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The present enquiry into the relation of Sat. I,10 to Sat. I,4 is based on the assumption that the reader is familiar with the contents of the first study (on I,1–4), or at least with the analysis of I,4 given in Acta Classica XI, 1968, 56ff. By way of brief recapitulation the structure of I,4 may be set out as follows:

First half of the poem, vss. 1–63
(i) 1–8a: mainly on the moral function of satire, containing praise of Lucilius as dependent on Old Greek Comedy.
(ii) 8b–21a: mainly on artistic requirements of the genre, with criticism of Lucilius for his harsh versification and prolixity.
(iii) 21b–38a: mainly on moral function, containing an exaggerated 'popular' image of the satiric poet feared and hated by all.
(iv) 38b–63: mainly on artistic requirements, with Horace rejecting the 'moral' charges against the satirist on the ground that he himself does not write (pure) poetry.

Second (and longer) half of the poem, vss. 64–143, mainly on the moral function of satire
(v) 64–78a: The innocent are quite safe from the 'soapbox' satirist; in any case Horace does not propose to publish – or even to recite, except for a small select group.

---

* The above analysis is a continuation of an article which deals more specifically with Satires I, 1 and 2, and 3 and 4, as pairs: see AClass XI, 1968, 37–62. For bibliographical Addenda to that article, see the Appendix below. The continuation of this enquiry was made possible by a Senior Scholarship awarded by the National Council for Social Research – now the Human Sciences Research Council – in Pretoria, and held during a period of study leave (February to October 1969). My grateful thanks and acknowledgement are due to the Council, to Libraries at home and abroad for hospitality extended to me – in particular the Library of the University of Leyden – and to colleagues with whom I had the privilege of discussing the drafts of the present and subsequent articles which will appear in Acta Classica. As in the case of the first study I wish to record my special thanks to J. H. Waszink and to Gregor Maurach for their helpful advice and criticism. In its original form the third article, on Satires 5 and 6 (infra, p.45ff.), was presented as a paper on January 29, 1969 at the Biennial Conference of the Classical Association of South Africa held at the University of Potchefstroom.
As for the charge of malice on the part of the satirist, H. strongly rejects the charge of back-biting or of spiteful intent on his part.

If H. speaks 'liberius', he has derived the habit from the practical moral training given him by his father.

Thanks to this training H. is free from extreme 'vitia'. In the contemplation of his own moral improvement he amuses himself by writing satire.

Of the eight sections only the fourth (at vs. 63) and the last conclude at the end of a line. Elsewhere the transition from one section to another is marked by an incision in the middle of a verse. An incision after 'emunctae naris' in vs. 8 is implied by the sudden transition from praise to criticism.

* * *

In the opening passage of Sat. I,10, and in further portions, Horace presents himself as replying to critics who had defended Lucilius against the criticisms of I,4, and who had attacked satires written after I,4. Whether the poem should be interpreted against the background of an actual literary controversy, is less clear; but it is generally accepted that it should be viewed against such a background. While there can be no doubt that it was composed as one of a pair with I,4, I submit that it should be interpreted more closely with reference to – and also in structural and other contrast to – I,4 than has been done up to the present day.

There is more than one way in which the tenth satire may be divided. I would distinguish the following five main sections, all of which start or conclude at the beginning or end of a line:

(i) 1–19
(ii) 20–35
(iii) 36–49
(iv) 50–77
(v) 78–92

The first section, 1–19

This opening passage immediately manifests some points of contrast with I,4. Whereas in the earlier member of the pair the consideration of the moral function and satiric spirit of the genre on the one hand, and on the other hand its stylistic qualities, had been mainly kept apart in different sections, we now find that within the same opening section they are either considered in close proximity to each other, or are run together in such a manner that it is difficult to keep them apart. In I,4 a 'split' treatment had

---

suited Horace, because it enabled him to balance Lucilius' literary 'virtutes' against his literary 'vitia', but in an inverted manner - inverted, because that satire opens suitably with an approval of the moral function and spirit of Lucilian satire, thus linking up with the first three 'moralistic' satires in general and the ethical 'virtutes' and 'vitia' of I,3 in particular.

