) anything (of the matter)." **quicquam quid:** right after H.'s statement ends with the indefinite *quicquam*, the interlocutor responds with the interrogative *quid*. Consonance creates the effect of a quick exchange, with the interlocutor almost stepping on H.'s words, ignoring the answer as he rushes to ask another question.

Triquetra: Sicily. Literally, "three-cornered," named for the triangular shape of the

island. In Greek, Τρινώκρια. The three points were Pachynus, Libybaeum, and Pelorus; cf. Lucr. 1.717: *Insula quem triquetris terrarium gessit in oris* (Palmer).

56 praedia: “lands.”

57 unum: not simply “a man,” but “the one” of all the men (Greenough).

58 scilicet: shows sarcasm; its placement at the beginning of the line marks the tone of the rest of the sentence. **egregii** and **silenti:** “Montrent le traitement différent du gén. des déclinables en -ius avant Properce et Ovide. Le génitif des adjectifs était toujours en -ii, celui des substantifs toujours en -i, sauf que l’on évitait à l’époque classique les formes qui eussent constitué un iambe après contraction. A partir de Properce, tous les déclinables en -ius ont indifféremment le génitif en -i ou en -ii. Cf. *Carm.* 1.6.11-12: ‘Egregii Caesaris...culpa ingeni’” (Plessis and Lejay).

59 perditur: this is the only instance of the present passive form of *perdo* in Classical Latin. Usually forms of *pereo* are used, or *perit*, a typical substitute for the passive verb (Greenough; Morris). It provides a distinct opening to the line, and signifies the strong negative tone to come in the sentence. **haec:** neut. acc. pl.; i.e., these constant annoyances and conversations that accost H. in the city. **haec inter:** anastrophe (Plessis and Lejay). **lux:** *dies.* **non sine:** *cum;* litotes.

59-67 Now, talking about the country, H. finally governs his own first-person verbs, albeit not active in form or sense. The upcoming verbs are either passive forms or active forms that do not describe strong actions. *Aspiciam* (60), *licebit...ducere* (60-62. He leads, but in an impersonal infinitive construction, and all he ‘leads’ is *iucunda oblivia*), *vescor* (66), *pasco* (67).

59-65 o rus...o quando...o noctes: tricolon crescens of exclamatory questions and statements. Opens with an apostrophic rhetorical question, followed by another rhetorical question, and ending with an apostrophic exclamation. Anaphora of the “O!” creates both dramatic effect and exasperated tone.

60 ego te: juxtaposition of these two words next to each other literally places H., *ego*, next to the country, *te*. Textually, the answer to H.’s question *quando* is “*nunc.*” **quando ego te aspiciam:** two elisions emphasizing the long -a sounds, creating a sound and effect of longing that mirrors H.’s desire for the country.

61 This line shows imagery of country relaxation: old books, sleep, lazy hours. There is a switch from present to future tense for the main verbs (*aspiciam...licebit...ponentur*), to show anticipation. **veterum libris:** cf. *S.* 2.3.11, the Greek books taken along for entertainment during vacation at his villa. “Horace did not care much for the early Latin literature, though he speaks with respect of Ennius” (Morris). **libris:** abl. of means with *ducere*.

62 sollicitae iucunda oblivia vitae: “pleasures ignorant of a busy life”; chiasmus. **iucunda oblivia:** object of *ducere*.

63 faba: “beans,” simple country food. **Pythagorae:** Pythagorean philosophy includes the doctrine of metempsychosis, which souls reincarnate after death by transmigration. Beans were forbidden to be consumed as food, because they might contain souls of the dead. Horace pokes fun at Pythagoras by calling the beans his friends (Greenough). The belief in metempsychosis, however, was questioned by Aristoxenus, who wrote that beans were one of the main components of Pythagoras’s diet (*Gel.* 4.11; cf. Palmer). Here, the humorous effect works better if we presume Horace to be lightly ridiculing Pythagoras.

64 satis: with *uncta*, the oil coming from the bacon. **pingui...holuscula lardo:** vivid food imagery. H. describes it to tantalize the reader, but it is out of reach. **holuscula:**

diminutive of *holus, holeris*, n. The diminutive form further emphasizes the quaint country table.
ponentur: H. has to make no effort; the food will be placed in front of him. Also see *vescor* (66).

65 deum: i.e. as enjoyable as theirs (Greenough). **mei:** supply *amici*. “Le verbe est au sg., parce que *ipse meique* forme une sorte de parenthèse, “je mange, moi et mes amis.” L’accord avec la personne dominante n’est pas exceptionnel; Cic. P.Tullio. 44” (Plessis and Lejay).

65-67 Morris describes this as the ideal rustic supper: *ipse*, the host; *mei*, the intimate friends; *larem*, the sacred hearth; *proprium*, at home; *vernas*, the old family servants; *procacis*, on easy terms with the master; *libatis dapibus*, there is enough for all.

66 ante larem: the hearth, named for the household god the *lex familiaris*; by metonymy, the home. **vernas:** *household servants*; this term echoes the simplicity of country life, where the slaves also ate in the atrium with the family (Greenough). **procaces:** *bold*, a characteristic of the slaves brought up in the house along with the children (Greenough). Here it has a playful sense.

67 libatis dapibus: “sampled feasts,” i.e., the leftovers from the banquet. There was an abundance of food, and plenty leftover for the servants (Palmer). The words can refer to a rich feast, of which part was offered to the gods (*libare*) (Greenough).

67-70 Horace describes his ideal dinner party. On the Sabine farm each guest may drink as much, or as little as he wishes. The satirist and his guests discuss philosophy, and steer their conversation away from urban topics (cf. 71 *Lepos*). Cervius recites old wives’ tales throughout (cf. 77 *haec inter*) and finally launches into the fable of the country and city mouse.

67 prout: “according to, in proportion to.” Scanned as one syllable. The contraction into one syllable only occurs at the end of a hexameter, for similarly rare contractions in the same position cf. *S.* 1.8.43 *cerea*; 2.2.21 *ostrea*; 2.3.91 *quoad* (Kiessling-Heinze, xxi). The dinner guest is the subject. **cuique:** possessive dative.

68 siccāt: “drains.” The dinner guest completely satisfies his thirst. Cf. *Epod.* 2.46: *distenta siccāt ubera*; *Carm.* 1.35.27 *cadis cum faece siccātis*. **inaequalis** “unequally proportioned” (Greenough); alternatively, “not prescribed by regulation” (Morris). Some (e.g., (Schütz) have taken this as a reference to drinking cups of unequal size, as in *Hor. S.* 2.8.35 and 3.19.13. The guests drink from cups that contain an “uneven” mixture of wine and water, i.e. not everybody has the same amount of wine in their cup. This is highly unusual, as Horace and his guests are not following formal etiquette. Formal dinner etiquette required that each guest’s wine be mixed equally. Cf. Cic. *Ver.* 5.28: *illis legibus quae in poculis ponebantur diligenter obtemperat*; *Hor. Carm.* 3.19.11-12 (Kiessling-Heinze). Even in the countryside mixed wine would have been drawn from a common mixing bowl, so that each guest’s drink was equally proportioned (Kiessling-Heinze).

69 legibus insanis: ablative of separation. enjambment with *solutus*. The regulations are *insanis*, as they do not follow formal dinner etiquette (Greenough). Also appears in 2.2.123, where a *magister bibendi* presides over urban drinking rituals (Krüger). **capit:** “is able to stand” (Greenough) or “holds, carries” (Morris). Typical comic vocabulary for drinking; cf. *Plaut. Curc.* 110: *Quantillum sitit? Modica est, capit quadrantal* (Kiessling-Heinze). **acria:** here referring to the potency of the drink, modifying *pocula* in the following line. For situations where it modifies the drinkers, not the cups, cf. *Carm.* 3.19.10; *S.* 2.8.37 (Krüger; Kiessling-Heinze).

70 modicis cf. *Carm.* 1.18.7. *modici munera Liberi* **uvescit** perhaps a description of the drinking process: “drinks his fill” (Gow). Perhaps expressing the effect of the drink on the drinker: “grows mellow” (Morris). Here chosen for the resemblance to *uva*, the metaphorical

meaning is derived from the adjectives *udus* and *uvidus* (Kiessling-Heinze; Muecke). Here mocking epic diction; for serious use cf. Lucr. 1.306. Horace prefers *uvidus*; cf. *Carm.* 4.5.39 and *Carm.* 2.19.18 *tu separatis uvidus in iugis* (Fritzsche 1876). For similar meaning cf. βρέχεται (Anacr. 31.12), ὑποβρέχεται (Lucian *Gall.* 8).

71 oritur: “rises.” The choice of word suggests that dinner talk among Horace’s guests naturally rises beyond the ordinary. **non...alienis:** there is no room for gossip or envy about country houses, or the villas of others. Cf. *S.* 2.3.19 for the exact opposite, where Damasippus’ only concern is *aliena negotia*.

72 necne: oratorical diction; cf. Cic. *N.D.* 1.14.37: *hoc doce doleam necne doleam nihil interesse*. Notice the strikingly un-Horatian word-repetition in *nec...necne* **Lepos:** a pantomime dancer. His name translates to “Charm,” “The Charmer” (Morris; Greenough). The newest pantomime dancer in town (Kiessling-Heinze). Evidently a hot topic for discussion in the city. Lepos’ figure itself sets up the contrast between rustic and urbane. His dances may resemble a rabbit’s movements in a field (Fritzsche). **saltet:** subjunctive in an indirect question. The satirist avoids the topic for fear of disrupting his party. Cf. *S.* 1.5.63 where the request to perform a clownish dance is meant as an insult (Gowers).

72-73 quod magis ad nos pertinet: further distances the satirist from the concerns of the *urbs*. The satirist is only interested in the things that pertain to him and his guests.

73 nescire malum est: notice the close resemblance to *male* in the previous line. In trying to discuss lofty subject matter, the poet’s diction becomes ever more repetitive. Not knowing the things the satirist wishes to discuss is harmful to everyone, cf. *Ep.* 1.1.26 (*nescire malum est*): *aeque neglectum pueris senibusque nocebit*. **agitamus:** “discuss” (Gow). Cf. *S.* 1.4.138, where the satirist must discuss his subject matter with *compressis labris* (Heinze). **utrumne:** introduces a lengthy indirect question, hence present subjunctives in 74, 75, and 76. For a similar construction cf. *S.* 2.2.107 (Krüger).

74 “Whether mankind is truly made happy by riches, or by *virtus*.” Parallel sentence structure. Spondaic arrangement of *an sint* balances the line. This same question is discussed in Krantor’s Πλούτου καὶ Ἀρετῆς σύγκρισις (Kiessling-Heinze). The satirist will discuss τὰ πρὸς ἡμᾶς, the highest ethical problems, with his guests. Epicureanism views friendship as the highest form of human interaction. Nonetheless, it deduces its origin from *usus*; cf. Diog. 10.120 fr. 540: γίνεσθαι... καὶ τὴν φιλίαν διὰ τὰς χρείας... συνίστασθαι δ’ αὐτὴν κατὰ κοινωνίαν.

75 usus rectumne: “whether profit, or uprightness.” Stoics and Epicureans clash on this particular subject (Morris). For a comprehensive treatment, cf. Aristot. *Eth. N.* 8.2.1. Aristotle outlines three principles for which people engage in friendship: “good” (τὸ ἀγαθόν), “pleasure” (τὸ ἡδύ), and “mutual benefit” (τὸ χρήσιμον). True friendship can only exist between virtuous people, cf. Cic. *Fin.* 2.23.76, *Lael.* 6.20 (Fritzsche). Horace’s joke rests on reducing the discussion to five syllables. The aforementioned questions are not discussed with philosophical erudition, but with common sense of the *abnormes sapientes* in *S.* 2.2.3. Horace transfers the controversial philosophical disputes onto the conversations of his neighbors (Heinze). **usus:** “personal profit” (Krüger). **rectum:** *honestum* (Krüger). *Rectum* or *honestum* is both the band of friendship, and its origin; cf. Cic. *Lael.* 28: *nihil est virtute amabilius, nihil quod magis adliciat nos ad diligendum* (Kiessling-Heinze). **trahat nos:** i.e. “drags us,” “draws us,” “pulls us” towards *amicitia*. Humorous word choice considering the poet should need no outside motivation to seek out *amicitia*. His livelihood as an artist is completely dependent on a strong bond of *amicitia* between him and his patron. The fact that this is uttered in an indirect question may be an allusion to Horace’s diatribe persona in *S.* 1.1-3: “The speaker of the satires is

supposed to be understood both as a committed Epicurean and as a contemporary version of that stock figure of Greek and Latin comedy, the parasite, or professional guest” (Turpin 1998, 127).

