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PREFACE

It has taken more than two (in fact, now edging toward three) decades for this book to “find itself” and finally see the light of day. Producing lines of commentary is time-consuming, certainly. But it is not all that time-consuming. Before I could really settle down to want to finish this book (that’s the key: not the doing, but the determining to get done), I had to find some way to make this commentary “my own” (thinking here of Horace S. 2.6.5, ut propria … faxis). Frances Muecke’s commentary on book 2 of Horace’s *Sermones* appeared shortly before I signed the contract to produce this one. That work set the bar very high for whatever I might “thereupon” have to say about these same poems. Paolo Fedeli’s commentary on both books of the *Sermones*, also excellent, followed shortly thereafter. The publication of these commentaries made my work easier in some ways (you will notice numerous instances of ‘see Muecke *ad loc.*’ in the line-by-line below), but a good deal harder in others. Taking seriously the challenge that these commentaries had set, and wanting to do my own job responsibly and well, I needed to find other things to say about the poems of S. 2. Because these “conversations,” so unassuming on their surface, were written by none other than Quintus Horatius Flaccus, a demanding and meticulous poet, always sneaky smart, and never prone to dashing things off, I was sure that they had gems hiding under that surface waiting to be discovered. I just wasn’t sure how to get at them. No matter that. Having signed the contract, the second book of Horace’s *Sermones* was now “mine” to do a commentary on, even though the poems themselves were not, as yet, even remotely “my own.”

To develop new pathways into the second book of Horace’s *Sermones*, I needed to put the poems aside for what turned out to be an astonishing long while. Gathering ideas from places farther off, I conducted a large swing through the bigger world of Roman satire, and of Roman poetry and cultural life more generally. It was there, in working on other projects, and on other poets, concerns and times, that I found what I wanted to say about these poems. Oddly, it was by following Persius down one of his rabbit-holes (a curiously improbable metaphor) that I came to have a fuller (I dare not say “complete”) sense of what Horatian irony is, and how it operates. It was through Persius that these poems came into focus for me. For, whatever else Persius was, whether as a person or poet, he was antiquity’s best reader of Horace, and if modern scholarship has largely disregarded the eight oddball poems of Horace’s second book of *Sermones*, Persius knew better than to think them half-hearted, or even minimally beneath the standard set by Horace’s other works. If
you think about it, Persius was a most unlikely fan of these food-fanatical, Stoic-mocking poems, and yet he was obsessed with them. He knew how to read them, and how to think with them. I needed to find out what was behind that obsession.

Truth be told, I had no business undertaking this commentary. The unlikely chance that I was given to write it was both unexpected and serendipitous. In the last year of my graduate training at the University of Wisconsin I had the good fortune to overlap with Denis Feeney in his first year there. Under his direction I wrote a dissertation that I titled, rather clumsily, “Greek Theories of Comedy and Style in the *Satires* of Horace.” With a good deal of re-thinking and re-writing, that study became *The Walking Muse*. That first book of mine, which still has a few pages that don’t embarrass me (though the number of those pages has become fewer by the year), came out from Princeton University Press in late 1993. The following spring I attended a Classical Association conference at the University of Exeter, where I gave a paper on “Morals and verse-technique in two satires of Horace.” Professor E. J. Kenney (then Latin editor of the Cambridge Green and Yellows) happened to be in the audience that day, and he liked my paper. He kindly invited me to have lunch with him the following day. At that lunch he pitched two proposals over a single pint, both extremely generous and highly advantageous to my cause: (1) that I work up my conference paper and send it to *CQ* (which I promptly did = Freudenburg 1996 in the bibliography below), and (2) that I consider writing a commentary on book 2 of the *Sermones* for the Cambridge Green and Yellows. This took me by surprise. I had no idea what I was getting into, not a clue about the massive amount of work that the project would involve. But I was dazzled by the offer and said yes. Not knowing the ABC’s of commentary-writing, in order to produce the required sample commentary for the syndics of Cambridge University Press to consider, I promptly purchased a copy of Ted Kenney’s own Green and Yellow on Lucretius book 3, determined to use it as my guide. Looking back on that decision, I could have done no better. The pages of my personal copy of that impressive old book, by now heavily annotated and falling out, have yellowed to match the shade of its cover. That book is the wiser older brother, and patient mentor, of the one you hold in your hands.

Because the Latin of Horace’s hexameter poems is often peculiar, unprecedented and/or hard to construe, in the commentary below I expend a good deal of effort in explaining difficulties of grammar, word-choice, syntax and versification. Not all commentaries take the time to do this. Often, I give two possible translations of words, phrases and passages that defy being taken as one thing and not also the other. In the volume introduction below, I chose not to add the standard section on “style and
metre” because the poems of S. 2, I long ago discovered, have no single “style” or “metre” to be observed about them; rather, they have at least eight different styles, depending on which of the eight poems one is reading, and who’s holding forth in that poem, and at least as many metres, even though all are hexametric, and all belong to the same genre. Both as *sermo* and as hexameters, these poems vary wildly in the ways that they express themselves. Because of this, matters of style and generic expression are discussed in the essays that introduce the individual poems below, and they are treated *ad hoc* in the line-by-line commentary.

