Introduction

Horace opens his first programmatic satire by declaring that Lucilius, the poet he professes to regard as the founder of Roman Satire and as his immediate predecessor in the genre, "hangs entirely" (*omnis pendet*, *Sat.* 1.4.6) from the writers of Old Comedy. Persius likewise defines his ideal reader in his debut poem as one whose ear has been "steamed clean" (*vaporata*, 1.126) by the writings of Eupolis, Cratinus, and Aristophanes. These are among the most-discussed lines of these two poets, and yet there is little scholarly consensus as to what Horace and Persius mean, and even whether the passages are important or informative at all. What does *omnis pendet* describe? Does Lucilius have no more in common with the writers of Old Comedy than their shared interest in attacking vice? Did he really do no more than change only the meter (*mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque*, 7) of the Greek genre in writing his *saturae*? Similarly, is Persius' Horatian moment to be taken as critical of or laudatory toward Old Comedy/ Horace/ Roman Satire/ the reader? This book aims to rehabilitate the programmatic claims found in Horace and Persius regarding the affinity of their poetry with the plays of Cratinus, Eupolis, and Aristophanes, and to elucidate the various ways in which Roman Satire may be conceived of as Old Comedy brought to Rome.

Rereading Quintilian

Quintilian's pithy précis, *satura quidem tota nostra est* (*Inst.* 10.1.93) has traditionally been translated as "satire, at least, is entirely our own" and taken as an avowal of the genre's autochthony, an attribute that would set it apart from epic, elegy, epigram, lyric, drama, and every other type of writing practiced at Rome, all of which had Greek counterparts. Roman Satire, however, whose very name, *satura*, acknowledges and draws attention to its appetitive, chimerical nature,[1] manifestly encompasses

[1] The etymology and resonances of *satura* are discussed in Chapter 1.

material from a wide variety of genres, both Greek and Latin,[2] among them Archilochean iambus,[3] Greek New Comedy and Roman Comedy,[4] and philosophical dialogue and diatribe,[5] as scholarly investigation in recent decades has shown. If Quintilian is not to be convicted of misunderstanding the genre or misinforming his readers (he was, after all, writing an educational handbook and may have had good reason for oversimplifying), how should his claim be read? Though others have privileged *quidem*,[6] the crucial word in the phrase may rather be *tota*. Understood adverbially with *nostra*, as it generally has been, it produces the untenable meaning "satire, at least, is entirely our own," but if *tota* is instead taken as modifying *satura*, the rather more satisfactory sense "satire entire is our own," or, less archaically, "satire as a whole is our own," emerges.[7] Far from implying that nothing Greek at all lies behind Roman Satire, Quintilian is emphasizing that as a final product (*tota*) it lacks a Greek equivalent. Rather than stating the obvious (that there is no genre called Greek Satire) or being blind to the clear Greek presences behind Roman Satire (in appearing to

[2] The minor Latin verse forms incorporated into Roman Satire include Atellan farce and Fescennine verse.

[3] See Freudenburg 1993, Barchiesi 2001, Zanetto 2001, and especially Rosen 1988 and 2007 on the ancient iambographic tradition, and Johnson 2011 with specific reference to Horace.

[4] On such material in Lucilius see Fiske 1920, Ramage 1974a: 10–12, Delignon 2006, and Hass 2007: 164–72; in Horace, Rudd 1966: 62, Leach 1971, Freudenburg 1993 (especially 227–35), and Delignon 2006; in Persius, Ramage 1974c: 128 and Jones 2007: 121; and in Juvenal, Keane 2003 and 2006.