76 natura boni: the shotgun approach to philosophy. Instead of attempting to answer one question, the satirist discusses a plethora of ideas in one extensive indirect question. The absence of formal dinner etiquette is mirrored in the absence of structured discussion. **boni:**

τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ Aristot. *Eth. N.* 1.2.1 (Fritzsche). **summum:** τέλος, *finis* (Schütz). **eius:** cf. *S.* 2.1.70 (Schütz). Augustan poets typically avoided the genitive singular *eius*, though Lucretius had used it frequently. Here, the prosaic Lucretian style is appropriate to the subject matter (Muecke).

77 Cervius: not to be confused with the satirist’s neighbor in *S.* 2.1.47 (Kiessling-Heinze). Cervius praises rustic simplicity and frugality in his fable. **haec inter:** Cervius lightens the mood by sprinkling little tales among the more serious talks. **garrit:** “chatters.” Unpretentious conversational tone, cf. *S.* 1.10.41 (Kiessling-Heinze). “Prattles,” sometimes used in a pejorative sense, cf. *S.* 1.9.13 (Muecke). For connotations of quotidian talk cf. *Cic. Att.* 12.1.2; 6.2.10 (Muecke). **anilis:** not necessarily contemptuous, but jovially as children would listen to tales of their grandmothers (Krüger). Just so, Tibullus in 1.3.84 listens to the tales of his lover’s mother (Fritzsche).

78 ex re: Cervius can spin old wives’ tales “from the subject matter;” “apropos” (Gow). **nam:** postpositive. For the same position cf. *Hor. S.* 2.3.20 (Schütz).

79-117 “The old story of the Town Mouse and the Country Mouse is retold and put into the mouth of a Sabine farmer with a purpose —like so much of Horace—at once serious and humorous” (Morris).

78-79 laudat Arelli sollicitas ignarus opes: “ignorantly praises Arellius’ care-laden wealth” (Oliensis 50, 1998). **Arelli:** a rich neighbour. If we are to believe the fable, he is so overly concerned about his wealth that he cannot find joy in his possessions (Schütz). **sollicitas:** “care-haunted” (Greenough). Here used in a causative sense (Krüger). For similar translation cf. *Cic. Lael.* 15.52 *omnia suspecta atque sollicita*; *Hor. Carm.* 1.14.17; *Verg. Ecl.* 10.6 *solliciti amores*; *Hor. S.* 2.6.62 *ducere sollicitae iucunda* (Fritzsche). **ignarus:** “foolishly” not knowing the true nature of happiness (Greenough). “In his foolishness” not knowing the *sollicitudines* of wealth (Kiessling-Heinze).

79 incipit: for other poetic uses where a speaker begins his speech with this word cf. *Hor. S.* 1.9.21, *Verg. A.* 11.13 (Fritzsche). **olim:** “once upon a time” (Greenough). “Der richtige Märchen- und Fabelanfang” (Kiessling-Heinze). For similar ways of beginning fables, cf. *Ar. V.* 1182 (οὐτῶ ποτ’ ἦν μῦς καὶ γαλῆ), *Hor. Ep.* 1.1.73 (Fritzsche), and *Hor. S.* 2.3.253. Beginning the tale at the start of the sixth foot adds an informal effect (Muecke).

80 rusticus: The country-mouse possesses the traits of a Sabine *rusticus: asper* and *attentus* (cf. *Ep.* 2.1.172), but generously receives his guests like Ofellus in *S.* 2.2.118. Cf. also *S.* 2.2.39 (Kiessling-Heinze). **murem mus...veterem vetus:** chiasmic arrangement. “The four words *rusticus...mus* balance *veterem...amicum*- adj.-adj., noun-noun; nom-acc., acc-nom. This is the manner of the serious teller of an old story, conscious of his moral purpose and not quite conscious of the incongruity between the purpose and the vehicle by which he conveys the lesson” (Morris). For this sort of common comic diction cf. *Plaut. Poen.* 685: *hospes hospitem*; *Pseud.* 1142: *praesens praesentem* (Kiessling-Heinze), *Ov. Tr.* 1.3.17 *flentem flens* (Fritzsche). Perhaps expressing the exchange of cordial greetings (Krüger). The allusion to fables is common; cf. *Hor. Ep.* 1.1.73; 1.3.19.

81 accepisse: “to have entertained” (Gow). Usual language of *sermo familiaris* for the “receiving” of a guest; cf. Cic. *Fam.* 9.26: *non multi cibi hospitem accipies* (Kiessling-Heinze).

82 asper: “ascetic” (Greenough). The mouse has exercised foresight. Much like the *formica* in 1.1.38 it must scrape together for its bare survival. The mouse, however, has so much in store that it can loosen (*solvet*) its restraints when receiving guests (Kiessling-Heinze). “Like the ideal Sabine or New England farmer” (Morris). **attentus quaesitis:** also used to describe a rustic in *Ep.* 1.7.91; *S.* 2.1.172 (Krüger). **attentus:** not quite *durus*, yet thrifty. **quaesitis:** “his store” (Gow). Dative. “The things he has acquired,” cf. *S.* 1.1.38 for the same use (Gowers). **ut tamen:** “but yet such that he could...” *Ita* is commonly used in this kind of sentence (Morris). **artum:** “constricted” because of the worries. The opposite of *solutus* (Krüger).

83 solvet hospitiis: the country mouse’s constricted or withdrawn temperament expands for hospitality’s sake (take *hospitiis* as a dative). Could also be an ablative “in hospitality” (Muecke). The mouse is happy to receive guests for once (Krüger). For a similar formulation cf. *Ep.* 1.5.20: *contracta quem non in paupertate solutum* (Kiessling-Heinze). **solvet:** “to balance *artum*; he could *relax* his *closeness*” (Morris). **hospitiis:** plural because *hospitalia* only proves itself in multiple *hospitia*, not just one *hospitium* (Schütz). **quid multa?:** “to make a long story short,” (Greenough); “the point is,” (Gowers). This is a common, if sudden, form of transition and is also seen in *S.* 1.6.82 and *Ep.* 1.7.62.

83-86: The food served by the country mouse is notable as it reflects gustatory themes running through H.’s second book of satires. In particular, it reflects an established contrast between the simple country diet (or *holus* diet, after Berg 1996) and the gourmet diet of the city. Throughout, the *holus* diet is frequently lauded by H. and taken to be indicative of a simpler, more virtuous philosophy and lifestyle. H.’s account of his own meals in *S.* 1.6.115 reflects the *holus* diet, as he dines on the food of the poor: leeks (*porrum*), chickpeas (*ciceris*), and a small flour cake (*laganum*). The contrast between the meals and the philosophies of the city and country mouse seems to reflect this tension, and the final decision of the country mouse to return to his simple life seems to be yet another affirmation of the country diet.

Although 2.6 ends on this positive note for the *holus* diet, *S.* 2.7 picks back up with the interruption of H.’s slave, Davus. Invoking the license to speak afforded to him by the Saturnalia, Davus points out H.’s hypocrisy in terms of his diet: he praises his vegetables only if he happens to not be invited to dinner elsewhere (2.7.29-30). As Berg (1996, 142) points out, Davus’ words undermine the previous “victory” of the *holus* diet as the poet’s inability to “practice what he preaches” is revealed. For more, see “*Ab ovo ad mala.*”

84 ciceris: the chickpea is the food of the poor and so part of a modest meal (cf. *S.* 1.6.115, 2.3.182, *Ars* 249). West (1974, 71) notes that H.’s use of the chickpea is unusual in the history of the fable in that it deviates from the natural diet of the mouse. He suggests that the chickpea was chosen to echo the diet of the poor farmer and further anthropomorphize the mouse. **longae:** the length probably refers to the glume at the end of the grain and not the stalk itself (Palmer). **invidit:** *invidit* takes the genitive *avenae*, a unique usage. Quintilian (*Inst.* 9.3.17) believes this use of the genitive to be a Graecism, possibly related to the construction φθονεῖν τινί τινος (cf. *OLD* s.v. *invideo* 2d). **avenae:** the *avena* is the wild oat, which is a weed that infests grain crops (Muecke). Although the mouse is trying to put together an impressive meal, it is still underwhelming.

85 ore ferens: a cute detail that is appropriate to the physiology of a mouse (how else would he carry things to his guest?). West (1974, 72) suggests that this detail would evoke the

new fad of having a slave as “taster” at the meal. **semesa:** “half-eaten,” “nibbled on.” The mouse has scavenged the bits (*frustra*) of pork, so the nibbles are human, not murine. The fact that the country mouse has scavenged meat demonstrates that no expenses were spared for his guest.

86 fastidia: “fastidiousness,” “want of appetite” (Palmer). **cena:** ablative of means. The country mouse wishes to overcome urban pickiness by offering an elaborate meal reminiscent of city practices. The *varietas* of gourmet meals is one subject of Ofellus’ criticism in 2.2 (Muecke).

87 tangētis: Refers to the city mouse, take with *fastitia*: “the fastidiousness of the one touching. . .” **male:** barely, hardly; with the participle. **superbo:** disdainful, haughty; applied to the *dente* as an extension of its owner.

88 pater...domus: a variation on *paterfamilias*. **palea...horna:** Palmer writes that there is something absurd about specifying that the straw is new, “as if it matters what year’s chaff it was.” In effect, straw is just straw and inevitably worse than the purple cushions (2.6.106) at the home of the city mouse. West (1974, 73), however, sees the newness of the straw as an endearing gesture: the city mouse has cleared out the old, musty straw and has laid down fresh chaff for his guest.

89 esset: archaic form of *edo*, imperfect subjunctive. **ador:** emmer wheat, a grain grown for bread making. **lolium:** darnel. Darnel is a rye grass that grows as a weed in grain crops. After the harvest it is difficult to separate weeds from the good grain, and so poorer quality breads often contained remnants of the weeds. Thus, just as the farmer eats bread with darnel seeds, the mouse also consumes a mixture of the two grains (Muecke). **dapis:** Originally a word denoting a solemn feast for religious purposes, it later became the term for a modest meal. The use of the singular indicates an elevated, poetic usage and hints towards a mock-epic style.

90 As in the overarching narrative, conversation at the dinner party soon turns to the topic of defining the “good life.” After seeing what he considers to be a display of poverty and self-denial, the city mouse tries to persuade the country mouse to come to the city, where he can live more happily. Throughout the city mouse’s speech, he includes several key words (e.g. *dum licet*, West 1974, 74) and ideas that identify him as an Epicurean. However, the city mouse is far from a true Epicurean, who defines pleasure as the freedom from pain in the body and trouble in the soul instead of the enjoyment of sensual pleasures (cf. Epicurus’ *Letter to Menoeceus* 131-32; Usener). Instead, the city mouse is a pseudo- Epicurean, seeker of sensual pleasure who uses his philosophical leanings to justify his extravagant lifestyle. For a discussion on the humor of having a mouse as an Epicurean philosopher, see West 1974, 74-76. **quid te iuvat:** “what good is it to you?”

91 patientem: “suffering,” “enduring.” Palmer suggests καρτεροῦντα, “bearing patiently,” as a Greek synonym. **dorso:** the edge of the woods.

92 vis tu: informal exhortation, “can’t you?” or “won’t you?” (cf. *S.* 1.9.69). This line has been read by some scholars (cf. Muecke; West 1974, 74) as echoing Socrates in Plato’s *Phaedrus* (230d): “Forgive me, my friend. But I am fond of learning, and the country fields and trees aren’t able to teach me anything. However, the men in the city can.” Like Socrates, the philosophizing city mouse desires to be near people, albeit probably for reasons relating to comfort rather than education.

93-97 Here the city mouse is echoing the Epicurean teaching of the mortality of the soul. According to Epicurus, when a person has died, their soul dissipates and they simply cease to be.

In his *Letter to Menoeceus* 124, Epicurus further clarifies that the mortality of the soul, properly understood, makes life more enjoyable because one participates in living instead of focusing on immortality (Usener). Thus, the city mouse engages with Epicurean teachings, but with a pseudo-Epicurean slant: the enjoyment he hints at is not the restraint of a true Epicurean, but the luxury to which he will later introduce the country mouse.

95 aut magno aut parvo: the impartiality of death is a frequent subject in H. (cf. *Carm.* 1.28.15, 1.4.13, 2.18.32; *Ep.* 2.2.178). **quo...circa:** only extant tmesis of *quocirca*. May have been separated for metrical reasons or for effect. Palmer notes that Ennius was famous for unusual and remarkable tmeses, so this tmesis may add an epic flavor to the exhortation that underscores the haughty air of the city mouse. West also notes (1974, 75) that the heavy punctuation in the fifth foot of this line and the bucolic diereses between the 4th and 5th foot are an “audible warning of approaching pomposity,” further stressing the pretentiousness of the mouse.

96 iucundis...beatus: the use of Epicurean buzzwords highlights the mouse’s primary concern with material pleasures and food.

