

INTRODUCTION

I SATIRES I

Satires I, published around 36/5 BC, is Horace's debut, a point of departure, in which he explains how he arrived where he is and where he might be going in the future.¹ He goes about this in the most teasing way. Three sermons, three anecdotes, two ruminations on satirical poetry, a self-justification and a travelogue; a trail of unidentifiable characters; an author-figure by his own admission clumsy, short-sighted and in a hurry to escape: it is hard to sum up just what *Satires* I is about, and for a long time this affected its reputation. The two satire books have traditionally been considered a means to an end, a rough apprenticeship before the perfection of the lyrics and epistles, particularly in works of criticism, like Fraenkel's *Horace* (1957), that span the entire oeuvre. They are regularly printed, with blatant disregard for chronology, after the *Odes* in most collected editions of H.'s works. And thanks to his own indirectness, false naïveté and occasional obscenity, H. has himself prompted affectionate but often puzzled opinions of his satirical poetry.²

Starting with Rudd's *Satires of Horace* (1966), which sympathetically considered the poems, even the unpalatable sermons, on their own terms, the full reinstatement of *Satires* I is in progress. Early and experimental though it may be, this is a ten-poem pre-Augustan poetry book written on the brink of a self-conscious literary 'moment', as it claims itself with its final word *libello*.³ Its newly flexible hexameters express the rise and fall of conversation, the delusions of human behaviour and the residue of all previous poetry. It is also a unique cultural document, a blueprint for how to survive in uncertain times and an individual view of one man's formation and emergence on the cusp between republic and empire. Under the rough exterior, lines of intertextual dialogue have been traced as fine as those in more respected Roman poetry-books, a vast web of engagement, usually parodic, with Homer, Hesiod, Aristophanes, Bion, Callimachus, Ennius, Cicero, Lucretius, Virgil and Philodemus, even Sallust, one that makes these breezy 'chats' into the overspill of a voracious bookworm.⁴

H.'s unassuming manner and easy self-presentation are harder these days to take at face value. The casual indirection and changing cast of characters are interpreted as tools for a sophisticated process of generic positioning.

¹ Cartault 1899: 2: '[U]n point de départ . . . Horace ne connaissait pas encore le point d'arrivée.'

² Voltaire's Pococurante is predictably among the most negative readers (*Candide*, chap. 25): 'I care little for his journey to Brundisium, and his description of a bad dinner; and the slanging match between some fellow Rupilius, "whose words", he says, "were full of pus", and another whose words "were as sour as vinegar".'

³ Zetzel 1980. ⁴ Freudenburg 1993, 2001, Cucchiarelli 2001.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45220-5 - Horace: Satires: Book I

Edited by Emily Gowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Sociolinguistic, feminist and historicist approaches have exposed H.'s stammering bonhomie as an excuse for special treatment within a masculine clique,⁵ for which, in return, he has performed the most winningly informal of publicity exercises, making Maecenas, Octavian and their revolutionary friends into the unchallenged representatives of pacifism, tolerance and camaraderie.⁶ Other critics, by contrast, have seen signs of resentment towards a totalitarian regime in the making.⁷ Some consider the 'real H.', his street people and the dynasts to be unreachable behind a baffling array of authorial disguises and type-names that send the poems inward into a closed, genre-determined world⁸ or up in the air in a proto-Bakhtinian 'dialogic' free-for-all.⁹

Under the influence of these new and often opposite approaches, the 'sweet reason' observed (and practised) by P. Michael Brown in his 1993 commentary must now be replaced by a greater sense of complication and a rather different picture of *Satires* I: of generic stock-taking that creates more puzzles than it solves, simple ethical guidelines blurred not just by ironic self-incrimination but by occupation of the moral high ground, a new dawn of civil interaction clouded by continued suspicion and envy, and, as H. knows only too well, inclusiveness that is also exclusiveness, one man's jokes that are another man's poison. Anyone who seizes the easy irresponsibility that this medium offers can expect to irritate as well as amuse.