[5] On philosophical elements in Horace's program see DeWitt 1939, Murley 1939, Turpin 1998, Morford 2002: 136–47, Mayer 2005, Delignon 2006: 97–8, 130–2, 177–9, Harrison 2007a: 79–85, Jones 2007: 117–18, and Moles 2007; in Persius, the "philosopher-satirist," Ramage 1974c: 124–5, Freudenburg 2001: 183–8, Reckford 2009: 65–101, and Bartsch 2012; and Jones 2007: 123–4 on moralizing-philosophical elements in Juvenal. Diatribe figured already in Lucilius (Fiske 1920: 143–218, Piwonka 1949: 96–114, and Rudd 1966: 123), though the diatribe element in Horace's satire is more commonly recognized (e.g., Van Rooy 1965: 109–10, Zetzel 1980: 69–70, Parker 1986, Freudenburg 1993: 16–21 and 2001: 15–23, Sharland 2010, Gowers 2012, Courtney 2013: 64–6), with *Satires* 1.1–1.3 even dubbed the "diatribe satires." Moreover, the very title chosen by Horace for his books, *sermones*, translates the Greek term διατριβή (Anderson 1963: 23, 30) and Horace himself describes his satirical writings as being in the tradition of Bion (*Bioneis sermonibus*, *Epist.* 2.2.60).

[6] For example, Freudenburg 2005: 2, who sees the particle functioning as "a sigh of relief" that "here, for once, and just this once, we Romans have something, *at least this one thing* that we can claim as our own and *not* derived from the Greeks." Van Rooy 1965: 122, on the other hand, stresses *tota*: "his dictum signifies that this finished product, 'satura' or hexameter satire as a *proprium opus*, was wholly a Roman achievement." *Quidem* is important in that it serves to tie Quintilian's *satura . . . tota nostra est* to its surroundings, marking Roman Satire as different from all the other genres named in the Latin catalogue.

[7] *OLD s.v. totus* gives the primary meaning of the adjective as "(dist. from a part) The whole of, all" and the second as "(indicating that no part of a person or thing is excluded from the action of the verb) Every part of, the whole of, in its entirety."

claim that there is nothing in it that is not Roman), Quintilian both draws attention to the nature of *satura* as a mishmash and makes the sensitive observation that it is, in its entirety, in the shapes it came to have under each satirist, authentically Roman.

More informative than his explicit claim for the Romanness of this genre is Quintilian's implicit marriage of Roman Satire with Old Comedy. Having presented the preeminent authors of Greek epic (10.1.46–58), elegiac (58), iambic (59–60), and lyric poetry (61–4), and of Old Comedy (65), tragedy (66–8), New Comedy (69–72), history (73–5), oratory (76–80), and philosophy (81–4), Quintilian declares his intention to work through the Roman genres in the same order (85), which he gives as follows: epic (85–92), elegy (93), *satura* (93–6), iambic poetry (96), lyric (96), tragedy (97–8), the comedy of Plautus, Caecilius, Terence, and Afranius (99–100), history (101–4), oratory (105–22), and philosophy (123–31). Although *satura* initially appears to occupy the place of iambus in the Greek list, Quintilian goes on to discuss Latin iambic poetry, and an overview shows that both lists are identical apart from the inclusion of Old Comedy in the former and of *satura* in the latter. By thus in effect pairing these two genres with one another,[8] Quintilian invites his reader to connect them and shows that he himself was alert not only to Roman Satire as resulting from the coalescence of a variety of Greek and Latin genres, culminating in a uniquely Roman creation, but also to the preeminence of Old Comedy among the genres that contributed substance to Roman Satire.

Roman Satire on Old Comedy

Horace twice speaks of *prisca comoedia* in *Satires* 1, first in the opening of his programmatic fourth poem:

> Eupolis atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae
> atque alii quorum comoedia prisca virorum est,
> si quis erat dignus describi, quod malus ac fur,
> quod moechus foret aut sicarius aut alioqui
> famosus, multa cum libertate notabant.
> hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus
> mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque.
> (*Sat.* 1.4.1–7)

[8] Hunter 2009: 96.

The poets Eupolis and Cratinus and Aristophanes and the other men to whom Old Comedy belongs, if anyone was worthy of being noted down on the grounds that he was villainous and a thief, an adulterer or a murderer or infamous in some way, they would brand him with great freedom. From here Lucilius hangs entirely, having followed these men with only feet and rhythm altered.