In I,10 both procedures are reversed, not simply by way of 'variatio', but because Horace wanted to lay the main emphasis on excellence of style, and at the same time to show that spirit and function are inextricably bound up with stylistic excellence in a poem. Horace starts by admitting to an imaginary defender of his predecessor (cf. 'Lucili fautor', 2) that he had criticised the rough versification of Lucilius, 1-2a:

Nempe incomposito dixi pede currere versus Lucili.

This reflects I,4, 8ff., 'durus conponere versus' etc. But while at the beginning of I,4 praise had been followed by criticism, we now have criticism followed by praise. And so, Horace reminds the 'fautor', 3-4:

at idem, quod sale multo urbem defricuit, charta laudatur eadem.

While this is a summary allusion to 4, 3-7a, it probably refers in particular to the implied 'multa libertas' of Lucilius ('sale multa' ~ 'multa cum libertate').

Horace now expands on his previous point as follows, 5-8:

nee tamen hoc tribuens dederim quoque cetera; nam sic et Laberi mimos ut pulchra poemata mirer.

ergo non satis est risu diducere rictum auditoris - et est quaedam tamen hic quoque virtus -

'However, while granting him this, I would not allow him the other qualities as well, for in that case I should have to admire even the mimes of Laberius as fine poems. So it is not enough to make your listener grin with laughter - though there is some merit even in that'.

Vs. 8, 'et est quaedam tamen hic quoque virtus' is really a note in parentheses, partly intended to counteract any suggestion that he is contradicting himself in regard to what he had said in vss. 3-7a of the fourth satire about Lucilius. It is also a formal counterpart to 'nam fuit hoc vitiosus' in 4,9. The constructive criticism which follows in vss. 9-15 does, of course, contain an implicit criticism of both the style and spirit of Lucilius.

In the second half of the first section Horace now proceeds - in a masterly manner - to give a list of stylistic demands for the writing of satire. This

---

2. For the significance of this procedure in I,4,1-21a, see AClass XI, 1968, 61.
3. For the significance of Horace's criticism of Laberius in regard to Lucilius, see infra p. 14f. on (Furius) Alpinus, vs. 36f., and cf. vss. 61-3 on Cassius (Etruscus).
This passage (cf. 16–17a) is based on the silent premise of the similarity of the two genres, and is intended inter alia as a silent comment on the one-sided *topos* that ‘satura dicitur carmen ... maledicum et ad carpenda hominum vitia archaeae comoediae charactere compositum, (quale scripsit Lucilius)’. The opening section of the fourth satire had been partly based on this *topos*, because it suited Horace’s aim and purpose there; in I,10 he will now expand on it. Rudd translates (p. 93):

‘You need terseness, so that the thought may run on and not become tangled in a mass of verbiage which will weigh heavily on the listener’s ear. You also need a style which is sometimes severe, sometimes gay, taking the role of an orator and poet, now of a clever talker who keeps his strength in reserve and carefully rations it out. Great issues are usually resolved more forcefully and more effectively by wit than by castigation’.

How does Horace start his list? ‘Est brevitate opus ... ’. Whereas in the first line he had spoken of ‘currere versus’, he now proceeds: ‘ut currat sententia’ etc., thus bridging in vs. 9–10 the gap between excellence of form and excellence of matter in the writing of satire. Rudd has formulated the double significance of these two verses as follows: ‘the proper aim of brevitas is two-fold, firstly a clear communication of meaning - which is ultimately a moral function, and secondly an arrangement of words which will satisfy the aesthetic sense’. However, it is necessary to stress that the emphasis falls on style (form and content), but with the implication that it is only by a free flow of thought and a pleasing form that satire will be able to achieve its aim. What this aim is will become clear only in vss. 14b–15.