2 HORACE AND HIS TIMES

Almost everything we know about H.'s life we know from his own work (supplemented by a brief Hadrianic biography, the *Vita Horati*, probably by Suetonius).¹⁰ The information offered in *Satires* I is foundational but sketchy. We learn, in no particular order, about H.'s humble freedman father (a poor Southern Italian auctioneer, who could nonetheless afford to educate his son in Rome), a youthful career as military tribune, his first encounter with his patron Maecenas, minor participation in a diplomatic mission to reunite Octavian and Antony, early blunders in an unfamiliar social sphere and daily routine in Rome. Many of H.'s 'biographical' details now look like genre-specific tropes, props for a rhetoric of authenticity (the freedman father, the receptive child) or personal parallels for a history of Roman satire (from clumsy to refined) that has the Horatian version as its endpoint.¹¹ Nevertheless, these are details that shape a story, and it can still be fruitful to treat the account as oblique 'autobiography', contrived and partial, like so many autobiographies: the self-presentation of a man from nowhere.¹²

⁵ Henderson 1993 = 1999: 202–27, Oliensis 1998.

⁶ DuQuesnay 1984, Kennedy 1992. ⁷ Freudenburg 2001.

⁸ Freudenburg 1993, 2001, Keane 2006, Schlegel 2002, 2005. ⁹ Sharland 2010.

¹⁰ Fraenkel 1957: 1–2 has the classic discussion.

¹¹ Anderson 1963 = 1982: 50–73, Zetzel 1980, Schlegel 2005.

¹² See Oliensis 1998 on 'face-work' and self-fashioning in *Satires* I, Gowers 2003.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45220-5 - Horace: Satires: Book I

Edited by Emily Gowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

2 HORACE AND HIS TIMES

3

The later works fill in some of the gaps. Quintus Horatius Flaccus was born on 8 December 65 BC (*Epod.* 13.6, *C.* 3.21.1, *Ep.* 1.20.26–7; Suet. *Vita Hor.*).¹³ He hailed from Venusia on the borders of Apulia and Lucania (*S.* 2.1.34–5), received a liberal education in Rome (*S.* 1.6.76–8) and possibly studied philosophy in Athens (*Ep.* 2.2.43–5). He fought with Brutus as a military tribune but escaped from Philippi in 42 BC (*S.* 6.46–8; *C.* 2.27, *C.* 3.4.26, *Ep.* 2.2.49; cf. *Epod.* 4.20). Deprived of his father's 'small' estate (*Ep.* 2.2.50–1; cf. *S.* 6.71 *macro agello*), he was granted pardon by Octavian, whereupon he miraculously found the assets required to buy a post among the *scribae*, the most prestigious department of the emerging administrative class of *apparitores* (Suetonius' and Porphyrio's interpretation of 2.6.36) and also equestrian status (cf. 6.58–9),¹⁴ which required a substantial income.¹⁵ Like Messalla, who fought with Brutus at Philippi, then for Octavian at Actium, he could claim 'I have always fought on the better and juster side.'¹⁶

In the late forties, H. met Virgil and Varius, who allegedly propelled him towards Maecenas, around 39/8 BC (6.54–5). This anomalous figure, an *eques* of Etruscan origin, who showed H. how to wield power with Epicurean insouciance and outside normal career structures, was Octavian's ad hoc deputy in Rome (*Eleg. in Maec.* 27) during his absence. A millionaire, perhaps as a result of the proscriptions, he was mocked for effeminate manners and womanizing, but his encouragement of Virgil and Propertius, as well as H., has made his name a synonym for 'patron' in many European languages.¹⁷ Maecenas and H. (in the *Satires* and *Epistles*) make an odd couple: one aquiline and fastidious, the other pot-bellied and clumsy, though H. identifies with Maecenas' laconic detachment. At some point, H. acquired the Sabine farm (*C.* 2.18.12–14), which may or may not have been his patron's gift. The ambiguous nature of the friendship – bond between like-minded companions or profitable symbiosis of parasite and host – inspired a number of poems in which H. begins to assert his independence from the dedicatee of all his early collections (e.g. *Ep.* 1.7 and 1.18).¹⁸ *Satires* II and the *Epodes* were published in 30 BC, *Odes* 1–3 in 23 BC, *Epistles* 1 in 20 BC, *Epistles* 2 in 14 BC, *Odes* 4 in 13 BC. Maecenas may have faded from prominence after 19 BC, but H. rose to further favour with Augustus (whose letter inviting him to the top table is perhaps the imagined prompt for the *Epistle to Augustus*, *Ep.* 2.1, though H. refuses the invitation). In the event, he became Rome's virtual poet laureate. An inscription recording the Secular Games of 17 BC (*ILS* 5050) ends: *carmen composuit Q. Hor[at]ius Flaccus*. H. died on November 27, 8 BC.