These lines are "the first words of the satirist as a theorist,"[9] and as such ought to be read carefully, but they have been persistently undervalued.[10] The prevailing attitude has been that "Horace quickly abandons any real pretensions to the role of the Old Comic poet and ... champions Aristotle's theory of the liberal jest against the traditions of Old Comedy and the iambic idea" (Freudenburg 1993, 53), as if these two strands of humor could exist only in conflict, rather than coexist, as they do throughout Horace's hexameter poetry. Horace's apparently straightforward and confidently presented assessment of the character of Old Comedy and of Lucilius' relation to it functions as a disinvitation to consider the matter any further, but things are not as he makes them seem. He absurdly reduces Old Comedy, and with it Lucilius, to a social policeman,[11] and while certain stock *komodoumenoi* make appearances throughout the plays of Aristophanes and his fellow-poets, there is to be found no criticism at all of the targets identified.[12] Explanations for this have varied. Some suggest that Horace is participating in the Hellenistic and Roman tendency to overstate the role of personal invective in Old Comedy,[13] which has been extended to ascribe to Roman Satire a similarly broad swath of targets. Horace is accused of "exaggerating" the resemblances between Lucilius and Old Comedy, and he plainly does, though to what end we are not told,[14] while others give the passage some credit for at least its internal consistency.[15] It has even been suggested that Horace is doing little

[9] Freudenburg 1993: 96. So, too, Heldmann 1987: 129 and Cucchiarelli 2001: 33, who likens Horace's pose to "un filologo alessandrino."

[10] Similar dismay is expressed by Cucchiarelli 2001: 34 ("perché dunque non prendere sul serio Orazio?") and 2009: 10 n. 16 and by Rosen 2007: 7 and 209; cf. also Müller 1992.

[11] See Rudd 1957: 319 and Rosen 2007: 209.

[12] Cf. Freudenburg 2001: 18: "how often, an uncooperative reader might ask, does Aristophanes name and/or disgrace murderers in his extant plays? How many adulteries does he expose on stage?"

[13] See Halliwell 1980 and 1984, Dickie 1981: 185–6, and Gowers 2009: 88; the same is evident at Cic. *Rep.* 4.11 (= August. *De civ. D.* 2.9; cf. Heldmann 1987: 126 with nn. 17 and 19).

[14] Nisbet 1963: 48, Van Rooy 1965: 149, 187, 193–4, Rudd 1966: 89, and LaFleur 1981: 1795.

[15] For example, Hunter 2009: 101, who points out that the emphasis on people worthy of censure is supported by the examples given. Sommerstein's 2011 solution is to have Horace insist on the connection between Lucilius and Old Comedy in order to leave Archilochus available for him as his own preeminent model.

more – in the opening lines of his first programmatic poem – than paying a compliment to Varro, widely supposed to have been the first to posit a connection between Lucilian satire and Old Comedy.[16] Certainly, Old Comedy and Lucilius are both present in part to allow Horace to participate in the hallowed Roman tradition of claiming a Greek origin (albeit a relatively unillustrious one) for his current genre.[17] As is typical of Horace, we are made to wait until the second or third recurrence of an idea in order to grasp the rich entirety of the author's meaning, but certain preliminary details may nevertheless be gleaned from this first explicit appearance of both Old Comedy and Lucilius in his *Satires.*

If the description given in lines 3–5 applies to neither Old Comedy nor Lucilius in any real sense, why is it present? The clue lies in the words themselves: not in the much-vaunted *libertas* of both genres (though this is a trait they famously have in common), but rather in the odd procession of criminals and in the word *notabant* to which these build. This verb was the technical term for the activity of the Roman censors, among whose duties was the "noting down," and so "branding," of anyone guilty of 'theft, adultery, murder, or some other crime' (*Sat.* 1.4.3–5) for which the penalty included removal from the role of citizens.[18] The effect of painting Cratinus, Eupolis, and Aristophanes as holding this highest office of the *cursus honorum* is multivalent. In the first place, it Romanizes them: Horace subjects these Greek poets in a literal and amusing way to the treatment he will later boast that he has given to two other genres of Greek poetry: iambic (*Epist.* 1.19.23–4) and lyric (*Carm.* 3.30.13–14). On the one hand this creates a comically jarring discordance of Classical Greek and Republican Roman. On the other, and more importantly, it suggests that Roman Satire is Greek Old Comedy made Roman. The requisite mental