97-105 As the mice travel to the city their journey is written in a mock-epic style, which is rendered burlesque and laughable by the species of the protagonists.

97 haec ubi dicta: an epic formula (cf. Verg. *A.* 1.81, 2.790, 5.32, 5.315, among others) employed to signal the beginning of the murine epic. However, the seriousness of the diction is undercut by its placement. Although it always appears at the beginning of the line in Vergil, here it is found after the bucolic diaeresis.

98 pepulere: “struck.” **exsilit:** “bounds,” “leaps” in the historical present. The verb is accurate for the physiology of a mouse but as West (1974, 76) points out, epic heroes frequently leap (cf. Hom. *Il.* 13.140).

98-100 The nocturnal journey is another recurring epic motif made humorous by the use of mice. Compare the journeys of Diomedes and Odysseus in *Iliad* 10 and Nisus and Euryalus in *Aeneid* 9 (West 1974, 76).

99 propositum peragunt iter: Description of travel has an epic flavor. Compare Verg. *A.* 6.384, *ergo iter inceptum peragunt* and 8.90, *ergo iter inceptum celerant* (Muecke).

100 subrepere: ‘to creep up to’, a verb commonly used for the movement of animals and chosen for its applicability to mice. **iamque** is mock-epic (West 1974, 76). Its presence here suggests loftier subject matter than what we actually have. The idea is to exaggerate what is written through the use of words which carry a force that is more fitting for epic poetry. Two mice are hardly epic material, and so their usage with *iamque* makes the account humorous. Satire, given its nature, regularly employs mock-epic. For a similar mock-epic usage of this phrase, cf. Hor. *S.* 1. 5. 20. For its appropriate epic treatment, cf. Verg. *A.* 2. 567-69.

101 cum: begins an inverted cum-clause (West 1974, 76). When translating, begin here. The inversion of cum-clauses is another favorite feature of epic poetry. In an inverted cum-clause, the logical order of the clauses is *inverted*. For an inverted cum-clause and its appropriate use in epic, cf. Verg. *A.* 4.6-8 (*postera Phoebæ lustrabat lampade terras umentemque Aurora polo dimoverat umbram, cum sic unanimam adloquitur male sana sororem*).

102 locuplete: in reference to inanimate objects in the ablative case, the adjective *locuples* is usually rendered *locupleti* (Lewis). This is what we might have expected given the fact that here this adjective is being used to describe *domo*, a non-human entity. *In locupleti domo*, however, would not work metrically here. The final ‘e’ that Horace gives us in *in locuplete domo* creates two dactyls. If Horace had written *in locupleti domo* the meter would

have given first a dactyl then a spondee, leaving the next foot to begin with a short syllable, which dactylic hexameter does not allow. For a more standard usage of *locuples* in the ablative case, cf. Tac. *Hist.* 1.46 (*inops pro locuplete et iners pro strenuo in manipulum redibat, ac rursus alius atque alius*) and Cic. *de Or.* 3.185 (*cuius membra et pedes, ut ait idem, sunt in omni locupleti oratione diffusa*).

102-103 rubro...cocco...eburnos: the contrast between a red covering with an ivory couch is also made in Catull. 64.47-49 (Moore and Morris).

104 magna...cena: in Rome, gastronomy and dining in general were controversial subjects. With regards to food and dinner (and basically everything else), some Romans saw a marked contrast between perceived invasive and foreign luxury and supposed Roman frugality and simplicity. Simpler food was thought to have originated in an earlier and more pristine age (Gowers 1993, 18). These older practices consisted of a meal with a single and far simpler dish than the seven meals which Juvenal describes, cf. Juv. 1.94-95 (*quis fercula septem secreto cenavit avus?*). The subjects of food and dinner should not surprise us within this satire because they offer us such conspicuous ways of drawing contrasts between wealth and rustic simplicity, a distinction that Horace wants emphasized. Simply, food polarizes. The country mouse prepares humble fare (so does Horace in 63-64) such as chick-peas, oats, and half-eaten bacon (84-85), while the city mouse cooks a banquet with, we assume, many dishes. Horace's satires are filled with references to food, dining, and eating, cf. 1.1.46, 32, 119; 1.2.9, 115-16; 1.3.6-7, 81; 1.4.85-89; 1.5.7-9, 69-70, 75; 1.6.115-17, 127-28. Indeed, it seems that the very word *satura* was originally a type of dish (Van Rooy 1965, 2-20). *Satur* itself means "satiated" or "full of food." It is evident then that here and in other satires "Horace is still aware of the culinary origins of *satura*" (Gowers 1993, 126).

105 procul: can be translated as "at one side" or "near." It is derived from the preposition *pro*, which can itself mean *on the side of* (Greenough).

106-107 ergo...agrestem: note the contrast between *purpurea...in veste* and the mouse's title as *agrestem*. Purple was the color of the elite and as such is hardly fit for this mouse. *Agrestis* reminds us that the country mouse does not belong near such sumptuous surroundings.

107 succinctus: literally, "having been girded up." So, by extension, acting as waiter (Greenough).

108-109 continuatque...adfert: it is interesting to see the *urbanus mus* likened to a house slave (*verna*). For someone whose home implies that he has so much wealth, it is surprising that we are not told that he has his own *verniles mures* doing this sort of work. Perhaps Horace, by denying servants to the city mouse, reminds us that whether it is in the country or in town, a mouse is still just a mouse. On the other hand, we do expect the owners of the home that the *urbanus mus* is 'renting' to have *vernae*. It is also possible that Horace simply did not want to deviate from or expatiate upon Aesop's (Aesop does not include a *verna* for his rich mouse) pithy rendering of the tale. *praelambens omne quod adfert* offers another interpretation: maybe our more refined mouse, because he is an *urbanus* or, because he is just greedy, wants the first taste. This is in contrast to the hospitality that he, as *urbanus mus*, received at *pauper cavum* of the *rusticus mus* (Morris). In lines 86 and 87, we are told that the city mouse barely touches the food which the country mouse has prepared for him. We may also suspect then that the city mouse only invites the country mouse to join him for dinner as an excuse to ensure that he himself will have something suitable to eat.

108 dapes: This word *dapes* can be translated as "banquet," though Greenough suggests "meals." *Dapes* is mock-epic. we might expect *convivium* in this context (we get *conviva* in 111).

Daps means, in other instances, a kind of religious meal in honor of a divinity, much like the Greek προσηρόσια, cf. *Carm.* 2.7.17 (*ergo obligatam redde Ioui dapem*).

110 gaudet mutata sorte: here, *gaudet* takes the ablative case, rendering “he rejoices in his changed fate.”

110-11 bonisque...convivam: you may translate *agit* as “behaves like.” “play the part of” also works (Greenough). *Agit* may also be translated as “imitates” or “acts,” which is how Plautus uses it, cf. Plaut. *Am.* prol. 88 (*ipse hanc acturust Iuppiter comoediam*). In this way, perhaps Horace is reminding us that the rustic mouse, though he appears confident in his new surroundings, only plays the part, and cannot fully become a city mouse. Horace will however let him pretend to be one for the time being. Render *bonisque rebus* as “amongst good things.”

111-12 cum...utrumque: note that *both* mice run for their lives at the sound of the door crashing. There is no distinction made between country and city, poor and rich. The crash equalizes them. It is not as if, at the onset of danger, the city mouse can afford to go about his business preparing the banquet, as if he were impervious or immune to the danger, or as if the danger did not apply to him. No, ultimately, by having both flee, Horace shows us that a mouse is a mouse. *Lectis* is ablative of separation with *excussit*.

113-15 currere...canibus: historical infinitives (West 1974, 78). The idea here is to express swiftness, which the historical infinitive accomplishes. In this way, the Latin itself is imitating the events which it describes. Both mice have just heard a potentially threatening and sudden (*subito*) noise, which incites rapid movement from both of them (*excussit*). Also, take note of the use of enjambment that takes place in these lines. Line 114 runs through into line 115 without a pause. The reader knows that the mice are fleeing, but Horace delays what they are fleeing from until the last possible moment. This creates heightened suspense.

115-16 haud mihi vita est opus hac: literally, “there is by no means a need for me of this life.” We can render it more colloquially, “this life is not necessary for me” or “I do not need this life.” With this phrase, the rustic mouse means that the type of lifestyle which he just encountered at the city mouse’s home is superfluous and too grand for his tastes. Also, he could not consider a lifestyle, though full of luxury, that could potentially compromise his very life.

116 valeas: hortatory subjunctive. Literally, “may you fare well,” but “farewell” or simply “goodbye” are perhaps less stilted.

117 ervo: ablative of means. *Ervo* is from *ervum*, meaning “bitter vetch.” Vetch is a type of grain.





Thomas Nichols

Horace's *Satires*: a Starting Point for Patronage

The first and second books of Horace's *Satires* are his starting points. Because they are his first works, they act as a kind of window through which we can catch a glimpse of the young Horace and some of the primary issues that he engages with initially in his literature. Because of this, we cannot regard them as lacking sophistication, or see them as a kind of practice for his *Odes*—this work is often considered his greatest—or as a sort of clumsy step at the beginning of the poetic road. Indeed, the *Satires* must be interpreted and valued in their own right, but interpretation is no easy task. Fortunately, even if we depart from the old biographical interpretation of Horace in favor of the more recently popular theory which maintains that the way to get at the true Horace is to peel back the layers of his many *personae* (see Freudenberg 1993), we must admit that, as elusive as Horace's *personae* render his *Satires*, each allusion and reference is itself a declaration of Horatian personality and thus of the true Horace (Anderson 1989, 4). This true Horace and the issues and themes that occupied the course of his literary career extend beyond the scope of his *Satires* and into his other works and genres (McNeill 2001, 7). Therefore, the *Satires* cannot be ignored, for they offer us valuable hints at subjects, issues, and themes to come.

Patronage is one such theme that is, for Horace, present from his first published work. Maecenas occupied the pivotal role as Horace's primary patron for much of Horace's literary career. Maecenas used his immense wealth and influence to sponsor talented writers. In return, these writers gave him a kind of symbolic capital by reaffirming his status in the present and conferring immortality on him for posterity (Bowditch 2010, 59). Certainly, other prominent writers of the early Principate benefited from Maecenas' patronage, such as Virgil, Propertius, Varius and others, but only Horace incorporated the poet-patron dynamic into his poetry as a central and overarching theme (McNeill 2001, 11; Bowditch 2010, 54). Indeed, the first line of his first published work addresses Maecenas—*Qui fit, Maecenas?* (*Sat* 1.1)—and Horace, in addition to dedicating his *Satires* to Maecenas, makes him the dedicatee of the *Epodes*, *Odes* 1-3, and *Epistles* I as well. Though Horace makes the link between himself and Maecenas obvious enough, the nature of their relationship is not always so clear. This ambiguity tends to polarize scholarship, with one party being a proponent of a positive relationship between poet and patron, another being a supporter of a negative relationship, with yet another opting for neutral ground (see Fraenkel 1957, 15-17 for a positive interpretation, Nisbet 1984 for a negative, and McNeill 2001 for the neutral). Regardless of interpretation, what is clear is that the nature of the poet-patron relationship is established in the *Satires*, that it is not static, and that there are evident changes in its nature from work to work and genre to genre.

In *Satires* 1.6, we see a fawning and grateful Horace relating his first encounter with Maecenas: [*Maecenas*] *nec quod avus tibi maternus fuit atque paternus/ olim qui magnis legionibus imperitarent/ ut plerique solent, naso suspendis adunco/ ignotos, ut me libertino patre natum* (*Sat.* 1.5. 3-6). Horace recognizes that he himself is the unknown descendent of a freedman, while Maecenas' ancestors commanded legions (an indication of nobility). Horace is thankful that Maecenas does not consider lineage, but rather the purity of one's heart when selecting his friends and clients: *qui turpi secernis honestum/non patre praeclaro, sed vita et pectore puro* (*Sat.* 1.6. 62-64). This anecdote reveals more than a simple set of specifications that Maecenas' required his friends and potential clients to have. It also shows a young and ambitious Horace concerned with upward mobility and pleasing those who can potentially facilitate his socio-economic ascension.

In *Satires* 1.5 Horace gives us no hint of his own deference to Maecenas. Take lines 30-32: *hic oculis ego nigra meis collyria lippus/ illinere. Interea Maecenas advenit optimus atque Cocceius Capitoque...* The atmosphere between poet and patron is so relaxed here that Horace seems nonchalant about Maecenas' arrival, even occupying himself with his bleary eye instead of greeting his benefactor (McNeill 2001). The fawning Horace from 1.6 seems absent, having been replaced by Horace the casual friend. Horace portrays this relationship, informal as it is, as fundamentally amicable, with nothing to indicate tension or conflict.