On the following verses, and particularly on 11–13a, Brink comments as follows: ‘Like some of the older editors, for example Orelli, I take ‘the parts of the rhetor and poet’ (12) to pick up the *sermo tristis* of 11, and ‘the part of the civil man’ (13) to pick up the *sermo iocosus* of 11 ... In sum, the demand is for a shifting and flexible mean between serious and humorous criticism,

---

4. On this, see Brink, *Horace* 165f., n. 4.
7. See further *infra* p. 19f.
which well describes Horatian satire. In addition I would submit that in vss. 14b-15 the term 'ridiculum' picks up or continues 'urbanus', 'the part of the humorous man', while 'acri' stands in a less close relation to the impassioned style 'of the rhetor and poet'. At the same time we observe that Horace finds the most important weapon of the satirist in the 'ridiculum', and that it serves the same purpose — but now more explicitly — as 'brevitas' (in respect of style); it is more effective in achieving the critical aim of satire.

That Horace wished the above pronouncement to be read as an addendum to the opening passage in I,4 is made clear by the following verses, 16-17a:

ili scripta comoedia prisca viris est
hoc stabant, hoc sunt imitandi;

which hark back to 4,1-2 ('poetae ... quorum comoedia prisca virorum est').

How far has Horace now answered the question left open in 4,63b ('alias iustum sit necne poema'), whether satire qualifies as true poetry? The answer is not clear. He has called the three great masters of Attic Comedy 'poetae' (with emphasis) at 4,1; and he has now set out the ideal qualities of comedy in which they excelled and in which they are to be imitated by the satirist. The answer therefore might be that if the satirist satisfied these requirements, his work would qualify for the title of true poetry. But in fact verses 12-13b of Sat. 10—

defendente vicem modo rhetoris atque poetae
interdum urbani,

— clearly impose a limitation, and so we may take Horace's answer to be that even the best satire is not poetry in the grand style as defined in 4,43-4, but a mixed genre, partly poetry. It should be noted that 'poetae' (vs. 12) links up closely with 'rhetoris' in 'rhetoris atque poetae', and that the expression as a whole signifies a grand, spirited style — as opposed to the more 'worldly' and reserved style of the 'urbanus'. Not only are these two styles to mix or alternate in satire, but the main component of satiric style should be that of the 'urbanus': this follows implicitly from the stress laid on the 'ridiculum' in vss. 14b-15, a concept which in its context is none other than the second type of 'iocandi genus' defined in the De Officiis: 'Duplex omnino est iocandi genus, unum illiberale, petulans, flagitiosum, obscenum, alterum elegans, urbanum, ingeniosum, facetum. Quo genere non modo Plautus noster et Atticorum antiqua comoedia, sed etiam philosophorum libri referti sunt'.

8. Brink, Horace 166, n. 1.
10. Cicero, De Off. 1,104; cf. Rudd 96f. on the literary background of Horace's theory.
Finally, vss. 11-15 confirm the critical, outward function of Horace’s satire which he had suppressed by way of ironic understatement of method (‘liberius si/dixero quid, si forte iocosius, 4,104f.) or by limitation of his aim to self-improvement (4,137b–139a). Any suggestion that he may have renounced his implicit claim to ‘libertas’ – cf. liberius, though not the ‘multa libertas’ of Old Comedy and Lucilius – is immediately ruled out by vss. 17b–19 (linking up with 16–17a quoted above):

quos neque pulcher
Hermogenes umquam legit neque simius iste
nil praeter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum.

Apart from the relevance of this swift thrust within its own context – that these ‘littérateurs’ (Ed. Fraenkel) do not fulfil the stylistic demands set and met by the Attic comic poets – the passage not only prepares the way for similar assaults later in the poem, but occupies a significant place at the end of the first section.