[16] First ventured by Jahn 1854, Leo 1889 and 1904, and Hendrickson 1894 and 1898, and mentioned by several more recent scholars, including Kiessling and Heinze 1977: 70, Brown 1993: 128, Zietsman 1997: 97, Gowers 2009: 88, and Hunter 2009: 99. Rudd 1957, Brink 1963b: 193–200, Cucchiarelli 2001: 47, and Sommerstein 2011: 27 are, however, rightly skeptical, pointing out variously that: Horace would hardly open his first programmatic poem with words that accomplish no more than a nod at a (Menippean) satirist whose satire he otherwise pointedly ignores; he is surely capable of thinking for himself at this crucial juncture; and shifting the problem back onto a work that no longer exists hardly constitutes a solution (moreover, while the notion that Lucilian *satura* derived from Old Comedy may well have predated Horace, there is little evidence to support a Varronian origin specifically, see n. 75). Freudenburg 2013 explores the mess of Roman theorizing about satire's origins, and Hose 2013 argues convincingly for Horace as the inventor of this Old Comic Lucilius.

[17] See n. 152.

[18] Cf. LaFleur 1981: 1795, Heldmann 1987: 130, Freudenburg 2001: 17, Cucchiarelli 2009: 8 n. 12, and Gowers 2012: 154.

image of this canonical trio of Old Comic poets as toga-clad, senatorial ex-consuls ensconced in offices on the Capitoline's Tabularium is absurd and evocative in equal measure. One further detail forges a pointed connection between the Old Comic poets and Horace himself. Among the duties of the censors, in addition to administering the citizen-role, carrying out censuses of the population and its wealth, and performing a variety of juridical duties, was the overseeing of public *scribae*, an office held by no other than Horace himself (*Sat.* 2.6.36).[19] Not only does Horace place the poets of Old Comedy in the position of preceding generations in relation to Lucilius (and so himself), he also makes them his (and only his) actual bosses: his satirical writing activities are overseen by this canonical triad.[20]

In addition to these implications of *notabant* in isolation, several further ones may be imported from the other uses of the verb in Horace's *Satires*, for it appears twice in *Satires* 1.3 as if to prepare the reader for *Satires* 1.4, where it is also found twice. Horace criticizes one Maenius at *Satires* 1.3.24 for exhibiting a self-love that "is stupid and dishonest and worthy of censure" (*stultus et improbus . . . est dignusque notari*). *Notare* here occurs in a phrase with *dignus*, anticipating the identical syntax of *Satires* 1.4.6 (*si quis erat dignus describi*).[21] Next, Horace describes the evolution of the human animal from sea creature to social one (1.3.99–106), endowed with language: *donec verba quibus sensus vocesque notarent* (103). This passage would not appear to have much in common with the beginning of 1.4 beyond the use of *notare* but for the mention immediately following that laws were developed "that no one be a thief or an adulterer" (*ne quis fur esset, neu latro, neu quis adulter*, 106), which again functions as a clear preview of 1.4.3–5.[22] Primed by these two instances of *notare*, the reader might well recognize *multa cum libertate notabant* as no idle choice of words on Horace's part.

The second occurrence of *notare* in 1.4, at line 106, further informs the first, for Horace employs this now marked term to describe how his "most excellent father" (*pater optimus*, 105) taught him to avoid misbehavior by pointing out examples of it (*ut fugerem exemplis vitiorum quaeque notando*, 106). Leach (1971) has exposed the New Comic

[19] Brill's Neue Pauly *s.v. censores* and *scriba.* Horace was a *scriba quaestorius*, the highest of the profession's various offices.

[20] Horace's description of himself as *infra Lucili censum* (*Sat.* 2.1.75) may also hint at Lucilius as (his) *censor.*

[21] Gowers 2009: 88 (cf. 2012: 126) notes the correspondence.