Turning to the *Epodes*, a work written shortly after *Satires* II, we see Horace display even greater boldness when addressing Maecenas: *at si quid umquam tale concupiveris/ iocose Maecenas, precor/manum puella savio opponat tuo/extrema et in sponda cubet* (3.19-22). The *tale* (such a thing) here is a reference to the *alium* (garlic) which Horace references at the beginning of this epode. The entire poem is interestingly and humorously about how terrible garlic is. Again, in keeping with the two previous examples taken from Horace's *Satires*, there is no tension here, but these four lines do distinguish themselves in other respects. That Horace would include Maecenas in such a poetic context indicates just how informal the relationship between Maecenas and Horace has become. This playful banter appears as though it could be at the beginning of some jocular exchange between two friends, and is a far cry from the language of a client bowing before some detached benefactor (McNeill 2001, 12).

If playful jest between Maecenas and Horace is the innovation in the *Epodes*, impudence is its novel counterpart in *Epistles* I. *Epistles* I is some nine years removed from the *Epodes*, and fourteen from *Satires* I, and it shows. The nature between patron and poet seems strained in a way that we have not seen to this point. It appears that the further removed Horace is from his *Satires* in both time and genre the bolder he becomes. Note the first selection: *nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri* (*Epistles* 1.1.14). This is a strong assertion of independence (Maecenas is the *magister*), and one that is not found in a normal patron-client relationships because interdependence and mutual benefit of the patron and client are key to the relationship's continuance (Bowditch 2010, 66). As a client, to declare oneself independent of one's patron is to end that relationship and any gain that might have come from it. And yet the mere mention of Maecenas' name indicates that his influence is still present, and that Horace has not completely separated himself from Maecenas. Our second selection from the *Epistles* reflects the general attitude of the first: *quinque dies tibi pollicitus me rure futurum/sextilem totum mendax desideror* (*Epistles* 1.7.1-2). There is a complete disregard for patron, as we saw in the previous excerpt. Deceiving Maecenas, Horace has shirked a month's worth of the responsibilities that he, as a client, owed Maecenas. Thus, we see in these few lines a complete going against the grain of

what Horace initially showed us about the poet-patron relationship that he shared with Maecenas in his *Satires*.

Maecenas' influence over Horace, as we might expect given the above examples, waned in the years following *Epistles* I. However, scholars are divided over the reason or reasons for this diminishing influence. The theories posited range from the belief that Maecenas angered the Emperor through some indiscretion to a theory that asserts that Maecenas purposefully withdrew his influence to allow the Emperor to step in (see Williams 1990; Bowditch 2010, 71-72). Both of these theories seem a bit strong and a little too absolute. We cannot actually say that Horace rejects Maecenas outright. Rather, it seems that the dynamic of their poet-patron relationship shifted with the development of Augustus' increasing influence over Roman literature. Augustus made literature a part of his cultural program, and thereby allowed himself to supersede Maecenas as the primary patron of the arts and consequently of Horace. This shift began in the early 20s BCE and coincided with Horace's publishing of *Odes* 1-3 (23 BCE), *Epistles* I (21 BCE), and the *Carmen Saeculare* (17 BCE). It should not surprise us then to see Augustus, who is not mentioned in *Satires* I, given the position of the primary addressee in the *Carmen Saeculare*.

Thus, we have come full circle. Though Maecenas' influence as patron did eventually begin to decrease, Horace's *Satires* introduce him and his patronage as a prominent theme which spans the majority of Horace's literary career. The *Satires*, in that they set the standard by which we are to view and interpret this theme, are an invaluable source. Moreover, the initial evidence that the *Satires* give to us about the nature of Maecenas' and Horace's poet-patron relationship helps us grapple with and understand the changes that would later alter this relationship.

The place of *Satire 2.6* in Book 2

Satire 2.6 cannot be fully appreciated in a vacuum. The poem is rich with allusions to poems in Horace's *Satires*. The *Odes* and *Epistles* also make frequent references to content from *Satire 2.6*. We could become dizzy from the references to drinking alone: The drinking party from 2.2.123 resurfaces in the second half of 2.6, and the *inaequalis calices* in 67 reappear in *S.* 2.8.35. When features of the earlier satires resurface here, we should be especially attentive, as one may be left with the faulty impression that 2.6 merely recycles older material. The clash between Stoics and Epicureans, the contrast between urban life and rustic simplicity, Maecenas' impact on Horace's life— all of these are themes seen in the first installment of the *Sermones* (in the diatribe persona from 1.1-1.3, and 1.6 specifically). Perhaps this is why scholarship has concentrated on *Satires* 2.1 and 8 to the extent that some style them as “The New York and California of the Book” (Freudenburg 2009, 7). But 2.6 is central to the second book on a stylistic level and thematic level. It shows the poet experimenting with shifting speakers and depicting a state of mental relaxation.

The second installment of the *Satires* was published in 30 B.C.E., a mere five years after the first book (Morris 1968, 219). It opens with a humorous exchange between Trebatius and Horace. Scholarship on Book 2 consistently highlights this formal dialogue as a stylistic innovation in *Satires 2*. From the outset of his work, Horace primes us to listen for more than one voice, and attune ourselves to the complexities of shifting speakers. Horace relates the latter half of 2.6 through his neighbor Cervius (not the Cervius of 2.1.47) and his *fabella* (77-117). The main topic is a contrast between country and city life, a theme with which we are familiar from 2.2. *Satires 2.2* and 3 also introduce us to a form of dialogue in which Horace relates the main body of his poem through another speaker. And yet 2.2 and 2.3 set up their content in didactic discourse much like 4, 7, and 8 (Morris 1968, 220). What are we to make then, of a poem situated *inter haec* (2.6.77)? We know nothing about Cervius. He is a mere mouthpiece for Horace to project his satiric discourse, much like Catus in *Satire 2.4* (Oliensis 1998, 51). The three other named interlocutors in *Satires 2* — Ofellus, Damasippus and Davus— are described with much more detail and emerge as a trio that has suffered “a reversal of fortune” (Oliensis 1998, 52). These three homespun philosophers may remind us of the diatribe persona employed in *Satires 1.1-3*. Ofellus can only express his past in terms of food and drink in 2.2 (Rudd 1966, 170) and Damasippus is consoled by the Stoic doctrine that all men are equally insane (2.3.35). Davus, Horace's slave in 2.7, is perhaps the most humorous of these figures when he advises Horace to act with *libertate Decembri* (2.7.4). Cervius of 2.6 thus occupies a unique place among the characters of *Satires 2*. By employing him, Horace steps away from the form of dialogue he has developed previously and divides the poem into two long monologues.

Whereas Cervius' monologue emphasizes the joys of rustic simplicity, Horace takes great pains to illuminate his own pains and worries. 2.6 opens with a prayer to Mercury (however sarcastic) that the poet be allowed to keep the Sabine farm for which he so piously prayed. This is the only poem in the *Satires* that clothes a monologue in a prayer to the patron-god Mercury (Kießling-Heinze 1961, 298). We may view this as Horace's way of distancing himself from Maecenas' generosity. Oliensis, however, comments on the loose resemblance between the patron's name, and Mercury's epithet *Maia nate* (Oliensis 1998, 48). We should, as the poet

undoubtedly did, envision Maecenas in the background every time Horace's new villa is mentioned (See "The Sabine Villa in Horatian Verse"). When Horace references his newly acquired farm he is desperate to define it as his own property and thus mentions the physical alterations he has made to it in Satire 2.3.308 (Kiessling-Heinze). Yet the poet understands that he cannot live on the villa year round. Damasippus mocks the satirist for his delusions of retreating to his villa in the midst of the Saturnalia (2.3.1-10; Freudenburg 2006, 3) and Cervius' *fabella* removes it to the realm of dreams. 2.6 is thus a "safe space" for the poet within Satires 2. Nowhere else in the book does Horace convey such a relaxed state of mind.

Evidently, we are being presented with a poem about personal feelings. Horace invites us to share in his fears and anxieties when he offers us an insight into how his literary success has affected him (40-59). As always, Maecenas and Octavian loom large in the background. 2.6 was written shortly after the preceding poem, late in 31 B.C. or early in 30 (Morris 1968, 219). Allusions to "the chilling rumor about the Dacians" (2.6.50, 53) can help us establish a date securely after the battle at Actium (Morris 1968, 143). In a similar vein to 2.1, H. discusses Maecenas' impact on his life. In 2.1, however, the satirist is still optimistic about roaming the streets of the *urbs* without worry. Evidently Trebatius' humorous advice could only go so far: the satirist may have had nothing to fear on a legal basis, but the *invidia* of his urban neighbors awakens in him the desire for scenery of rustic simplicity. As Oliensis remarks "the author of *Satires* 2.6 is a busy man and, in a small way, a public figure" (Oliensis 1998, 46). Horace is so well known that the people he stumbles over in the city not only know his name, but his exact destination: Maecenas' dinner table (2.6.30-31). Throughout Book 2, Horace cannot escape Maecenas' reach. Some even view Damasippus in 2.3 as a stand-in character for the poet's patron (Freudenburg 2006, 5). 2.6 is thus central for understanding the theme of the client-patron relationship in Book 2.

Horace wants to flee from mundane concerns such as Maecenas' influence and his own status as an emerging celebrity. In 2.5 he has skillfully shown that one of the most banal expression of Roman anxieties (legacy hunting) can extend even to mythological figures such as Ulysses and Tiresias. Likewise, his patron only discusses gladiatorial games and other *nugae* with him (2.6.43). It should come as no surprise that the poet seeks recourse in the most complex philosophical questions (*natura boni*, 2.6.76) as a counterbalance. Reckford, however, notes that this is only a temporary solution. The satirist of 2.7 readily leaves the "humble vegetables," which Cervius praised in 2.6 to attend Maecenas' dinner party (Reckford 1977, 592). The satirist's obsession with food pervades Book 2. In 2.4 Catus gives extensive advice on which meal to eat with which course (see "*Ab ovo ad mala*") and 2.8 depicts a pretentious host's enormous dinner banquet. 2.8 can be interpreted as mockery of a Platonic feast (see "Food and dining in Roman satire"). This link between philosophy and dinner parties can be traced back directly to 2.6. Horace envisions himself and his guests in a symposiastic arrangement, discussing philosophical problems of the highest pedigree (*usus rectumne*, 2.6.75; *natura boni*, 76). It comes as no surprise then, that Horace briefly includes the disputes of Epicurean and Stoic philosophy first heralded by the diatribe persona in Book 1 (Turpin 1998, 128).

2.6 cannot function as a stand-alone poem. It is central to book 2 on a stylistic and thematic level. Horace uses 2.6 to further develop the dialogue form adopted in 2.1 and to present earlier themes (the clash between Stoics and Epicureans, Maecenas' influence) in a relaxed state of mind. When features from Horace's earlier works reappear here, they do so on the periphery of the poet's mind. Satire 2.6 is a place for Horace to escape, but only temporarily. If 2.1 and 2.8 are "The New York and California of the Book," 2.6 is the book's Caribbean

island resort. While new and exotic on the surface, the familiar lurks around every corner, reminding us that the poet must eventually return to his known *modus operandi*.

Pedestrian Muse

When Horace refers to his *musa pedestri*, he uses a decidedly unpoetic term for an allegedly unpoetic genre. At *S.* 1.4.39-42, Horace disavows the poetic status of his satires. “Of those whom I’ll admit are poets, well, I divide myself from that number. And really, you wouldn’t say that it’s enough [*satis*] to pen verse [to be called a poet], and if anyone writes (as I do) stuff closer to conversation, you wouldn’t think him a poet.” Now, H.’s recusal is riddled with so many holes as to be tongue in cheek (Freudenburg, 1999, 124), but we cannot easily dismiss allegiance to a “pedestrian muse.” What follows is an unpacking of the term that situates it in a Callimachean critical discourse that preserves the exclusive poetics espoused by Horace in his Satires and elsewhere, while acknowledging the strangeness of a “prosaic” muse.

Lines 16-17 of 2.6 feel programmatic: Horace asks a rhetorical question on the nature of his poetry (his *saturis Musaque pedestri*) before launching into the body of the poem. The translation of these lines is troubled, however: *ergo ubi me in montis et in arcem ex urbe removi quid prius illustrem saturis Musaque pedestri?* (“Therefore, when I have removed myself into the mountains and my stronghold out of the city, what should I celebrate better with my satires and ground-pounding muse?”) The juxtaposition of *illustrem* and *saturis* is tricky: satire “notes;” in what ways does this differ from “illustration”? Does *prius* refer to time? Now that Horace is away from the pressing concerns of city life, can he choose what he’ll illustrate “first?” Perhaps, given his rural bliss, there is nothing he’d *rather* write on than his fortune at escaping Rome (Greenough). Given these questions, *musa pedestri*, a phrase guaranteed to raise eyebrows and in a programmatic position, is not at all clear. In fact, it’s quite dull.