(ii) The second section, 30–35
‘At magnum fecit’, Horace makes the ‘fautores Lucili’ say (cf. ‘ut magnum’ in 4,10) ‘quod verbis Graeca Latinis/miscuit’ (20–21a) – a subtle link with the preceding subject of Greek Old Comedy as the stylistic model for Latin satire. In his reply to these ‘seri studiorum’, 21b (a subtle hint that Greek terms like ὄλυπτεις may be suitably translated into Latin – without resorting to formidable compounds), Horace replies inter alia that pure Latin should be used not only in the exalted prose of the advocate’s speech, but also in versemaking, ‘cum versus facias’, 25:

scilicet oblitus patriaeque patrisque Latini,
cum Pedius causas exsudet Publicola atque
Corvinus, patriis intermiscere petita
verba foris malis, Canusini more bilinguis? (27–30)

‘Whereas Pedius Publicola and (Messalla) Corvinus sweat out their cases, you I suppose would forget about your fatherland and father Latius and would sooner interlard your fathers’ speech with foreign importations like a two-tongued Canusian?’ (Rudd 94, my italics). Heinzé comments as follows: ‘Das nationale Moment, das für H. den Ausschlag gibt, wird in patriae, patris Latini (Verg. Aen. VII 92. XI 469, der Stammheros der lateinisch redenden Menschen), patriis nachdrücklich betont’. I tentatively submit that there is more that underlies this passage, and that the second section of I,10 links up with the last section but one of I,4, on his father’s training as the Latin root of his satire, expressed in the Roman fashion of ‘notare’ (4,105f.):

insuevit pater optimus hoc me,
ut fugerem exemplis vitiorum quaeque notando.
In 10,27–9 there is a strong play on the thrice-repeated ‘patriaque patriis Latini ... patriis (sc. verbis)’; and while ‘pater Latinus’ (with the significance indicated by Heinze) plays the chief role in this admonition, I suggest that ‘pater Latinus’ also recalls ‘pater optimus’ of 4,105 (with the adjective ‘patriis’ recalling ‘patriam (rem)’ of vs. 110 in the same context).11 Horace appears to be saying, in effect, that his satire with its Roman moral root in his father, will express itself in pure Latin language. In this respect he will not follow his Graeco-Latin exemplar, Lucilius.

On the next five verses, 32–35, Fraenkel comments as follows: ‘At 1.31 the discussion takes a somewhat unexpected turn: atque ego cum Graecos facerem, natus mare citra, versiculos, vetuit me tali voce Quirinus ..., ’and so when I, born on this side of the sea, tried to write Greek verses, Quirinus stopped me ...’. There was in the preceding discussion no thought of writing Greek poetry, but only of using Greek words in Latin poetry. Why, then, this departure? The answer is suggested by the following section, in which Horace explains why he, unlike many eminent poets of his day, has chosen as his modest task the revival of the satura of Lucilius. He is going to speak of his own work as a Latin poet, and it is to this theme that the little story about Quirinus provides a refined transition’.12

Fraenkel in a foot-note also draws our attention to the fact that Heinze has seen that here Quirinus, the patron of undiluted Latinitas, takes the place which in this vision of a poet belonged primarily to Apollo'.13 Now the Quirinus story reinforces the ‘auctoritas’ of ‘pater Latinus’ in vs. 27, but it should not be taken too seriously, as it is an elegant parody of the motif of ‘revocatio’ which Horace also applied successfully at a later stage at the beginning of Odes 4,15.

11. See also n. 13 infra, second paragraph.
13. Fraenkel, Horace, 130 n. 4; and see Heinze ad loc.: ‘Horaz bekraftigt ... hier seinen vorhin an das Gefühl der Stammeszugehörigkeit gerichteten Appell und lässt daher, während sonst in ähnlichen Erfindungen, gewiss nach helleistischem Vorbild, Apoll als Warner eingeführt wird (od. IV 15,1; Virg. buc. 6,3; Prop. III 3,13), Quirinus-Romulus, den Ahn der Römer, auftreten’, etc. See also the rest of Fraenkel’s note on Apollo as the ultimate prototype at the beginning of Callimachus, Aitia, fr. 1,21ff.