[22] Cf. Van Rooy 1968: 59, Zetzel 1980: 65, and Gowers 2012: 140, 176–7.

background to *Satires* 1.4.105–31,[23] and *notare* adds to this vignette an Old Comic layer, too, since, just like Horace's biological and yet simultaneously New Comic father, the Old Comic poets also "brand" those who commit crimes.[24] In appearing to say simply that Lucilius "hangs entirely" from Old Comedy, then, Horace hints in these various ways at his own Old Comic paternity.

Censorial imagery appears once more in a context relevant to *Satires* 1.4.1–7. In *Epistles* 2.2, Horace advises the would-be author that "he who desires to have produced a worthwhile poem will take up the spirit of an honest censor together with his writing tablets" (*qui legitimum cupiet fecisse poema, / cum tabulis animum censoris sumet honesti*, 109–10). This directive allows one further nuance to be imported into the opening of *Satires* 1.4: beyond viewing Lucilius and Old Comedy as (censorial) correctors of vice, and (via the 'branding' activities of Terence's Demea) Old Comedy as parent to himself (as well as to Lucilius), Horace makes explicit the literary critical element so essential to Old Comedy, Lucilius, and his own satirical writings. Moreover, while the type of criticism Horace recommends in *Epistles* 2.2 may encompass that directed at others, it primarily describes that to which one ought to subject oneself – a prescription fundamental to Aristophanic Old Comedy and Roman Satire. Within the apparently straightforward image of the Old Comic poets as correctors of vice thus lurk a number of further characterizations that are, particularly in their relation to Horace, far more illuminating.

If the first difficulty of *Satires* 1.4.1–7 is the gross misrepresentation of the activities of the Old Comic poets (though it serves to conceal a number of very real connections between them and Horace), the second lies in the claim that Lucilius "hangs entirely" (*pendet omnis*) "from there" (*hinc*) "with only feet and rhythm altered" (*mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque*). Horace delivers this assessment, like that of Old Comedy and Lucilius as social policemen, with a confidence that obscures its complexity, and almost every aspect of it is more informative than it appears to be. First, rather than pointing narrowly at the contents of lines 3–5 with their

[23] Horace's father is the Demea of Terence's *Adelphoe*, a rustic *pater ardens* come to investigate the activities of his potentially wayward city-dwelling son. By associating him with this type-character, however, Horace somewhat undermines his description of his father as *pater optimus*.

[24] Heldmann 1987: 135–6 (who sees Horace distancing himself from the censorial attitude of Old Comedy), Hunter 2009: 101, and Gowers 2012: 175–6 also connect the two passages, but stop short of the reading offered here.

puzzling description of Old Comedy's activities, *hinc* seems better interpreted as encompassing all that comes before it: lines 1–5, complete with named practitioners of *prisca comoedia*.[25] This reading would expand Lucilius' connection with Old Comedy from a (tendentious) shared interest in attacking vice publicly to potentially the entirety of both genres.

Second, the apparent absoluteness of *omnis* and *tantum*[26] is undercut by the verbs *pendet* and *secutus*, which evoke departure and distance. *Secutus* is the very participle Horace employs to denote his own connection to Archilochus at *Epistles* 1.19.23–5 (*Parios ego primus iambos / ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus / Archilochi*, "I first showed Parian iambs to Latium, having followed the meter and spirit of Archilochus"), and *sequor hunc* describes his self-professed relation to Lucilius at *Satires* 2.1.34. While *omnis* and *tantum* convey translation or replication, *secutus* and *pendet* describe literary borrowing, creative imitation, and, above all, Romanization – the rendering of Greek material into Latin.[27] *Omnis pendet*, which now emerges as an evocative oxymoron, is thus simultaneously suggestive of full dependence and yet distance between source and imitator, conveying how Lucilius anchored his material in Old Comedy but remade it as Roman.