Pedester is rarely a poetic word. It is picked up after Horace, but of Horace’s contemporaries, only Virgil uses it, and only after the *Sermones*, scattering it through the *Aeneid*. There, it refers only to foot soldiers. In fact, in another Horatian context *pedester* is used to signal prose in opposition to poetry: *tuque pedestribus/ dices historiis proelia Caesaris* (“And you [Maecenas] may recite the battles of Caesar in prose history” (*Carm.* 2.12.9-10). Some commentators have seen *pedestribus* as a martial term here (“‘footslogging’ rather than ‘pedestrian’—it balances *proelia*”) (Nisbet and Hubbard). Our *pedestri* may also have martial connotation, “balancing” the *arcem* of 16. Regardless, of all the surviving uses of pre-Horatian *pedester*, they all have either prose or military contexts. Is a pedestrian Muse a paradox?

Pedester is defined by opposition. It is not equestrian (Caes. *Gal.* 7.67.5; Verg. *A.* 10.364). It is not sea-travel (Liv. 26.51.3; Cic. *De Sen.* 13; Caes. *Civ.* 2.32.12). Both of these oppositions may factor in to Horace’s use. “Equestrian” is of higher status than “pedestrian.” Sea-travel, especially over the broad sea, has epic connotations in Callimachean discourse (Wimmel 1960, 227-33). Horace may set up his “pedestrian” muse, then, in opposition to high status epic poetry. In *S.* 1.4, Horace describes a silly Lucilius rattling off verses while standing on one foot (1.4.9-10). Contrasting with (good-natured) humor of those earlier lines, Horace warns of Sulcius “who walks around sharp” (1.4.65-66). Sulcius and his neighbor Caprius may be informers or vicious satirists (Gowers). In the same lines, there is a great fear of roving bandits. *Pedester* thus locates Horace in a zone opposite aloof nobility and in an area of “on the ground” humor or danger. This danger can turn against satirist’s enemies, as well. Horace ends 1.4 with the threat of press-ganging his listener into his band: *ac veluti te/ Iudaei cogemus in*

hanc concedere turbam (“And just like Jews, we’ll compel you to assimilate into this crowd”). The horde of satirists, followers of a *musa pedestri*, are a pedestrian menace, but *pedester* already participates in literary criticism without these intermediate metaphors.

Pedester translates the Greek literary-critical term πεζός, used to mean prose, prosaic, or infantry, so the same range as *pedester*, and it is used in a sphragis of Callimachus. “αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μουσέων πεζὸν ἔπειμι νομόν.” “But I head off to the pedestrian grove of the Muses.” (Call. fr. 112.9) This apparently comes at the end of the *Aitia* and the next line in Callimachus’ papyrus roll would have been the start of the *Iambi*.¹ Πεζὸν thus locates Callimachus’ *Iambi* in a different poetic register from his *Aitia*. Horace, continuing in a Callimachean iambographic tradition, replicates his terminology. But what does πεζὸν νομόν mean?

It is possible that “pedestrian,” instead of marking a meek poetics that recuses itself from lofty aspirations, affirms a noble commitment to representing “real life.” “El ideal de vida y el ideal de estilo parten de un mismo principio: el decoro, τὸ πρέπον, cuyo paradigma ha de ser la verdad. El poeta satirico propugna, consecuentemente, una adecuacion del lenguaje a la realidad cotidiana que se pretende expresar” (Maldonado 1997, 135). In this view, Horace, following Lucilius, is able to *illustrare* the world using satire. The prosaic muse is not a flaw but an apt conjunction of style and content. The trouble with this view is that, ironically or not, Horace repudiates it elsewhere: *nec sermones malle/ repentis per humum quam res componere gestas* (“I don’t prefer satires that creep along the ground to the composition of *res gestae*,” Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.250-51). This occurs in a *recusatio*, in which Horace claims that he would love to praise Augustus, but his talents are fit to lesser genres. The lofty Muse, according to Horace in this epistle, is objectively better than the prosaic one. This may be ironic, of course. The point still stands that Horace is not using *musa pedestri* to valorize his satires, but simply to describe them.

The Muse’s walk, coupled with the remoteness of Horace, may reinforce the poetic exclusion appropriate to the Callimachean school. Horace, in a different context, makes known, *odi profanum vulgus et arceo* (“I hate and shun the base crowd,” *Carm.* 3.1.1). Notice the shunning (*arceo*) echoes Horace’s remote citadel (*arcem*). This seems to be a trope the Romans got from the Alexandrians. “If we ask what in general constitutes the Callimachean aesthetic enterprise,...[we see]...two related themes: rejection of the common crowd of poets and common taste, coupled with an insistence on the special or exclusive position of the poet” (Bassi 1989, 220 emphasis mine). In the *Aitia* prologue, for example, Apollo appears to the poet and tells him, πρὸς δέ σε καὶ τόδ’ ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἄμαξαι/ τὰ στείβειν, ἐτέρων ἵχνια μὴ καθ’ ὁμά/ δίφρον ἐλᾶν μηδ’ οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους/ ἀτρίπτους, εἰ καὶ στειγοτέρην ἐλάσεις (“For you, I also command this, that those [tracts] which wagons don’t partake in, you tread; the trails of others don’t drive your chariot down the same, nor along the wide path, but [take] the untrod roads even if you drive down a narrower path,” Call. *fr.* 1.25-28).

I’d like to suggest that the paths on which Horace treads would be inaccessible by chariot (or by an equestrian?). His muse, consequently, must be on foot. I have emphasized how Callimachus excludes himself from other poets. Here, crucially, Horace differs. As a satirist, Horace attempts to exclude himself from the city by fleeing to the mountains but is caught back up in it. (Note how Horace must talk about the bustle of Rome even at his retreat. See also how this satire ends with the mousey conversation at Rome, even though Horace’s dinner guests have also escaped.) The “pedestrian” Muse captures this tension. On the one hand, *pedester* is itself a prosaic word denoting prose. As such, it is an appropriate word for a satirist who denies that his

¹ This is not uncontroversial. For a discussion of this argument, along with a review of the difficulties of πεζὸν νομόν, see Clayman 1988.

work is even poetry. On the other hand, with its echoes of Callimachus, *πεζὸν νομόν*, and exclusionary poetics, it fits well a poet trying to get away, to gain a vantage point on the corruption of Rome and its social scene.

The Sabine Farm in Horatian Verse

Est modus in rebus (S. 1.1.106), says Horace. His miserly interlocutor just asked, “What, you want me to be a spendthrift and lose everything?” Horace, who of course penned his interlocuter’s objection himself, “responds” that there is a mean between being a miser and a spendthrift. Horace mentions *modus* again in *Satires* 2 (published five years later, around 30 B.C.E.). This time it is something he once prayed for, a *modus agri non ita magnus* (S. 2.6.1). He does not pray anymore, however, because his prayers have been answered. It is *hoc* (right before him) and it is his. Horace means the farm in the Sabine hills, about thirty miles northeast of Rome, that Maecenas awarded him presumably after the publication of *Satires* 1. The ruins of what is believed to have been his farm still stand and command a lovely view. The spot has been a place of “pilgrimage” for centuries. While the size of the 20,000 square foot villa may seem *magnus*, scholars who excavated the site hypothesize the house was expanded years after Horace’s death (Soren 2007, par. 18). Thus the claim *non magnus* could be accurate.²

From around 30 to 11 B.C.E., Horace mentions the estate in his work frequently. Doubtless he composed many of his poems there. He ceases mentioning it around the time of *Odes* 4, which he published presumably in 11 B.C.E., following a relocation to Tivoli (Nisbet 2007, 16). Many of the passages in which he mentions the farm directly continue to deal with the theme of the *modus* (*parva rura* [*Carm.* 2.16.37], *unicis Sabinis* [2.18.14], *permutem Sabina divitias operosiores* [3.1.45-48]) and also the extremes that are its opposite. At the same time, *modus* denotes rhythm in poetry (cf. S. 1.4.58) and thus we can ask at least whether we should associate Horace’s farm with the tempered, Callimachean style of his own verses (Harrison 2007, 245). Moreover, Horace likened Lucilius’ satires to the *tabella votiva* on which a Roman would inscribe his prayers (S. 2.1.33). Horace likewise sounds confessional when he says the farm was among his own *vota*. Now if Lucilius’ entire life was in his work, as his prayers were on his tablet, then his work would represent his life. If, however, he received something he had prayed for, which he had inscribed on the tablet, the thing received would be what he had written on the tablet (its very embodiment). It would be both the fulfillment of the thing prayed for and an expression of the fact that Lucilius wanted it badly enough to inscribe and ask for it beforehand. Hence, it would be an image of the very act of inscription. The Sabine farm, then, the answer to Horace’s own prayers, would be emblematic not only of the style he preferred, but of his writing itself: his own inscription.

Horace brings up his farm in *Carm.* 2.16. Here, he does not seem to be associating it with moderation, but rather the absence of something threatening or distasteful. Since absence is negative, one can argue it is more an extreme than a mean. He tells us in the final stanza that *parca non mendax* has granted him his *parva rura* (37), his *spiritum Graiae tenuem Camenae* (38), and the opportunity to reject the *malignum... volgus* (39-40). Thus Horace’s moderation, manifest in his small home and slender Muse, contrasts with Grosphus, to whom the poem is dedicated (7), and who wears twice-dyed wool (35-37). Note that he associates the farm with his Muse. This is one reason at least to associate the farm with Horace’s poetic style. Moreover, the poem’s first word, *otium*, for which a sailor on the Aegean prays when the sky darkens, is a reminder of *modus* because it is reminiscent of his claim *domesticus otior* (S. 1.6.128) according

² For more on Roman villas, see Plin. *Ep.* 5.6.

to which he celebrated his moderate lifestyle. He reapplies the word here, however, because the *otium* the sailor desires is the cessation of the pending storm and the fear it engenders. Thus, as was said, one can consider it an extreme, and not a mean, because it is negative. This sense of *otium* as extreme is reinforced by *volgus* (40), the last word of the poem. Hatred of the *volgus* is parallel with the *parva rura* (37) and *spiritum* (38) Fate has granted Horace. Hence, by association with *parva rura*, presumably the seat of *otium*, we can also associate seclusion from the mob, another negative, with *otium*. Moreover, *volgus* is the poem's last word and therefore clashes with *otium*, the first word, especially. By recalling the fury of the storm, which *furiosa* (5) and *tumultus* (10) echo, with which the poem began, Horace (out of the seclusion of his *parva rura* and *spiritum tenuem*) creates a vicious circle. We begin with the sailor praying for *otium* and we end with *volgus*, in whose noisy presence we have to pray for *otium* all over again. (See "The City/Country Dichotomy in Roman Satire.")

In both *Carm.* 2.16 and 2.18, Horace reflects on two speeches of Achilles. He reflects on Achilles' line at *Iliad* 9.318 that "coward and brave are equally honored" (Verity 2011) and, I would argue, goes on to connect it with the theme of *modus*. To begin with, he reworks the very atmosphere of the farmhouse in *Carm.* 2.16, from *modicis uvescit laetius* (*S.* 2.6.70) to *laetus in praesens... amara... temperet riso* (*Carm.* 2.16.25-27). In the first case, the guest drinking from a moderately sized glass grows tipsy more joyfully. In the second, one should be happy with the present by suppressing thought of the future and laughter can only moderate bitterness. Horace then refers to the speech of Achilles (whom he mentions outright at *Carm.* 2.16.29) to Priam from *Iliad* 24.529-33: *nihil est ab omni parte beatum* (27-28). As was said, he develops this Homeric theme in *Carm.* 2.18 (in which he also mentions the farm, *satis beatus unicus Sabinis* [14]). There he echoes the words of Achilles that I mentioned above about everyone being honored equally (*Carm.* 2.18.32-33 *aequa tellus/pauperi recluditur/regumque pueris*). Horace explains these allusions to Achilles, and perhaps his darker reimagining of his farm and the *modus* associated with it in *Carm.* 3.1.40-48. He asks, if the utmost wealth cannot ease one's suffering, *cur valle permutem Sabina/divitias operosiores?* Thus, because death deprives both the wealthy and the poor of what they have, what is the point of having a lot? Horace's insight could explain why he associates the *modus* of his farmhouse in *Carm.* 2.16 with an *otium* that was more a deprivation than an opportunity for other activities.