This information can be applied retrospectively to flesh out some opaque passages in *Satires* I. H.'s presence at Philippi and possible proscription have

¹³ Bradshaw 2002 on H.'s birthday and deathday.

¹⁴ Armstrong 1986, 1989: 18–19; Purcell 1983, 2001 on the *scribae*.

¹⁵ Taylor 1925, Armstrong 1986, Mayer 1995.

¹⁶ Plut. *Brut.* 56. See Nisbet 1995c on other survivors.

¹⁷ Reckford 1959, Lefèvre 1981, Graver 1998, Evenpoel 1990. ¹⁸ Oliensis 1998.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45220-5 - Horace: Satires: Book I

Edited by Emily Gowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

been read into *S.* 7,¹⁹ allusions to his career as a *scriba* into *S.* 1 and 10 (also into *S.* 6, where the disavowal of ambition is typical of the rhetoric of other late-republican social aspirants).²⁰ A distinction between H.'s status as a 'made' *eques* and Lucilius' as a 'born' one has been extracted from the denial at 6.58–9 *non ego circum | me Satureiano uectari rura caballo*,²¹ whereas the poverty and ex-slave status of his father is now regarded sceptically (Williams 1995 proposes that it is a convenient interpretation of a crisis in the Social War, when the adult males of rebellious Venusia were briefly sold into slavery). Other biographical details in the *Vita* are more obviously fabricated from the imaginative world of the poems: H.'s burial next to Maecenas on the Esquiline, based on the grave shared by a playboy and a parasite in *S.* 8, or his mirror-lined bedroom, a fantasy inspired by the frank discussions of sex in *S.* 2.

H. was thus around thirty when *Satires* I was published, during the uncertain period of the second triumvirate.²² Julius Caesar had been assassinated in 44 and the memory of his experiment in long-lost regal power hung in the air. In 43 Octavian, Caesar's heir, and Antony formed an alliance with Lepidus, and violent times followed, with many individuals, including Cicero, falling victim to their savage proscriptions, and the liberators, Brutus and Cassius, hunted down and killed after Philippi (42 BC). The triumvirs subsequently concentrated on 'restoring the republic', a process interrupted by internal dissent, the war between Octavian and Antony's supporters at Mutina (41–40), a number of attempted peace treaties (the Treaty of Brundisium of 40 BC, resulting in the marriage of Antony and Octavia, and the Treaty of Tarentum, 37 BC; the two are perhaps blended in *S.* 5) and the war with Sextus Pompeius, who was granted Sicily in 39 before further rebellion led to his defeat at Naulochus in 36.²³

The part H. allows for contemporary politics in *Satires* I is ostensibly small. Octavian makes a fleeting but ominous entry at 3.4 (*Caesar, qui cogere posset*), in a poem that urges give-and-take in any new order of social relations.²⁴ A compressed history of the republican constitution (6.8–22) impales fickle plebs, degenerate aristocrats and thrusting new men equally and resists pushing for further opportunities for those with slave origins. Yet it has been argued (DuQuesnay 1984) that the triumviral struggles are all the more glaringly refracted in H.'s 'blinkered' disquisitions on *amicitia* and forgiveness.²⁵ In portraying his own role

¹⁹ Gowers 2002; see Hinard 1976, Citroni 2000 on the proscriptions.

²⁰ Nichols 2009 compares the unobtrusive rhetoric of H. and another *apparitor*, Vitruvius.

²¹ Armstrong 1986.

²² DuQuesnay 1984: 20–1 gives the arguments for a date of 36/5; the journey to Brundisium assumes preliminaries for the Treaty of Tarentum (37); more precisely, at 10.86 H. mentions Bibulus (probably L. Calpurnius Bibulus, who spent the winter of 36/5 at Rome after his naval exploits in Sicily and before leaving to govern Syria).