Finally, Horace's assessment of Lucilian meter is, in a sense, spot-on: his earliest books (26 through 29) are in the senarius and septenarius, the Latin counterparts to the Old Comic iambic trimeter and trochaic tetrameter.[28] While Lucilius did, by the end of his career, establish the (un–Old Comic) dactylic hexameter as *the* meter of Roman Satire, his choice was preceded by a great deal of experimentation, much of it in the meters of Greek drama. In saying *mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque*, Horace gets to have his cake and eat it, too: if genre is meter, as was generally the case in the ancient world, Lucilius could only have been thought of as reinventing Old Comedy as Roman Satire if he wrote in the same meters, which he did, at least initially. By the time of his later metrical departure from Old Comedy, however, which culminated in the establishment of the hexameter as the definitive meter of his new, Latin genre – an innovation for which Horace, in drawing attention to it, gives him credit – the Old Comic element had so

[25] So Wickham 1891: 49 and Lejay 1911: 110. [26] See Freudenburg 2001: 18.
[27] On this sense of *pendet* see *TLL s.v. pendeo* (101.1039.70), Zimmermann 2001: 194, and Gowers 2012: 155; on *secutus* see Pseudo-Acro *ad Sat.* 1.4.6 (*secutus, id est, eos est imitatus*), Fiske 1920 (especially 25), and Ferriss-Hill 2011.
[28] Cf. Marx 1888–9: 12.

firmly entrenched itself in Roman Satire that the shift did not dismantle the connection between the two genres.[29]

Horace's lumping together of Eupolis, Cratinus, and Aristophanes is another among the sleights of hand that characterize the opening of *Satires* 1.4. His deployment of what had since at least the Alexandrian period been the canonical triad obscures the fact that these three poets were, beyond sharing the formal components of their plays, qualitatively different from one another. Moreover, they were no harmonious threesome, but rather rivals.[30] To depict Lucilius, himself multifaceted,[31] as hanging from all of them, as well as from all the other poets who wrote Old Comedy, ascribes to him a range of activities no single poet could possibly embrace, and this pastiche should, once again, make us quite suspicious. If Lucilius first made *satura* satirical by endowing it with the component of public censure, however, then the Old Comic poet whom he most resembles is Cratinus, likewise held responsible in ancient thought for introducing to Old Comedy the element of *ad hominem* abuse.[32] *Satires* 1.4.1–7 thus serves to set up an equivalency that will run throughout Horace's satire: Lucilius, as censor of vice and in his muddiness of style (a trait formally introduced in line 11), is the Roman Cratinus.

In what respects does or could Horace conceive of Roman Satire as the entirety of Old Comedy brought to Rome? The plays, despite certain natural differences in tone and topic depending on the author and decade, share a number of elements without which they would not qualify as Old Comedy: an agonistic bent (whether as formal agon or a generally polemical attitude), a prominent base component (phallic and scatological), and, above all, the presence of a parabasis,[33] arguably the defining feature of an Old Comic play, in which the chorus stepped forward (παραβαίνειν) to address the audience on behalf of, or even in the voice of, the poet.

[29] Consider how invective poetry may be called *iambus* even when it is no longer in *iambi* (e.g., Catullus' hendecasyllables, Mayer 1994: 263), or how Ovid's *Fasti*, while in elegiac couplets, are not generally considered Latin elegy (Jones 2007: 27). Rosen 2007: 209 rightly speaks of Horace here "inching his way toward conceptualizing satire primarily in terms of poetic tropes and dynamics, and only secondarily in terms of its particular instantiations."

[30] Gowers 2009: 90: "literary *opponents*, not . . . allies." Horace's trio is further incongruent with the office of censor in that it was held by a pair of ex-consuls, who moreover always acted in concert.

[31] Cf. Cucchiarelli 2001: 16 (who rightly wonders, "quale Lucilio?") and Keane 2002a: 24.

[32] Cf., for example, Rosen 1988: 39, Hubbard 1991: 74, and Sommerstein 2011: 26.