While I have linked up ‘pater Latinus’ with Horace’s father, ‘pater optimus’, Walter Wimmel, starting from the earlier satire, has matched ‘pater optimus’ in a sense with the Callimachean Apollo (replaced by Quirinus). With reference to 4,105b–6 he writes: ‘So hat der Vater den Jungen nicht nur zum Menschen ohne schlimme vitia geformt, er ist auch Ursache seines Satirenschreibens geworden; Horaz setzt nur seine Weise fort: durch exempla zu erziehen. Damit wird der Vater zur berufenden Instanz; er entspricht in gewisser Weise dem kallimachischen Apoll ... s. 1,10,32 bildet der römische Stammvater Quirinus eine Verbindung des kallimachischen Apoll und des horazischen Vaters’ (Kallimachos in Rom, Hermes Einzelschriften, Heft 16, 1960, 152, cf. also 137). It seems that Wimmel has omitted the middle term in the (probable) relation (a) ‘pater optimus’ ~ (b) ‘pater Latinus’ ~ (c) Quirinus; and that, while (b) links up with (a), (c) links up much more closely with (b) than with (a).
(iii) The third section, 36–49
We have quoted above the link indicated by Fraenkel between the (second part of the) second section and the (second part of the) third section, vss. 40–49. In the latter Horace wishes to explain why he chose satire as a literary genre, and accordingly he first gives a brief survey of genres in which there were already expert contemporary exponents, these being comedy (Fundanius), tragedy (Pollio), epic (Varius), and pastoral poetry (the Eclogues of Vergil). What remained for Horace was to improve upon the satire in which Varro of Atax and others had failed, and of which he says, 'melius quod scribere possem', 47. Here we have, as so often in both I,4 and I,10, a nice balance between confidence ('melius') and playful modesty ('possem') in our poet, modesty which is further developed when in the following verse he describes himself as a lesser poet than Lucilius, who is honoured with the glorious title of 'inventor' of the genre, cf. 48–9:

inventore minor; neque ego illi detrahere ausim
haerentem capiti cum multa laude coronam.

Here the explicit praise of Lucilius as inventor contained in 'cum multa laude' perhaps links up with the implicit praise of our poet's predecessor contained in 4,5, 'multa cum libertate'.

Before proceeding to the fourth section, in which Horace resumes his criticism of Lucilius, 'at dixi fluere hunc lutulentum', 50, we still have to attend to the first part of the third section, 36–9:

turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona dumque
diffingit Rheni luteum caput, haec ego ludo,
quia neque in aede sonent certantia iudice Tarpa,
nec redeant iterum atque iterum spectanda theatris

– where 'spectanda theatris' prepares the reader for the first examples in the list of genres given in the second half of the section, viz. for Latin comedy (of Fundanius), followed by tragedy (of Pollio).

In 38–9 (the last two verses quoted above) Horace returns to his favourite topic – cf. Sat. 4,22–3 and 71–4 – the avoidance of publicity (or publication), a theme to which he will finally return at vss. 73–5 and in the final section of the poem.

Structurally vss. 36–7 – 'While the turgid Alpman cuts the throat14 of Memnon and disfigures with mud the head of the Rhine . . . ' – contains more than meets the eye at first glance. The Callimachean epithet 'turgidus' censures not only the style of the epic poet Furius (cf. Sat. 2,5,41) nicknamed Alpinus; together with 'luteum' it looks forward to the resumption of Horace's criticism of Lucilius' style as muddy at the beginning of the fourth section: 'at dixi fluere hunc lutulentum', 50. But why? With reference to

14. On 'iugulat', cf. Palmer's note and also n. 46 infra on A.P. 475 'occidit (legendo)'.

14
10, 5-6, 'Laberi mimos' etc., Rudd has maintained correctly that 'Laberius absorbs some of the criticism which is aimed at Lucilius'. It seems clear that Alpinus, criticised for the same kind of fault as Lucilius, in part fulfils the same kind of function in the present context: in between the criticisms of Lucilius in the second and fourth sections he acts as a kind of lightning-conductor. A parallel to the Laberius example is provided in the earlier member of the pair 1,4 and 1,10: at 4,14ff. Horace explicitly satirises the poetaster Crispinus by name, but implicitly also Lucilius, when he suddenly switches from the long-winded Lucilius to the wind-bag Crispinus.