Over the years I have had many conversations with scholars who have done much to expand and enrich my thinking about these poems in particular, and about Latin literature more generally. Especially generous with their encouragement and expert advice were my former Latin colleagues at Ohio State, Will Batsone and Erik Gunderson, as are my current Latin colleagues at Yale: Christina Kraus, Irene Peirano, Joe Solodow and David Quint. Egbert Bakker rates a special mention here as well. For many years he has been my go-to source for all things linguistic, epic and tragic, as well as a sounding board for my ideas. Among Yale graduate students, Nick Janssen has given me much to think about (especially in matters of parody), and among undergraduates Sam Katz and Alex DiMeglio put many hours into reading the commentary when it was still in a shaggy state. Leendert Weeda, whom I once met in Nijmegen, is to be thanked for providing detailed comments on the draft commentary of several poems. Among those persons admired from farther off who have shaped my thinking about satire in fundamental ways, I am especially grateful to John Henderson (hoisting DNA-themed beers with Tom Geue), Emily Gowers (referred to on nearly every page of the commentary below), Kenneth Reckford and Michael Putnam. Paulo Martins has twice hosted me in Brazil, and the audiences there have been remarkable. Andreas Michalopoulos and Sophia Pappaoannou gave me the keynote spot at their humor conference in Athens, and it was that occasion especially that gave me the opportunity to rethink Horatian irony. Christiane Reitz invited me to Rostock to give a lecture in celebration of Werner Krenkel’s eightieth birthday, where I met the great man himself. For many years, now, I have benefited from the intellectual brilliance and friendship of Alessandro Barchiesi and Andrea Cucciarelli. Many years back, Alessandro and Andrea undertook to draw me into the Latin lit. scene in Italy, and over the years they have repeatedly welcomed me into their homes, with their families, and they have introduced me to numerous scholars whom I am very glad to have met: Franco Bellandi, Sergio Casali, Mario Citroni, G. B. Conte, Luca Graverini, Mario Labate, Silvia Mattiacci, Sandra Citroni Marchetti, Rita Pierini, Vicki Rimell, Gianpiero Rosati,
PREFACE

Alessandro Schiesaro, Antonio Stramaglia. All have heard me hold forth on satire, and all deserve my (in many cases long overdue) thanks. Thanks to friends at Washington University in St. Louis (Cathy Keane) and the University of Illinois (Antony Augoustakis and Ariana Traill), I was able to test out my ideas on ‘the waters of Roman satire’ (= Freudenburg 2018) in front of knowing and engaged audiences. This list could be extended much further, but without Dan Hooley it would be, at best, half-complete (a “fake list”). Dan and I go way back as satiric interlocutors and friends. There are precious few Latin scholars one can “talk kids and politics and satire” with while rock climbing. He’s that friend.

Ted Kenney got me started on this project. Upon his retirement, Philip Hardie and Stephen Oakley took over the editorial oversight of the Green and Yellows, and the amount of work that they have done on my behalf, and for the betterment of this commentary, has been nothing short of staggering. I can scarcely believe the amount of detailed work that they do to get these volumes into shape. Not only have they identified countless grammatical, citational and punctuational gaffes that needed to be fixed, they have pulled me back from a substantial number of wrong and/or wrongheaded ideas. In the end, they have done much to sharpen my thinking about things I thought I knew well. This book is much better for their hard work. They, along with Michael Sharp, are to be thanked for the forbearance and good humor that they have always shown in their dealings with me. Finally, I owe a great debt of gratitude to Anna Oxbury for a magnificent job of copyediting.

In the matter of institutional support, a sincere debt of gratitude is owed to the College of the Humanities at the Ohio State University for helping make possible two year-long fellowships that were spent working on this commentary at an early stage: in 1994–5 I was “Friedrich Solmsen” Fellow at the Institute for Research in the Humanities at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and in 2001–2 I was a Fellow of the American Academy in Rome. Since my arrival here at Yale fourteen years ago, I have enjoyed an impressive level of research support in the form of regular leaves and ample funding for research materials and travel. Given the times we live in, one can hardly believe that such investments still happen.
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NOTE ON THE TEXT

The text used in this volume is that of Klingner’s third edition (1959), adjusted to the paragraph structure of Shackleton Bailey’s 1991 Teubner edition (Klingner’s text is unparagraphed), and with ample changes of punctuation and orthography throughout: nominative singulars in -os changed to -us; compound words such as inludere, componere assimilated to illudere, componere; third-declension accusative plural changed from -is to -es; all forms of siquis separated into two words (si quis, si cui, etc.). Significant changes from Klingner’s text are listed below, as well as changes in punctuation that affect meaning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>locus</th>
<th>Freudenburg</th>
<th>Klingner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>in uanis</td>
<td>insanis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>hanc magis illa</td>
<td>hac magis illam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Archilocho</td>
<td>Archilochum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.132</td>
<td>es.</td>
<td>es?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.163</td>
<td>brackets removed</td>
<td>[line bracketed]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.208</td>
<td>alias ueri</td>
<td>alias ueris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.212</td>
<td>tu, prudens ... cum admittis</td>
<td>cum prudens scelus ob titulos admittis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.234</td>
<td>tu niue</td>
<td>in niue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.303</td>
<td>abscessum</td>
<td>abscessum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.313</td>
<td>tantum dissimilem</td>
<td>tanto dissimilem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>mixto</td>
<td>musto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.29−31</td>
<td>‘quid tibi uis, insane, et quare me improbus urget</td>
<td>‘quid tibi uis, insane?’ et ‘quam rem agis?’ improbus urget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>precibus? tu pulses omne quod obstat ... recurras.’</td>
<td>iratis precibus, ‘tu pulses omne quod obstat ... recurras.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>potestas?</td>
<td>potestas,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>iustior.</td>
<td>iustior?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>famam?</td>
<td>famam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>Natura</td>
<td>natura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>adde, super dictis, quod ...</td>
<td>adde super, dictis quod ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>quas</td>
<td>quos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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