[33] Aristophanes' last two extant plays, *Plutus* and *Ecclesiazusae*, are generally categorized as Middle Comedy specifically because they lack a parabasis (a shift discernible as early as *Birds*), as do the lost *Aeolosicon* and *Cocalus*. Much has been written on the Old Comic parabasis; especially useful are Sifakis 1971, Hubbard 1991, Silk 2000a, and Biles 2011.

In strikingly parabatic language and form[34] – for *Satires* 1.4.1–7 echoes the parabasis of *Knights*, in which Aristophanes enumerates the ignominious fates suffered by Magnes, Cratinus, and Crates at the hands of unappreciative Athenians – Horace introduces the idea that Lucilius' satire, and with it his own, is the fullness of Old Comedy, with its public censure and, especially, its parabatic and agonistic concerns and modes of speech, rendered into Latin.[35] Hubbard (1991, 27–30) identifies the salient features of the parabasis as being the "extradramatic," the "self-critical," and the "intertextual," and these are the very qualities of it that may be seen remade in and as Roman Satire. *Satires* 1.4.1–7 is Horace's own (parabatic) expression of the parabatic essence shared by Old Comedy and Roman Satire.

No less deceptive than his unified and uniform trio of Old Comic poets is the Latin genealogy Horace presents in the opening lines of *Satires* 1.4, for neither here nor elsewhere does he name the pre-Lucilian satirists, insisting (as he does throughout) that the genre begins with Lucilius. Horace never mentions Ennius, the first writer of *saturae* in Latin,[36] except as an epic poet[37] and a dramatist,[38] and Pacuvius, of whose satires nothing remains, appears nowhere at all.[39] Horace refers to the satires of a Varro once, only to disparage them (*hoc erat experto frustra Varrone Atacino / atque quibusdam aliis melius quod scribere possem, / inventore minor*, *Sat.* 1.10.46–8), but this Varro (*Atacinus*) is not the Varro (Reatinus) who wrote Menippean

[34] Noted previously by Parker 1986: 68 ("Sermo 1.4, with its direct presentation of his aims, almost acts as a parabasis"; cf. also 56–7), Freudenburg 2001: 17 ("here, perhaps to simulate an Old Comic *parabasis* . . . "), and Gowers 2009: 89 and 2012: 152.

[35] See Rosen 2007: 6 ("we may assume that the affiliation [Horace] sensed between his *Sermones* and Greek comedy – the polemical, aggressive, yet comic, impulse – transcended all aspects of form, time, and place, and offered an abstract paradigm against which he could gauge his own compositions") and Gowers 2009: 90 ("by insisting on the function of Old Comedy as a *moral deterrent*, Horace is justifying some of the *literary* possibilities that the *parabasis* model offers his poetry and which he is about to take up. These include: *synkrisis* between poets, parody, criticism, and abuse of his poetic rivals").

[36] Cf., for example, Van Rooy 1965: 30–44 and Ramage 1974a: 8–26.

[37] *Epist.* 1.19.7, probably *Sat.* 1.10.54, and perhaps *Epist.* 2.1.50 (cf. Rudd 1989: 81).

[38] *AP* 259 and perhaps *Epist.* 2.1.50 (cf. Kiessling and Heinze 1914: 209). Whether or not Horace ever mentions Ennius as a satirist is the subject of some debate. Rudd 1966: 87–8 shares my view ("Horace never mentions Ennius as a satirist"; see Rudd 1960a for a lengthier explanation of the disputed passage, *Sat.* 1.10.66), but others, including Lejay 1911: 278, Van Rooy 1965: 32–3, 145, LaFleur 1981: 1806, and Gowers 2012: 332 have argued that Ennius-the-satirist is or may be intended by the phrase *Graecis intacti carminis auctor* – a reading hard to defend as context favors that it describe Lucilius (as Pseudo-Acro *ad loc.*, Palmer 1883: 237, and Wickham 1891: 106 see).

[39] Pacuvius appears in Lucilius (fr. 844), though not as a satirist. Persius follows Horace, mentioning Ennius as an epic poet (6.9–10; cf. Miller 2010: 248) and Pacuvius as a tragedian (1.77). Juvenal names neither.