Thus Horace's farm could represent a lack of either hassle or wealth. If so, it could explain why, in other places, especially in his more comic work, Horace seems to be of two opposite minds about country living. He prefers it when staying in town, but longs for the town when staying in the country. His treatment of country life at certain places in his *Epodes* and *Satires* admonishes us not to romanticize unduly his life on the farm. Consider *Epodes* 2: *beatus ille... (1) paterna rura... exercet... (3) libet iacere modo sub antiqua ilice... (23) has inter epulas ut iuvat pastas ovis/videre properantis domum... (61-62)* and then the final lines: *haec ubi locutus faenerator Alfius/iam iam futurus rusticus/omnem redegit idibus pecuniam/quaerit kalendis ponere* (67-70). Why in the world would Horace spend sixty-six lines enumerating pastoral delights only to reveal we have been hearing from Alfius the moneylender all along? Moreover, it seems Alfius is still practicing usury. Do Horace and Alfius have something in common? While Horace begins *S.* 2.6 with a description of his farmhouse, within some twenty lines, he is out and about in town. (See "The City/Country Dichotomy in Roman Satire.") The two-faced god Janus, like the *consultor* at the lawyer's door in *S.* 1.1.9, rouses him early in the morning. Then people in the street hassle him, as do Maecenas' clients. Seemingly tired of the city, he asks, *o rus, quando te aspiciam?* (60). In *S.* 2.7, however, his slave Davus reminds him,

Romae rus optas; absentem rusticus Urbem/tollis ab astra levis (28-29). Likewise, at the close of *S. 2.6*, amid the *sermo* of the villa, his friend Cervius tells the famous story of the city mouse who visits the country mouse. The country mouse's *lardi frusta* (85-86) are reminiscent of the *uncta satis pingui holuscula lardo* (64) for which Horace longs supposedly when staying in town. On the other hand, when the mice arrive in town, the town mouse *fungitur officiis* (109). So does Horace when he bustles about the city for Maecenas. (His persona seems similar to the town mouse's also when he is at the mercy of the pest in *S. 1.9*) It has been suggested that the mice represent different sides of Horace himself (Keane 2006, 118). If so, the villa is no longer *modus*, but one of the extremes between which Horace vacillates. It is a thing that, by itself, fails to satisfy him. Horace's *patriae quis exsul/se quoque fugit* (*Carm. 2.16.19-20*) perhaps describes the dissatisfaction he tends to feel in both town and country.

So what does the farm of modest size signify for Horace? A *modus* that is really the removal of something unpleasant, a relief from cares? Or a philosophical modesty in the face of certain death, which equalizes everything and everyone? Or does it represent everything that he does not have currently when he is in the city and therefore desires eagerly (that is, until he gets back to the country and begins pining for the city again)? On the other hand, in *S. 1.3.76-79*, Horace asks why *ratio* does not employ weights and measures (*modulis*) in assigning punishments for crimes. Similarly, in *S. 1.2.111*, he asks whether it is better to find out, with regard to sex, what sort of *modus* nature has established, what it will endure and what it cannot suffer. Perhaps his farm, his work, the very act of writing, in the course of which Horace bites his nails (*S. 1.10.71*) and then gets Quintilius to edit (*Ars 438-41*) (who sends him back to bite his nails again), are all emblematic of some sort of *modus* in Horace himself.

The City/Country Dichotomy in Roman Satire

Among the prominent diametric oppositions in the Roman literary mindset of the late Republic was one that divided city (*urbs*) from countryside (*rus*). The growth of the city into a sprawling metropolis over the course of the Republic had exacerbated the distinction between urban and rustic lifestyles as new customs permeated Rome and the demographic structure of the city shifted. This nascent diversity, coupled with the decadence of the upper classes, provided a suitable foundation upon which a new breed of social commentary was rooted: Roman satire. The variegated stuffing of the satirical sausage consisted of extreme portraits of poverty and luxury, wretchedness and depravity, dripping with the bitter juice of invective (see “*Ab ovo ad mala*”). The satirist’s Rome was a city of excess: *nil medium est* (Hor. *S.* 1.2.28). Such extreme objects of satiric vitriol as Horace’s unflagging pest (Hor. *S.* 1.9) and the hyperbolic urban misfortunes bemoaned by Umbricius (Juv. 3.21-314) were lent an air of realism verging on credibility when set in the cosmopolitan urban center of the empire (Braund 1989, 24). That is, satire exploited urban anxieties that were familiar enough to trigger the audience’s suspension of disbelief.

The city/country dichotomy found a place in certain rhetorical frameworks that pitted the quaint rustic against the cunning city-dweller. The simple virtues of the rustic are commonly exaggerated in these arguments to contrast with urban vices targeted by the orator. The polarization of positive and negative characteristics in this rhetorical framework echoes an exercise practiced in the schools of declamation, first mentioned by Quintilian (2.4.24; cf. Braund 1989, 23). In this exercise, orators drew on a common set of advantages and shortcomings with which to argue against city life or country life (cf. Sen. *Contr.* 1.6.4; 2.1.8; 2.1.11-12; Val. Max. 4.4.11). It follows that both earlier and contemporary satirists were notably consistent in their adoption of these rhetorical commonplaces when their *personae* engaged in the city/country debate. Of particular prominence was the association of the countryside with Rome’s ancestral population: rugged, austere, and noble, while the city was associated with social-climbing Greeks, sexual deviants, and a growing rift between rich and poor (cf. Hor. *S.* 1.2; 2.6; Juv. 3).

This superficial division of qualities in Roman satire is not devoid of nuance despite frequent appeals to the city-country dichotomy as a rhetorical framework. Satire was inextricably bound to the city as a font of source material. Writers of satire persistently refer to the habit of finding material for their poetry in the bustle of downtown Rome (cf. Juv. 1.63-64) and occasionally the satires themselves follow the *persona* through a day in his life in the bustling urban environment (cf. Hor. *S.* 1.9). For Horace, the practice of crowd-gazing as research for his *sermones* began at an early age: we are told that as a boy, Horace’s father brought him to the city for a proper education away from the brutish provincial boys at the local school in Venusium (cf. *S.* 1.6.71-88). Horace’s father taught him using the conspicuous living *exempla* inhabiting the city, pointing out their faults one by one as Horace himself was destined to do, though without the moralizing agenda of his father (cf. *S.* 1.4.105-26; Freudenberg 1993, 39 and Gowers). Satire’s links to the city are further conceptualized by Horace’s invocation of the fathers of Old Comedy, an anachronistic attribution that retrojects the satiric habit four centuries into the past, to the age of the Classical Greek *poleis* (*S.* 1.4.1-5).

Despite the alleged ancient origins of satire, the major satirists following Lucilius found it necessary to take precautions against possible consequences of their invective. It is curious that all three extant satirists suffered from reluctance to recite their *sermones* for the general population. As a humorous precaution, Horace resorts to menacing his audience with a band of resident Jews, as if he found it necessary to secure his satiric pedestal by allying himself with an element of the urban population known for its solidarity (Hor. *S.* 1.4.141-43; cf. Cic. *Pro Flacco* 4 and Gowers). The Roman mob was a suitable subject, but a dangerous audience. The satirists describe various preventative measures: Horace claims that he recites in private and rarely, Persius professes to commit his secrets to a trench, and Juvenal promises to satirize only the dead (cf. Hor. *S.* 1.4.22-25; Pers. 1.119-20; Juv. 1.149-71).

When the countryside is depicted outside the context of the city/country opposition, the satirist humorously describes the oppressive climate and boisterous natives of Southern Italy. A different sort of humor typifies satires of the countryside. Bitter invective is replaced with simpleminded slapstick coupled with a lofty urban perspective that cannot take the rustics seriously. A prime example is Horace *S.* 1.5, in which the audience is regaled with such episodes as a singing contest between a drunken *vappa* and a *viator* over lost sweethearts (15-17), a hothead mercilessly beating a lethargic barge-operator (21-23), and a municipal magistrate's poor gifts (34-36). Such rustic stereotypes may reflect those of Lucilius' *Iter Siculum*, Horace's satiric model for 1.5. Moreover, Atellan farce, one of Roman satire's poetic ancestors, may have inspired the verbal bout between Sarmentus and Cicirrus (51-69), adding a rustic component to the predominantly urban ancestry of Old Comedy and Lucilian satire (cf. Gowers).

By the same token, the city itself was not consistently envisioned as a den of iniquity. Horace's brief prehistory of mankind's evolution links the foundation of cities with the establishment of laws and the end of constant strife (Hor. *S.* 1.3.99-110). It is interesting that here the first elements of speech replace physical conflict and function much as satire does in theory: verbal attacks (*notarent*) leveled against the transgression of social norms (*ne quis fur esset neu latro neu quis adulter*). In Horace's prehistory, satire's origins date back to the foundation of the first towns. As mentioned above, it was linked to Greek Old Comedy, which allegedly performed a similar function in Athens as a means of castigating social deviants. Nevertheless, despite these occasional deviations from the established contrast between city and country, the prevalence of the sordid urban setting in Roman satire is inescapable.

The city/country dichotomy is particularly prevalent in the context of a specific theme in Roman satire: an escapism espoused by those who flee the corrosive influence of the city for the simplicity of country life, which is portrayed as frozen in time, preserving the idealized moral righteousness and simplicity of the ancients. The countryside serves as a pure backdrop against which the dark heart of the City appears in striking contrast in the words of our satiric *persona*. While the majority of extant satires are set in the city, two in particular appeal heavily to the city/country debate: Hor. *S.* 2.6 and Juv. 3. Both conclude with the departure of an individual from the city for a life in the country, though on different terms: Horace's country mouse returns home after an adventure in the city, while Juvenal's Umbricius abandons the city for a new life.

In 2.6, Horace's *persona* attempts and fails a justification of his preference for life in the countryside using rhetoric derived from the city-country debate. His failure reveals the inherent weakness of this simplistic division. He completes a modest prayer to Mercury for the simplicity and salubrity of a rustic life before describing the taxing *negotia* of the urban lifestyle (18-39; 59-70). City and country are further compared in the City Mouse/Country Mouse fable related by Cervius (79-117). This fable's function in the poem is not readily evident (cf. West

1974). Cervius tells it at a party attended by several of Horace's neighbors in the countryside while they are engaged in a discussion concerning the nature of their common friendship and of "the good" (73-76). All in attendance own villas nearby and appreciate the rustic lifestyle as much as the fable's country mouse does. It seems that Cervius was inspired to relate the fable out of concern for a friend who risked falling into the role of the naïve country mouse enamored with urban altérité. Yet the fable itself is complicated by the reader's knowledge of Horace's double life, divided between city and country. Horace, as much as he claims for himself the role of country mouse in lines 1-70 through his *recusatio* of city life and praise of the merits of country life, cannot help but acknowledge the pleasure he feels as a cog in the machine of Maecenas' clientele: *melli est, non mentiar* (32). The lure of the city traps Horace between these two worlds. Horace tries his best to convince himself of the validity of country life's superiority over city life, but fails because of its inherent flaw.

This interpretation of Horace *Satires* 2.6 illustrates the caution necessary in approaching satire. The simplicity of the city/country dichotomy serves as a dynamic with which the poet's *persona* engages to achieve the poet's desired effect. A further example of this function is the lengthy tirade of Umbricius in Juvenal 3. Umbricius adopts the role of narrator as Cervius did in Horace 2.6. He undertakes a justification for his flight within the typical rhetorical framework of the city/country debate: Greeks have taken over Rome, the hazards of the city make daily life unbearable, and traditional Roman values no longer confer any advantage. Yet it becomes evident that a different dichotomy would serve as a better framework for understanding Umbricius' argument: that between archaic idealism and profitable pragmatism. Umbricius' true issue is his failure to adapt to the economic realities of Rome. He clings desperately to an idealized view of the city aligned with the traditional portrayal of the Italian countryside and ignores the problem. The primary difference between Juvenal 3 and Horace 2.6 is the object of the satire: whereas Horace satirizes a dilemma of his own, Juvenal unleashes his satire on an unknown external target. In both instances, the city-country dichotomy is appropriated and complicated for satiric effect.

“*Ab ovo ad mala*: The Place of Food in Roman Satire”

The quotidian nature of food consumption makes it a natural topic of discussion for the satirist, who tends towards the commonplace for his subject matter. Everyone, regardless of social status, must eat. The meal, then, becomes a means by which the writer can unify the ranks of the Roman *populus*, gathering guests from every walk of life into one poem in order to draw attention to iniquities. Food embodies some of the main polarities of society and literature that satirists sought to address: it is perishable yet omnipresent, trivial yet essential, vulgar yet luxurious.³ This idea of dichotomy carries over into the way satirists describe food, argues Gowers. In fact, it is difficult to find a description of a typical Roman meal⁴; everything is either extravagant or simple. Satirists create fantastical *cenae*, often plagued by social catastrophes, to illustrate and critique meals they deem too sumptuous.⁵

The banality of food relegates it to the lower realms of literature, of which comedy and satire are a part. While the etymology of the term *satura* is unclear, it is generally accepted that it has some root in culinary language.⁶ The term does not appear until the opening of the second book of Horace’s *Satires* (2.1.1),⁷ after which point his satires take a decidedly alimentary turn. Food in satire, Gowers argues, functions as a metapoetic allegory for literature and the writing process. The vocabulary that describes food can be metaphorically expanded to explain literary style as well—tone, flavor, the process of cooking or writing.⁸

Satirical authors draw on the precedent of Greek literature and Roman comedy when including food in their work. When the Greeks wrote about food, they focused mainly on what was served (*deipna*) or the guests’ conversation (*symposia*). *Cena* was the Roman equivalent to the Greek *symposium*. (Shero 1923, 126; Gowers 1993, 29). The most relevant primary texts to the discussion of food in Roman⁹ satire are Lucilius’s fragments; Horace *S.* 2.4 and 2.8; Persius; and Juvenal *Sat.* 4 and 5.¹⁰

Lucilius

From the extant fragments, we know that Lucilius discussed a variety of meals, ranging from rustic country *cena* to elaborate banquet. Book 5 describes a humble, rustic meal. Book 13 criticizes the luxury of a sumptuous dinner, while Book 20 describes a lavish dinner party hosted

³ Gowers 1993, 191-92.