There is one further parallel between 1,4 and 1,10 in our present passage. 'Haec ego ludo', 37 recalls and echoes 'illudo chartis' of 4,139, and once again it should not be taken too seriously, since it is a playful understatement. And so we get a nice pattern of: self-confidence - modesty - self-confidence - modesty - self-confidence in the sequence: criticism of Lucilius, 20-35 - 'haec ego ludo', 37 - 'melius quod scribere possem' 47 - 'inventore minor' 48 - 'at dixi fluere hunc lutulentum' 50. It is perhaps needless to say that the modesty of Horace is usually combined with ironic understatement.

The intricate structural relation between the second, third and fourth main sections of our poem may be indicated as follows:

\[ 
\text{Section 2: vss. 20-35} \\
\text{'cum Graecos facerem ... versiculos, vetuit me ... Quirinus', 31f.} \\
\text{Section 3: vss 36-49} \\
\text{'turgidus Alpinus ... diffingit Rheni luteum caput', 36f.} \\
\text{'hoc erat ... melius quod scribere possem', 46f.} \\
\text{Section 4: vss. 50-77} \\
\text{at dixi fluere hunc lutulentum, 50} \\
\]

(iv) The fourth section, 50-77
Horace now returns to his criticism of Lucilius' diffuse composition and hasty production. In 50-51b –

16. It will be clear that I cannot accept Wimmel's interpretation that 'dieser Hiobempfänger Alpinus leitet die mit Fundanius, Pollio, Varius und Vergil fortgesetzte Reihung ein' etc. (op. cit. 157f.).
17. There is also more in the content of 10,36-7 ('...Alpinus... Rheni... haec ego ludo') than meets the eye. In a forthcoming article on a systematic 'imitatio' of the Eclogues by Horace in the Satires of Book I, I shall suggest that we have in Sat. 10,36f. a playful allusion to Ecl. 10,47f.: 'Alpinas, a dura, nives et frigora Rheni / me sine sola vides'.
at dixi fluere hunc lutulentum, saepe ferentem
piura quidem tollenda relinquentis

- he takes up 4,11:

cum flueret lutulentus, erat quod tollere velles;

It is noteworthy that whereas in 1,4 this observation followed Lucilius’ feat of composing 200 lines in one hour (4,9–10), introduced by ‘nam fuit hoc vitirosus’, the order is reversed in 1,10. Here it precedes at some distance the same feat, introduced by a different but similar type of hoc phrase, 60–1:

hoc tantum contentus, amet scripsisse ducentos
ante cibum versus, etc.

Thus, despite the repetition we get a ‘variatio’ of the chiastic type a,b : b,a.

While he claims the right to criticize Lucilius for his lack of ars – just as Lucilius, genial (‘comis’, 53) though he was, criticized Accius and Ennius – Horace does raise the question whether Lucilius’ relative lack of polish in composition was due to his own ‘natura’, (i.e. his ingenium, cf. 63) or to the harsh nature of his subjects: ‘num illius, num rerum dura . . . natura’, 57–8.

By placing the ‘dura’ immediately after ‘rerum’, Horace skilfully avoids giving the impression that he is now – in contrast to 4,1–8a – criticising the ingenium of Lucilius (in 4,8b he had used ‘durus’ to censure Lucilius’ lack of ars: ‘durus componere versus’). However, it will not escape the notice of the observant reader that the criticism of the ‘ingenium’ of Cassius (Etruscus) in 61b–64a (sandwiched in between, as it were) does contain an implicit criticism of the ‘natura’ of Lucilius.18

At the beginning of the second portion of the present section Horace, reverting to Lucilius by name, returns to both points, the ingenium and the ars of his predecessor, 64b–67:

fuerit Lucilius, inquam,
comis et urbanus, fuerit limatior idem
quam rudis et Graecis intacti carminis auctor19
quamque poëtarum seniorum turba:

Horace now further develops his appreciation of the level of artistic skill attained by his predecessor. In fact, he is manifesting historical sense in two