²³ Pelling 1996 gives a lucid outline; also Griffin 1993.

²⁴ Griffin 1984.

²⁵ Kennedy 1992: 33 argues that the 'apolitical' and 'integrational' stance of *Satires* I is precisely what gives it its political force.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45220-5 - Horace: Satires: Book I

Edited by Emily Gowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

2 HORACE AND HIS TIMES

5

as minor in the diplomatic mission to Brundisium, H. seizes a useful opportunity to frame world events (5.28 *magnis* . . . *rebus*) in disarmingly domestic terms (5.29 *auersos* . . . *componere amicos*). In general, his attitude towards politics is determined by an ingrained instinct for self-preservation. The diatribe poems (*S.* 1–3) are a moral survival course, the disavowal of ambition and loud-mouthed self-promotion in *S.* 6 an arriviste's plea for acceptance, and the army of friends in *S.* 10 a protective shield.²⁶ The critique of Lucilius in *S.* 4 defames as disruptive and antisocial the jeopardized republican virtue of *libertas*, free speech.²⁷ In *S.* 7, H. daringly reopens the festering wound of Philippi, but ends by stabbing a dead Brutus in the back and reawakening memories of republican kingship, rather than focusing on the tyranny to come.²⁸ The watershed of Actium lay between H.'s debut and *Satires* II (30 bc): his greater reticence and caution there have been interpreted not just as a further 'thinning' of satire but as a response to further political constraints.²⁹ Meanwhile, between 40 and 30 bc, he was writing his iambic poems, the *Epodes*, in a form that more stridently engaged with the Greek tradition of blame poetry.³⁰ *Satires* I needs to be read against this foil as just one of the poetic roads H. might have taken and would take in a career whose trajectory peaked with the *Odes* and mellowed into the *Epistles*.

It has rightly been said: '[T]here are, and always have been, many Horaces, not one Horace.'³¹ Different generations and different contexts have reflected his image in different ways, as a composite of the various personae of the poetry books: jaded, clubbable, philosophical, airborne or pedestrian.³² Even the H. of *Satires* I is a split personality: pure and irreproachable (6.64 *uita ac pectore puro*, 6.69 *purus et insons*, 6.82 *puicum*) but fleshed out with an unruly, leaking body (5.7–8, 5.84–5, 8.46) and spotted with minor blemishes (6.66–7 *uelut si | egregio inspersos reprehendas corpore naeuos*).³³ The risks he faces are usually self-limiting. All his poetry books present his life as a catalogue of lucky escapes: the Pindaric *Wunderkind* and Archilochian deserter are tailored to the *Odes*,³⁴ while the adultery farce of *S.* 2, the muddy treks and damp inns of *S.* 5 and the social extrication of *S.* 9 are more suited to a 'satirical' survivor. *Satires* I is only a provisional self-portrait. We cannot decode all the references known only to H.'s in-crowd. Why the river

²⁶ See Wiseman 1971: 107–16 on new man's rhetoric.

²⁷ Wirszubski 1950, DuQuesnay 1984: 29–32, Freudenburg 1993: 86–92.

²⁸ Krägerud 1979, Henderson 1994 = 1998a: 73–107.

²⁹ Freudenburg 2001: 71–82.

³⁰ See Mankin 1995: 10–12 on questions of dating, Cucchiarelli 2001 on the bifurcation of the two generic experiments.

³¹ Martindale 1993: 1. ³² Houghton and Wyke 2009: 1–15.

³³ Augustus' 'tubby pint-pot' (*Vita Hor.* 2: *sed tibi statura deest, corpusculum non deest. itaque licebit in sextariolo scribas*) or *purissimus penis* (*Vita Hor.* 2); Putnam 2003: 107–8. On the unaestheticized body of Horace the satirist: Barchiesi and Cucchiarelli 2005: 210–11, Farrell 2007.

³⁴ Harrison 2007: 22–35. Lowrie 1997: 187, on the *Odes*: 'Horace constructs a personal history for himself not as Q. Horatius Flaccus, but as lyric.'

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45220-5 - Horace: Satires: Book I

Edited by Emily Gowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Aufidus is enlisted at 1.58 and why the mountains near Venusia are described as ‘familiar’ (5.77) are questions that only those who already know him can answer.