⁴ Gowers 1993, 7, note 20.

⁵ Hudson 1989, 81-85.

⁶ Diomedes, *Grammatici Latini* I.485. 1) *satyri*—satyrs 2) *lanx satura*—full dish 3) *farcimen*—sausage 4) *lex satura*—a political bill. Diomedes settles on the first etymology, but it is now generally accepted that at least one culinary etymology is correct. Cf. Gowers 1993, 110f.

⁷ Lucilius includes food in his satires, but we have no way of knowing whether or not he introduces the term in missing fragments.

⁸ Gowers 1993, 41-42.

⁹ Rudd 1966, 204-5.

¹⁰ Petronius’s *Satyricon* tells the tale of the *Cena Trimalchionis*, but I will not discuss it in this paper. For discussion of the *Cena Trimalchionis*, as well as some bibliography, cf. Gowers 1993, 30f. For enumerated similarities between Petronius and Horace, see the citations in Shero 1923, 135.

by the auctioneer Granius.¹¹ Book 28 tells of a banquet in Athens, populated by philosophers and Epicureans, while Book 30 returns to a simple meal. Horace's *Cena Nasidieni* (S. 2.8) likely draws inspiration from some of Lucilius's banquets.

Horace

Horace takes gastronomic writing to a new level in his *Satires*, mainly in Book 2. Following in the footsteps of Greek New Comedy, he writes about food to an extent that even Plautus and Terence do not (Rudd 1966, 203). Horace's vocabulary is strewn with food puns and metaphors that translate his alimentary descriptions into social and ethical commentary. Horace relies on flavor words to describe both edible and inedible subjects; for example, *acerbus* and *amarus* are both bitter in taste and bitter in persona. In S. 1.7.7, Horace describes a quarrel between Persius and Rupilius, calling Persius "confident, bloated, thus of bitter speech" (*confidens, tumidus, adeo sermonis amari*). Here, *tumidus* describes an inflated ego and *amari* harsh and unpleasant speech; however, both terms belong to the culinary vocabulary as well, where *tumidus* might mean "bloated" or "full," and *amarus* "bitter" in flavor.¹² These dual meanings, often one culinary and one personal or civic, compromise one another (Gowers 1993, 134). Throughout his satires, Horace uses this food vocabulary to create tensions between the positive and negative aspects of a simple country lifestyle (and meal) and an urban existence.¹³

In 2.4, we witness the rambling gourmet Catus¹⁴ give a long, random list of trite culinary advice based on the opinions of his master. He lists and describes appropriate foods to be served at each of the courses of a traditional Roman *cena*, literally *ab ovo ad mala*. Catus begins with the *gustatio*, moves onto the *promulsis*, to lunch, to *mensae primae* and *secundae* and, finally, dessert.¹⁵ He leaves room to remark on standards of service as well. There is no consensus on how to interpret Catus and his pedantic gastronomic lecture; however, Gowers suggests that the lazy cooks whom Catus's master (via Catus) chastises should be taken as parallels to Lucilius, who prepared sloppy satires (Gowers 1993, 145-60). She reads the satire as a parody of didactic philosophy (Gowers 1993, 135).

2.8, possibly adapted from Lucilius, opens with an allusion to Plato, setting up the tale as a parody of a Platonic feast. Horace tells the tale of the *Cena Nasidieni*, a grand dinner banquet presided over by a pretentious host. The guests are a combination of literati and parasites, and they enjoy mocking Nasidienus as he makes every effort to ensure the meal goes perfectly. Disaster naturally ensues when a tapestry falls onto the table, ruining the lamprey dish. Nasidienus cries at the table, while the guests then deal him the ultimate insult: leaving the dinner early as their host struggles to continue. Recent scholarship has sought to address the inconclusive ending of the poem¹⁶ and the identity of Nasidienus. Rudd believes Nasidienus represents a wealthy man with no education or social conscience (Rudd 1966, 215), while Gowers argues that he is a distorted representation of Horace, who has to live in the same society he satirizes (Gowers 1993, 166-68).

¹¹ For a discussion of the possible host of Book 20 cf. Shero 1929. Shero 1923 also provides a more thorough listing of food-related fragments from Lucilius.

¹² Similarly, *sapiens* can be savory or wise. *Vitium* is both rotten food and decay of morals. *Sal* can stand for salt or for wit, as in Lucilius's treatment, while *ius* can refer to either the law or a gravy or sauce. Gowers 1993, 131-55. provides a systematic catalog of food terms and metaphors in Horace's *Satires*.

¹³ Hudson 1989, 72-80.

¹⁴ Gowers 1993, 141.

¹⁵ Rudd 1966, 206-13 analyzes Catus's description of the meal.

¹⁶ Lowe 2010; Sharland 2011.

Persius

Persius's six satires take a different tone than that of Horace and Lucilius. He makes no reference to the *cena* of his predecessors, but scatters their quotations, food terminology, and gastronomical metaphors throughout. He pits his harsh Stoic philosophy against Horace's Epicurean voice, as evident by the coarse foods he describes. In *S.* 2.7.29-30, Horace's slave mocks him for his fickle morals, telling him, "if, by chance, you are not invited to dinner, you praise your safe vegetables" (*si nusquam es forte vocatus/ ad cenam, laudas securum holus*). Persius's vegetables, on the other hand, are not secure Epicurean pleasures; they are "hard vegetables placed on a cold plate" (*positum est argente catino/ durum olus*, 3.111-12).¹⁷ Persius exposes an uglier side of both food and satire, writing texts and philosophy that are both bloated and drawing the analogy between the stuffed sausages of the dinner table and the stuffed pages of satire (Gowers 1993, 185).

Juvenal

Juvenal uses food in his satires to create a dichotomy between lack and excess, luxury and poverty (Gowers 1993, 191). In Satire 4, his epic parody of the events surrounding a 6,000-lb.¹⁸ turbot, Juvenal's descriptions of sumptuousness peak. The fish is so large that no dish can hold it, so a new one must be constructed. Juvenal tells a playful story about Domitian and exaggerates to the point of absurdity in order to reflect the character of the emperor's dominion (Gowers 1993, 202).

The *Cena Virronis* in Satire 5 contrasts a wealthy patron and a poor client at a dinner. While the host dines on delicacies like lobster, Trebius, his client, is left with a shrimp. The lobster is served on a *lancem*, the dish associated with satire, but it is not the satirist who eats off of it (Freudenberg 2001, 271). The client seems to represent Horace, argue Gowers and Freudenberg. He is *ieiunis* (hungry), even though he writes *satura* (Gowers 1993, 217). Freudenberg goes further, wondering if the scraps that Trebius receives are what Juvenal provides for us as readers; or, if the scraps themselves are in fact the feast.¹⁹

The satirists tend to express their disapproval of the lavish Roman *cena* by populating it with unsavory characters and calamitous or unbelievable events. The writer describes the food in great detail, laying out a full table before the reader, who cannot taste or experience any of it. By reading satire, we are participating in the banquet only to an extent. Like the poor client, like the satirist, we are left wanting to taste what we can see but not attain.

¹⁷ Gowers 1993, 180-7.

¹⁸ "No mullet could possibly be this big" (Gowers 1993, 204); cf. Thompson 1957.

¹⁹ Freudenberg argues that if Trebius represents Juvenal, who in turn represents us—wanting what he/we expect but cannot have: "Our wanting Juvenal to play Lucilius for us, waiting for him to deliver the goods, turns out to say as much about us as it does about him...Why are we still here? Why did we allow ourselves to be treated this way? Dare we let this book, now that it is over, count as 'satire,' the full, rich feast, so as to leave contented, and full? Or do we admit that we are still hungry, and not at all pleased, enraged at what Juvenal has fobbed off on us in the course(s) of this sham-epic book and deigned to name 'satire.' Now who is indignant, and ready to burst out? Now who is *becoming Juvenal?!?*" (Freudenberg 2001, 276).

The Animal Fable in Greco-Roman Literature

In the study of fable, the first hurdle that scholars and students alike face is the problem of defining the fable. This process is complicated by the fact that three words are used to denote fables in ancient Greek (αἴτιοι, λόγοι, and μῦθοι), each with their own connotations and interpretive issues (Adrados 1999, Van Dijk 1997). The first scholar to attempt to define the fable was Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* (2.20), where he defines fable as a type of proof in a rhetorical argument that is fictional and able to be utilized as an exemplum or illustration of a concept during an argument. Modern scholars generally agree with Aristotle's definition but have also elaborated upon it, primarily by defining the structure of fable.

Although fables have no universal tone or desired effect (Holzberg 2002), they have a consistent tripartite form that is often present from the Archaic period through the Hellenistic and Imperial collections. First, fables are demarcated from their contexts by an initial formula.²⁰ Then, the bulk of the tale is told, and finally a closing statement or *epimythium* finishes the tale, which gives the lesson meant to be imparted (Adrados 1999, Van Dijk 1997, Zafiroopoulos 2001). The structure of the fable also reinforces its ultimately didactic nature, as indicated by Aristotle.

Aside from structural elements, modern scholarship has also expanded upon Aristotle's definition in terms of the style and function of the fable. Although an exhaustive treatment of these would be prohibitively lengthy, two points must be noted for this essay. First, while Aristotle defines fable as a proof for a rhetorical argument, this definition is influenced by his own interests in writing the *Rhetoric*. As Van Dijk (1996, 1997) illustrates, the function of fable ranges from persuasive or illustrative to comedic and satirical, while maintaining a close thematic relationship with its framing context. Second, although Aristotle uses two animal fables as examples of fable (2.20), it is essential to note that not all fables were animal-centered, and many included gods, humans, and plants as characters. However, in antiquity there was no explicit differentiation of animal and non-animal fables, with both types performing parallel, if not identical, functions (1997, 21). Animal fables are simply fables employing animal characters. Thus, animal fable in antiquity is best viewed within the context of the history and evolution of fable as a genre, with nuances of the animal fable becoming evident only through the examination of specific works.

The earliest extant examples of the animal fable in Greek literature come from the Archaic period in the poetry of Hesiod and Archilochus. Hesiod includes a short fable in his *Works and Days* (202-12). While talking to his younger brother Perses, Hesiod tells a story of a nightingale who, caught in the talons of a hawk, thrashes about and tries to escape. The hawk, sensing the terror of the nightingale, offers her some advice: it is foolish for the weak to try to oppose the strong, as she will only incur more pain for herself. Finishing the tale, Hesiod then turns back to Perses and exhorts him to not foster violence within himself.

Hesiod's fable illustrates many stylistic and structural aspects that will become important later on: it is a short, direct tale addressed to the listener, and it has an introductory statement demarcating the fable from the narrative and the fable following it. However, the most pertinent aspect of the fable is its didactic nature. Although there is no *epimythium* stating the moral of the tale, the language of Hesiod throughout (Van Dijk 1997, 127) and his statement to his brother

²⁰ Such as the temporal *ποτε* or *quondam* (Van Dijk 1997, 363).

after the end of the tale both clearly indicate that the fable is to be read as a negative exemplum. The symbolism inherent in the animal characters gives further depth to his lesson: in epic simile (cf. Hom. *Il.* 17.673-78 and 22.306-10, *Od.* 24.538-39, etc.) and tragedy (A. A. 49-54), taloned birds are frequently associated with the ferocity of a warrior's *aristeia*, and smaller birds and mammals their weaker prey. In describing the violence of the hawk, Hesiod is demonstrating the ferocity of those in power and their unrelenting violence, and encouraging his brother to follow a different moral path.