19. The verse ‘quam rudis et Graecis intacti carminis auctor’ has been variously interpreted and translated, cf. Büchner, Gnomon 22, 1950, 242f. and Rudd, Horace on the Origins of Satura, in Phoenix 14, 1960, 36–44. Rudd translates ‘more polished than the author of a rough verse untouched by the Greeks’, and he regards the author as an indefinite poet writing in the Saturnian metre. While it is true that rudis, as the position of et shows, should strictly speaking be construed with carminis, Büchner interprets as follows: ‘rudis et Graecis intacti carminis auctor’ ist also ein Urheber und Beginner, der nicht vertraut ist mit einer Dichtart, eben weil er sie neu schafft, (rudis lat. conso von carminis ebenso...
ways in his new, comparative\textsuperscript{20} and constructive criticism of Lucilius: firstly in his positive appreciation of his poetic ability compared with that of his predecessors, 65b–67a (cf. 53f.); and secondly in his constructive criticism, that if Lucilius had lived in the Augustan age, he would use the file to smooth away (‘detereret’) his verse and to prune off (‘recideret’) what was superfluous, 67b–71.

In the third and final portion of the fourth section, 72–77, Horace confirms his previous point – if the author’s work is to qualify for a second reading. ‘Saepe stilum vertas’, 72a, takes up both ‘detereret’ and ‘recideret’, since ‘stilum vertere’ means \textit{erasing by smoothing out} the relevant portion of the wax on the tablet.\textsuperscript{21} As for one’s audience, it is important not to try and please the crowd, but rather a few competent readers. He concludes the section with a brief story of the actress Arbuscula, 76–77, which illustrates the sentiment ‘contentus paucis lectoribus’ (vs. 74),\textsuperscript{22} and which harks back to the theme of ‘theatrical’ publicity in vs. 39 (76 ‘equitem mihi plaudere’, cf. 39 ‘spectanda theatris’). This return to the theme of publicity or publication links up with the fifth and final section of the poem in which the poet specifies the ‘pauci lectores’ whose approval he would like to win, as readers of his (first) Book of Satires.

(v) \textit{The fifth section}, 78–92
The fifth is a concluding section not only to the tenth satire, but a conclusion to the whole book, which is about to be published: ‘I, puer, atque meo citus haec subscribe libello’, 92. No doubt Horace, like all authors, really hoped that his book would have a good, in the sense of a wide, reception; but, like all discriminating authors, he hoped that it would meet with the approval of, above all, a specific, limited number of discriminating readers. In the main portion, 81–90a, of this final section he specifies these ‘pauci lectores’. They include three of the leading four poets mentioned in the third section, \textit{wie auctor abhängig} und weil sie – das erschwert seine Situation – nicht einmal von den Griechen geübt wurde. Es ist zu übersetzen: als der ungeübte Stifter einer von den Griechen nicht angerührten Dichtart. Was macht man aber mit dem ‘et’? Es drückt die Steigerung aus, die im Begriff \textit{Graecis} schon angelegt ist ... eines selbst von den Griechen nicht angerührten Dichtwerkes (p. 243). However that may be, I regard Büchner’s arguments in favour of the \textit{identification} of the ‘auctor’ as Ennius as quite conclusive, and note in particular that ‘quamque poetae seniorem turbam’ in vs. 67, i.e. ‘and than the (whole) crowd of older poets’, makes little sense if the ‘auctor’ does not refer to a \textit{specific} (i.e. a \textit{particular}) author.

20. This feature is anticipated in the first portion (50–55) in the general principle (with specific applications) of the critical evaluation of the work of earlier poets.

21. With ‘\textit{saepe stilum vertas}’, 72 Horace deliberately links up the final portion with the preceding part of the fourth section which concluded with ‘\textit{saepe caput scaberet}’, etc., 71.