3 HORACE AND THE HISTORY OF SATIRE

Satura

By the end of *Satires* I, we may be equally unsure what Horatian satire is, beyond being hard to pin down. One of the most satirical jokes of the book, in its drive to avoid naming names, is that H. never names the *sui generis* form that he is creating. He refers to it only as (*genus*) *hoc* or *haec*, ‘this sort’ or ‘these things’, or *qualiacumque* ‘whatever these things are’. The word *satira* appears for the first time only in the first line of Book II, as though the genre were modest, shameful, or had only at that point come into being.

H. did not invent satire, as we know it. Indeed, at first sight, *Satires* I is remarkably unsatirical by modern standards. The satiric ‘spirit’ or ‘mode’, in the widest sense of sneering at other people’s shortcomings, whether bitter or humorous, literary, visual or performed, prompted by misanthropy, internal pathology or intense social commitment, was known in ancient Egypt and is alive and well today.³⁵ Its tone is recognizable at all periods of its history: confessional but evasive, scandalized but salacious, offensive but hungry for acceptance, self-righteous and self-loathing. The satirist’s ploy of trying to offload the venom that he feels onto his enemies or excuse it as a symptom of moral outrage (the so-called ‘disclaimer of malice’) goes back at least to Aristophanes; the anti-social aspect of defamation, its liability to increase the ugliness and victimhood of its mouthpiece, begins with Homer’s Thersites. Grumbling abuse is found in Hesiod and the iambists Archilochus and Hipponax.³⁶

Yet the word ‘satire’, just like our ‘libel’ and ‘scurrilous’, derives from a specialized *Roman* vehicle for (often distorted) truth-telling.³⁷ As Quintilian famously wrote, literary satire was the Romans’ own invention (10.1.94 *satura quidem tota nostra est*), which at least recognizes the potential of this form to be a proud (or abashed) carrier of Roman identity. Despite the claim to originality, grammarians’ instincts for categorization gave Latin satire a Greek past and linked it to many existing branches of literature, like comedy, satyr plays or vitriolic iambics, which came with their own myths of ‘primitive’ social or religious origins, in fertility ritual, curse tablets or witchcraft.³⁸ Some of these myths of origin were transferred from Greece to the Roman countryside, so as to claim equivalent origins for this ‘native’ genre in rustic rituals such as Atellan farce or Fescennine verses.³⁹

³⁵ Griffin 1994 is a good recent introduction. ³⁶ Rosen 1988, 2007.

³⁷ Though the adj. *satiricus* is mock-Greek. ³⁸ Elliott 1960.

³⁹ Graf 2005. See *Ep.* 2.1.145–55 (*Fescennina*), Coffey 1976: 18–22, Wiseman 1994 on Livy’s dramatic *saturae* and the possibility (still remote) of native satyr plays.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45220-5 - Horace: Satires: Book I

Edited by Emily Gowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

3 HORACE AND THE HISTORY OF SATIRE

7

At the same time, urban Romans prided themselves on living in ‘a suspicious city full of spiteful gossip’,⁴⁰ and thanks to teeming crowds, heaped merchandise and a sense of alienation, it is in Rome that satire’s long-standing associations with city life begin.⁴¹ Satire in the widest sense, as a cultural device to reinforce social groups and their values and ritually exclude the unwanted, flourished under the republic, mouthed, gesticulated and scrawled in court-case invective, anonymous pamphlets, graffiti and political squibs.⁴² Pompey’s freedman Pompeius Lenaeus, for example, responded to Sallust’s attack on his patron with an *acerbissima satira* (Suet. *De gramm.* 15), calling Sallust a drunk, a spendthrift and a plagiarist. Theatrical audiences positively expected political tension and ribald innuendo. H.’s satires are in fact the exception in being so literary and so tight-lipped.⁴³