Archilochus uses fable for a very different end in his epodes. In one of his epodes (fr. 174-81) against his ever-present foe Lycambes, Archilochus narrates a lengthy fable involving the friendship between a fox and an eagle (van Dijk 1997, Zafiropoulos 2001). The two animals become friends and decide to build their homes near one another. One day when the fox is away, however, the eagle steals the fox's pups from their den and feeds them to her eaglets. When the fox returns, she is only able to curse the eagle and pray to Zeus that the eagle will not escape punishment. Soon after, the eagle brings a smoldering piece of meat to her nest and sets the entire tree aflame. Her eaglets are singed to death and fall onto the ground below, where the fox devours them. Archilochus closes the fable with an epimythium: "thusly may punishment reach you" (Adrados 1999, 375).

Like Hesiod's, Archilochus' fable fulfills most of the stylistic and structural elements defined above. However, the fable of Archilochus bears a much more complicated relationship to its frame than Hesiod's. As previously stated, the epode containing the fable is an attack on his opponent Lycambes who, according to the poem, recently betrayed Archilochus in some way (Carey 1986). Thus, the tensions of the poem can be mapped onto the fable: both Lycambes and the eagle broke faith with the fox and Archilochus. Here, then, the fable serves to criticize and attack Lycambes by pointing out that his betrayal will not go unpunished. The use of animals in the fable is especially notable here, as it serves to make the attack more indirect and to "soften" the blow, as both Archilochus and Lycambes are wearing the masks of the animal protagonists (Zafiropoulos 2001).

In these two Archaic Greek examples, two functions of animal fables begin to emerge: the exemplum fable, as in Hesiod, and the use of fable as indirect criticism and satiric play in the iambic poetry of Archilochus. Both of these functions were retained in the Classical period, particularly in the social sphere, as fable was frequently used in sympotic and comedic contexts (Adrados 1999). The fable also appears in greater numbers in the Classical texts, popping up everywhere from Sophocles (*Aj.* 1142-46) to Herodotus (1.141). The most common framework for the fable in the Classical period, however, was in rhetorical contexts. Although there are no extant examples of fable in the corpus of Athenian orators, rhetorical handbooks and accounts of oratory indicate the frequent use of fables as exempla (Zafiropoulos 2001). Through its use as a rhetorical tool, the form of fable was also refined during the Classical period, becoming shorter and more succinct with a definitive introduction and epimythium employed more consistently (Adrados 1999).

It was perhaps this emphasis on the rhetorical use of fable that led to the compilation of the first collection of fables by Demetrius of Phalerium in 350-280 B.C.E (Adrados 2000). Although the collection is not extant, that has not kept scholars from wondering about its contents and purpose. As a student of Aristotle and a rhetorician himself, Demetrius could have amassed the collection for his own analysis and memorization, or it could have been created as a book to accompany his lessons at his rhetorical school. In either case, fragments illustrate that Demetrius standardized the form of the fable and streamlined it for easy reference, with a *fabula*

docet preceding each fable. These indicate the rhetorical context in which a fable should be used and include a note about the moral of the fable at the end (Holzberg 2002). The collection of Demetrius marks the first step in the Hellenistic and Imperial interest in the creation of collections of fables as freestanding books and their inclusion in novels (Van Dijk 1996).

Of the numerous collections of fables, the most famous and unusual is attributed to a man named Phaedrus, a Roman writing in the first 30 years of the first century C.E. Unlike Demetrius, Phaedrus wrote his fables in verse and sought to link them formally and thematically with each other in the collection, imitating the book-rolls developed by Augustan poets (Holzberg 2002). In order to create this technical cohesion, Phaedrus also frequently changed characters, settings, and details of fables from their traditional predecessors and even wrote his own new fables to fit within the collection. One of the most notable aspects of Phaedrus' adaptation of fable is his interest in the political dimensions of the genre. Looking back to the mythical originator of the genre, the slave Aesop, Phaedrus claimed that the genre of fable originated as a coded language among slaves (Marchesi 2005) against their masters. Thus, Phaedrus used the fables in his collection to criticize contemporary morals and to highlight specific social problems, especially struggles of class and inequalities of power (Holzberg 2002). In Phaedrus' treatment of fable, then, there is an indication of a shift away from fable as purely exemplum and towards a literary fable, able to be manipulated and rewritten to as the author sees fit.

Outside of the later Imperial collections, the Roman genre that most frequently employs fable is satire. Owing to Lucilius' ties with the Greek iambic tradition and Archilochus in particular, scholars believe that fables were probably first employed by him for attacks on personal enemies (Holzberg 2002, Marchesi 2005). Horace's use of fable, however, is less aggressive and also less obvious: the epimythia of his fables never end with the Archilochean accusation, nor are they evidently leveled at a single individual. Some scholars have even chosen to focus on the social implications of fable²¹ and argued for their inclusion on those grounds. This may certainly be one reason for the use of fables in Horace's *Satires*, but can this justify every instance? Armed with the history of the fable, when looking at 2.6.79-117 we must ask ourselves: if animal satire is used for veiled criticism, as in the Archilochean iambic tradition, what or whom is Horace criticizing? If it is an exemplum, what is he teaching? If he changes details from their Aesopic models (West 1974), like Phaedrus, what is his literary fable saying? Ultimately, the detail, structure, and frame of fables demonstrate that when he speaks of animals, a fabulist is rarely speaking of animals at all.



²¹ For example, Marchesi (2005) points to the fable's servile connotations as proof that Horace is including fable in his *Satires* to demonstrate the rusticity and lower class of his satiric persona.

WORKS CITED

Reference Works (cited with abbreviations)

- Allen, J.H., and J.B. Greenough. (1903) 2000. *Allen and Greenough's New Latin Grammar*. Updated for Focus by Anne Mahoney. Newburyport: Focus/R. Pullins. (AG)
- Gildersleeve, B.L. (1867) 1965. *Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar*. 3rd ed. Revised and enlarged by B.L. Gildersleeve and Gonzalez Lodge. Reprint, London: Macmillan. (G)
- Glare P.G.W. ed. (1982) 2002. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Reprint, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, Charlton T., and Charles Short. 1879. *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford. (L-S)

Texts and Commentaries (cited by author name only)

- Braund, Susanna. 1996. *Juvenal: Satires Book I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fritzsche, Herrmann. 1876. *Des Q. Horatii Flaccus Sermonen*. Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von B.G. Teubner.
- Fuchs, Jacob, trans. 1977. *Horace's Satires and Epistles*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Gow, James. 1909. *Q. Horati Flacci Saturarum Liber II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gowers, Emily. 2012. *Horace: Satires Book I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenough, James B. 1896. *The Satires and Epistles of Horace*. Boston: Ginn and Company.
- Heinze, Richard, and Kiessling, Adolf, eds. 1961. *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Satiren*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Krüger, Gustav. 1904. *Des Q. Horatius Flaccus Satiren und Episteln*. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner.
- Moore, C.H. and E.P. Morris. 1902. *Horace: Odes, Epodes and Carmen Saeculare*. New York: American Book Company.
- Morris, Edward. 1968. *Horace: The Satires*. Reprint, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Muecke, Frances. 1993. *Horace: Satires II with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Nisbet R.G.M. and Margaret Hubbard. 1991. *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book II*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Palmer, Arthur. 1964. *The Satires of Horace*. London: Macmillan & Co.
- Perry, Ben Edwin. 1965 *Babrius and Phaedrus*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Plessis, F. and Lejay, P. 1911. *Oeuvres d'Horace*. Paris: Librairie Hachette.
- Schütz, Hermann. 1881. *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Satiren*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Usener, Hermann. (1887) 2010. *Epicurea*. London and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wickham, E. C. 1891. *Quinti Horatii Flacci Opera Omnia: The Satires, Epistles, and de Arte Poetica*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Books and Articles

- Adrados, Francisco Rodríguez. 1999-2000. *The History of the Greco-Latin Fable*. Translated by Leslie A. Ray and revised by Francisco Rodríguez Adrados and Gert-Jean van Dijk. 2 vols. Boston: Brill.
- Armstrong, David. 1989. *Horace*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Bassi, Karen. 1989. "The Poetics of Exclusion in Callimachus' Hymn to Apollo." *TAPA* 119: 219-31.
- Bowditch, Phebe Lowell. 2010. "Horace and Imperial Patronage." In *A Companion to Horace*, edited by Gregson Davis, 53-74. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Braund, S. H. [=Susanna], ed. 1989. *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- _____. 1989. "City and Country in Roman Satire." In Braund, *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*, 23-47.
- Carey, C. "Archilochus and Lycambes." *CQ* 36 (1986): 60-67.
- Clayman, Dee L. 1988. "Callimachus 'Iambi' and 'Aitia.'" *ZPE* 74:277-86.
- Colton, Robert. 1965. "Dinner Invitation: Juvenal 11.56.208." *CB* 41: 39-45.
- Davis, Gregson. "'Carmina/Iambi': The Literary-Generic Dimension of Horace's 'Integer vitae' ('C.' 1,22)." *QUCC*, n.s., 27.3 (1987): 67-78.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Freudenburg, Kirk, ed. 2009. *Horace: Satires and Epistles*. Oxford: University Press.
- _____. 2006. "Playing at Lyric's Boundaries: Dreaming forward in Book Two of Horace's *Sermones*." *Dictynna* 3:135-72.
- _____. 2001. *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1993. *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gowers, Emily. 2009. "The Ends of the Beginning: Horace, Satires 1." In *Perceptions of Horace: a Roman Poet and his Readers*, edited by L.B.T. Houghton and Maria Wyke. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Harrison, Stephen, ed. 2007. *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. "Horace: life and chronology." In Harrison, *Cambridge Companion to Horace*, 235-47.
- Holzberg, Niklas. 2002. *The Ancient Fable: An Introduction*. Translated by Christine Jackson-Holzberg. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Hudson, Nicola. 1989. "Food in Roman Satire." In Braund, *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*, 69-87.
- Keane, Catherine. 2006. *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Knoche, Ulrich. 1975. *Roman Satire*. Translated by Edwin Ramage. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Lowe, Dunstan. 2010. "Burnt Offerings and Harpies at Nasidienus' Dinner-Party (Horace, *Satires* 2,8)." In *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* vol. XV, edited by Carl

- Deroux, 240-57. Bruxelles: Éditions Latomus.
- Maldonado, José C. Miralles. 1997. "Lucilio y Horacio: El motivo del ornatus corporis en la sátira." *QUCC* 57.3: 119-38.
- Marchesi, Ilaria. 2005. "Traces of a Freed Language: Horace, Petronius, and the Rhetoric of Fable." *CA* 24: 307-30.
- McNeill, Randall. 2001. *Horace*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. 1984. "Horace's *Epodes* and History." In *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, edited by A.J. Woodman and David West, 1-18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nisbet, Robin. 2007. "Horace: Life and Chronology." In Harrison, *Cambridge Companion to Horace*, 7-21.
- Oliensis, Ellen. 1998. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reckford, Kenneth J. 1997. "Horatius: The Man and the Hour." *AJP* 118.4: 583-612.
- Rudd, Niall. 1987. *Horace: Satires and Epistles; Persius: Satires*. Reprint, London: Penguin.
- _____. 1966. *The Satires of Horace*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Sharland, Suzanne. 2011. "Ghostly Guests and Venomous Snakes: Traces of Civil War in Horace, *Satires* 2.8." *AC* 54: 79-100.
- Shero, L.R. 1929. "Lucilius's *Cena Rustica*." *AJP* 50: 64-70.
- _____. 1923. "The *Cena* in Roman Satire." *CP* 18: 126-43.
- Sommer, E. and Desportes, M. Aug. 1903. *Les Auteurs Latins: Horace: Les Satires*. Paris: Librairie Hachette.
- Soren, David. 2007. Review of *The Horace's Villa Project, 1997-2003*, by Bernard Frischer, Jane Crawford, and Monica De Simone. *BMCR* 2007.10.25.
<http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2007/2007-10-25.html>
- Turpin, William. 1998. "The Epicurean Parasite: Horace, *Satires* 1.1-3." *Ramus* 27.2: 127-40.
- Van Dijk, Gert-Jan. 1997. *AINOI, AIOFOI, MYΘOI: Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature*. New York: Brill.
- _____. 1996. "The Function of Fables in Graeco-Roman Romance." *Mnemosyne* 49: 513-41.
- Van Rooy, C.A. 1965. *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Verity, Anthony, trans. 2011. *Homer: The Iliad*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- West, David. 1974. "Of Mice and Men: Horace, *Satires* 2.6.77-117." In *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*, edited by A.J. Woodman and David West, 67-80. London and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, Gordon. 1990. "Did Maecenas Fall from Favor? Augustan Literary Patronage." In *Between Republic and Empire*, edited by Kurt A. Raaflaub and Mark Toher, 258-75. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wimmel, Walter. 1960. *Kallimachos in Rom: die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.
- Zafiroopoulos, Christos A. 2001. *Ethics in Aesop's Fables: The Augustana Collection*. Boston: Brill.