Yet it is hard to analyse the history of Roman satire without H. We owe to him our picture of its ‘dark ages’ and ‘golden heyday’, a picture he has shaped to his own advantage; as far as his chosen canon of authors goes, his predictions have been largely self-fulfilling. He explores the paradox of trying to define a genre that on principle is indefinable, ‘elusive’ or ‘restless’.⁴⁴ In many ways, he offers us the best summary of the satirist’s predicament; questions about authority, control, interpretation and readership that continued to occupy him are intensified in the context of exploratory verse that risks causing offence and being misunderstood. From Aristophanes on, satire had justified itself as socially constructive criticism (medicinal, legislative, didactic, ethically sound, funny or involuntary) – unsurprisingly, when it could be construed as malicious and anti-social by those on the receiving end. Indeed, it was potentially dangerous to write satire in most periods of Roman history, from the Twelve Tables’ primeval ban on *mala carmina*, malicious poems, to Augustus’ book-burning in 12 BC,⁴⁵ and the response of those in authority could not be foreseen. Julius Caesar’s relaxed approach to the risqué epigrams of Catullus and Calvus invites contrast with Asinius Pollio’s guarded remark on receiving scurrilous verses from Octavian: ‘I’ll have to keep quiet. It’s not easy to write verses (*scribere*) against someone who can proscribe me (*proscribere*).’⁴⁶

While he helps to define the satirical ‘tradition’, H. also transforms it. His strategy to pre-empt criticism is to go in a new direction, ethically and aesthetically, towards inoffensive and disarmingly self-critical poetry. Promoting restraint and compositional neatness, he makes a literary virtue out of a political necessity. Yet the way in which he defames his chosen predecessors only reinforces the antagonistic identity of the tradition. Roman satire, like Roman pastoral, is essentially nostalgic: it mourns the lost conditions for its existence and classifies itself at the moment of potential extinction. Starting with H., Roman satire is

⁴⁰ Cic. *Flacc.* 68 *in tam suspiciosa ac maledica ciuitate locum sermoni obtreptatorum non reliquit*; cf. *Cael.* 38.

⁴¹ Kernan 1959, Braund 1989. ⁴² Corbeill 1996. ⁴³ Ruffell 2003.

⁴⁴ Classen 1988 (title): ‘elusive’; Labate 1981 (title): ‘un genere irrequieto’.

⁴⁵ LaFleur 1981. ⁴⁶ Suet. *Jul.* 73, Macr. *Sat.* 2.4.21.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45220-5 - Horace: Satires: Book I

Edited by Emily Gowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

always ‘meta-satire’, poetry that tells us, tongue in cheek, why it can no longer be full-bloodedly satirical.

Origins: Ennius and others

Roman literary satire first appeared in the second century BC as no more than a fuzzy ‘miscellany’ or ‘ragbag’, on the model of Hellenistic anthologies with names like *Soros* ‘Heap’ and *Summeikta*, ‘Medley’.⁴⁷ Among Diomedes’ fourth-century AD collection of etymologies of *satura*/*satira*, two culinary metaphors are most plausible: *lanx satura* (adj., from *satur* ‘full, fat’), a mixed harvest festival platter or cornucopia, or *satura* (n. fem.), a type of edible stuffing, miscellaneous and bursting at the seams.⁴⁸ Of his other suggestions, Greek *satyros* ‘satyr’ is inaccurate but often harnessed to justify ribald masculinity, while *lex per saturam*, a law with many heads, is an extension of the ‘medley’ metaphor.⁴⁹

H. gives short shrift to an unnamed *auctor* of the first *saturae* (10.66–7). Most probably he refers to Ennius (239–169 BC), but there is little we can do to correct H.’s neglect, since only 31 lines of Ennius’ satires survive.⁵⁰ If squeezed, his depleted ‘haggis’ yields some of the classic ingredients of later satire in embryo form: gluttons and parasites, animal fable, comic dialogues, even paranoid disavowal of malice⁵¹ and a sense of crowded urban space. But he is missing from Quintilian’s history of satire and named in H.’s poems only as the author of the grand hexameter epic *Annales*, ripe for satirical dismemberment. Absent, too, from H.’s account are the satires of Ennius’ nephew Pacuvius and, more notably, the bulky but fragmentary satirical output of M. Varro Reatinus (116–27 BC), proscribed by Antony after Caesar’s death, who has continued to be sidelined, thanks to H.’s omission, as a practitioner of a separate strand of Greek-influenced ‘Menippean’ (prose-verse) satire. Varro of Atax (82–c. 35 BC), all of whose satires are lost, is briefly mentioned as a failure (10.46 *experto frustra*). Of the other satirists who do not make it into H.’s canon (10.47 *quibusdam aliis*), we have no more than a few names.⁵²

Lucilius

H.’s chosen ‘father-figure’ in satire is the laughing cavalier C. Lucilius (*fl.* c. 130–103 BC), against whom, in *S.* 4, he positions himself as upstart

⁴⁷ Coffey 1976: 16–17.

⁴⁸ Diom. 1 485 *GLK*. On mixture as the quintessential characteristic of satire, see Classen 1988.

⁴⁹ Knoche 1975: 7–16, Coffey 1976: 11–23. See Keane 2002d on etymologizing as an ‘interested’ pursuit for satire’s theorists and practitioners.

⁵⁰ Courtney 7–21. ⁵¹ E.g. *meum non est, ac si me canis memorderit* (fr. 19 Courtney).

⁵² They include: Ennius Servius Nicanor (Suet. *De gramm.* 5) and L. Albucius (Var. *RR* 3.2.17: *cuius Luciliano caractere sunt libelli*).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45220-5 - Horace: Satires: Book I

Edited by Emily Gowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

3 HORACE AND THE HISTORY OF SATIRE

9

successor. H. commends Lucilius as a pioneer in establishing the hexameter as the fixed metre of satire (4.7) and, later, as tackling a genre ‘untouched by the Greeks’ (10.66); he dismisses him as ‘wholly dependent’ on Athenian Old Comedy (4.6 *hinc omnis pendet Lucilius*), yet claims him as an ally in an independent genre (4.56–7 *his, ego quae nunc, | olim quae scripsit Lucilius*): it is thus unclear where he stands on whether *satura tota nostra est*. The point may be in fact to parade the inconsistency of contemporary theories about a genre that claimed to be singular but was inevitably parasitic on Greek and other Roman genres.⁵³

Thanks to H., Lucilius remained the almost undisputed ‘father’ of satire, protective authorizer and *bête noire* to his successors.⁵⁴ A rich *equus* from Campania with friends in high places like Scipio and Laelius, he is constructed by H. as an enviable figure, with unlimited licence to lash out against millionaire auctioneers, partisan politicians, provincial speakers of Latin and pretentious playwrights. It is with Lucilius that Roman satire’s connections with outspoken invective and aggressive abuse are born, if only to be mourned as lost by his successors. The imagery he attracts is hyper-masculine: abrasive salt-rubs, skin-ripping, dog-bites, cavalry attacks and sword-wielding.⁵⁵ His satires reflect and construct the swaggering world of second-century BC Roman citizen performance: a world of litigation, xenophobia, anti-provincialism and big fish in small ponds (real and metaphorical, given the enduring fame of the trial of Lupus ‘Bass’ in Book I).⁵⁶ Only 1300 lines of his thirty books remain, giving Lucilius little chance to rebut H.’s criticisms or avoid being caricatured as he himself had belittled Homer, Ennius, Accius and other literary giants. He becomes the foil to H.’s own unobtrusive civility – aggressive, uninhibited and brash, like the upstart auctioneers he used to flay. Some of this reputation squares with the relaxed and self-possessed air of his writings, which offer an unabashed portrait of himself as others saw him: *improbo illo . . . Lucilio* (929–30W = 821–2M; 1075W = 1035M). The rest stems from his association with the perceived outspokenness of the late republic (especially with the Pompeian party), for which he became a figurehead; the anti-Caesarian convert Trebonius, writing to Cicero (*Fam.* 12.16), enshrines him as the epitome of republican free speech (*libertas*).⁵⁷

Lucilius’ *chartae* gave him freedom in another sense too: *carte blanche* to ‘confide in friends’ (in reality, to broadcast) his inmost thoughts on any matter (2.1.30–1 *ille uelut fidis arcana sodalibus olim | credebat libris*, 32–3 *ut omnis | uotiuu pateat ueluti descripta tabella*).⁵⁸ somewhat like a modern newspaper columnist. Naming names (*onomasti komoidein*) as well as claiming friends and making enemies: this was the

⁵³ The link with comedy may derive from Varro: Leo 1889.

⁵⁴ Coffey 1976: 39–62 is a good introduction; see also Muecke 2005.

⁵⁵ 10.3–4 *sale multo | urbem defricuit*, 2.164 *detrudere . . . pellem*, Pers. 1.114–15 *secat Lucilius urbem, | te Lupe, te Muci, et genuinum fregit in illis*, Juv. 1.165–6 *ense . . . stricto . . . Lucilius ardens | infremuit*.

⁵⁶ Gruen 1990: 272–317.

⁵⁷ Anderson 1963, DuQuesnay 1984: 29–31.

⁵⁸ Cucchiarelli 2005.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-45220-5 - Horace: Satires: Book I

Edited by Emily Gowers

Excerpt

[More information](#)

link H. and others perceived with Aristophanic comedy. Hard as it is to recover the alleged openness of Lucilian satire, it is possible to assess some of the ways in which he is and is not like H. Clearly, his satires were longer and more sprawling. A glance at an extended fragment, from the poem about his journey down the Italian coast in Book 3, H.'s model for the journey to Brundisium, shows an easy redundancy that H. avoids in his own clipped version:

uerum haec ludus, susque omnia deque fuerunt,
 susque haec deque fuere inquam omnia ludus iocusque;
 illud opus durum, ut Setinum accessimus finem,
 αἰγίλιπτοι montes, Aetnaea omnes, asperi Athones.
 (102–5W = 110–13M)

The self-conscious unevenness ('jogging and bumpy progress': Coffey 1976: 60), awkward elisions and colloquial repetition mixed with Grecizing grand style are generic fixtures entirely fitting for the subject and tone, but H. dismisses them as merely acceptable for earlier experiments in the genre, no longer satisfactory.⁵⁹

The fact remains that Lucilius was inspirational for H. His casual labels for his satires, *ludus ac sermones* 'amusing chats' (1039W = 1039M) or *schedia* 'improvisations' (1131W = 1279M),⁶⁰ lie behind many of H.'s less guarded characterizations (e.g. 4.139 *illudo chartis*, 10.37 *haec ego ludo*). Lucilius' 'confessions of a columnist' put autobiography and the personal at the heart of Horatian satire. His sexual openness licenses H.'s earthy poem on sexual choice (*S.* 2) and account of a wet dream in *S.* 5, while his suspicious impressions of the centre of Rome (1145–51W = 1128–34M) paved the way for H.'s agoraphobic street scenes in *S.* 4, 6 and 9.⁶¹ Lucilius' friendship with Scipio and Laelius was exemplary (for Cicero, as well as for H.), and established *amicitia* as H.'s basic satirical framework, with its characteristic blend of relaxed warmth (2.1.73 *nugari cum illo et discincti ludere*) and ruthless exclusion. Horatian-style paranoia can already be detected in fragments like 1085W = 1015M *gaudes, cum de me ista foris sermonibus differs*.⁶² Lucilius also led the way in making satire a vehicle for literary as well as social criticism, promoting urbanity over rusticity, debating matters of taste, pretension and acceptability and probing language as a social phenomenon.⁶³

Yet *Satires* I is largely an exercise in (genre-appropriate) defamation of Lucilius' legacy. H. caricatures his rival's productions as over-casual (4.10 *stans pede in uno*, 4.12 *piger scribendi ferre laborem*) or routinely spewed forth (10.60–1 *amet scripsisse*

⁵⁹ Morgan 2004: 8–15 defends Lucilian metre as appropriate for deformed subject matter.

⁶⁰ Lucilius never uses '*satura*': Martyn 1972.

⁶¹ Henderson 2005: 312: Lucilius 'paraded authentic selfhood'.

⁶² Cf. 1084W = 1014M, 1086W = 1016M, 1087W = 1021M, 1069W = 1030M.

⁶³ E.g. an urban praetor's rustic accent (232W = 1130M); Albucius' inept use of *chaere* (1183–41W = 87M); Vettius mocked for speaking Latin like a Praenestine (1138–41W = 1322M); the gross statue of Accius (844W = 794M); grammatical questions in Books 9 and 10 (Puelma Piwonka 1949: 28).