22. ‘Contentus’ on the artistic level (cf. and contrast ‘hoc tantum contentus’ 60 of Lucilius) links up with ‘viverem uti contentus’ on the moral level in 4,108. On the structural function of ‘contentus paucis lectoribus’ in marking the transition between the fourth and fifth sections of 1,10, see Knoche, \textit{Phiol}. 90, 1935, 476f. n. 38.
viz. (Asinius) Pollio, Varius and Vergil; further Maecenas and (Valerius) Messalla; and ten more, who are mentioned by name, and who were certain or probable members of the literary circles of Maecenas, Pollio and Messalla. A total of fifteen, and in addition ‘compluris alios, doctos ego quos et amicos/prudens praetereo’, 87–88, as against the large reading public – the ‘turba’ of vs. 73, an exaggerated maximum – which, Horace implies, Lucilius strove to satisfy. Brink has rightly concluded, on different grounds, that ‘the very satire which has found fault with Lucilius’ poetic standards ends by demanding a more discriminating type of reader than Lucilius did’. 23

The above catalogue of names is set within a special kind of frame, one of ὑπερπάνω and τεταρτάς, in vss. 78–80 and 90b–91; that is, once more (cf. vss. 17b–19, 36–37) in prominent positions, at the beginning and end of a section. Horace is having a final fling at his literary opponents, the ‘louse’ Pantilius, Demetrius (the ‘ape’ of vs. 18), Hermogenes Tigellius (the ‘pulcher’ of vs. 17) and the ‘blockhead’ Fannius, all members of a rival literary party to those mentioned above.

One of the main themes of I,4 and I,10 is that of models, in two senses: a) models as ‘exemplaria’, moral and (or) literary examples who set a standard which is worth following and improving; and b), models in the sense of ideal readers. In the first section of I,4 we have the writers of Attic comedy as implicit ‘exemplaria’, according to Horace, with the main emphasis on their outspoken moral criticism; and in the seventh section (vss. 103b–129a) we encounter the poet’s father as moral ‘exemplar’; while 4,71–74a foreshadows the theme of ‘pauci lectores’ whom the poet regards as discriminate, model readers.

The following scheme will show how the theme of models in both senses, but particularly in the sense of the ‘exemplar’, runs right through the tenth satire:

| 1–19 exemplar: ‘comoedia prisca’ (emphasis on style) |
| 20–35 Latinity ‘exemplar’ (‘pater Latinus’ ~ ‘pater optimus’, 4,105) |
| 36–49 exemplaria in genres: comedy, Fundanius tragedy, Pollio epic, Varius pastoral, Vergil satire: Lucilius (‘inventor’) but Horace as new model: |

23. Brink, Horace 169. Brink bases his argument on Lucilius’ record of the kind of readers for whom he wrote (595–6M, 532–4W). Perhaps, as Armstrong has suggested, Horace does take advantage of Lucilius’ own claim that he meant to be read neither by the learned nor the ignorant, but those in between (Arion 3, 1964, 94). If this supposition is correct, Horace is certainly too harsh in his implied judgment of Lucilius’ choice of readers.
In regard to I,4 and I,10, it remains to consider as briefly as possible the twofold question of a development in Horace's appreciation of Lucilius, and in his theory of satire. We shall have to determine how far the distinction is merely one of different formulations, i.e. how far Horace purposely – because it suited his specific purpose – gave different formulations in I,10 to those in I,4; and how far the difference is merely one of amplification and of complementary observations in so far as I,4 and I,10 form, as it were, two chapters dealing with the same general subject.

Eduard Fraenkel concludes his analysis of I,4 by pointing out that, while the discussion on metre and style is not of secondary importance, Horace does give the lion’s share in this piece to the moral vindication of satire. That corresponds to the moral contents of his demonstrably earliest satires, I,2 and I,3. Of the opening section of I,10 he goes on to say that, whereas in I,4 Lucilius was merely in general terms accused of hasty and slovenly workmanship, Horace now gives a piece of constructive criticism in announcing his stylistic ‘commandments’ for satire (I, 10,9–15). Fraenkel proceeds to emphasise that in the present context these stylistic demands are by no means a mere matter of form: 'As is clear from the whole section, and particularly from its conclusion, ridiculum acri fortius et melius plerumque secat res, the dominating interest is in the moral function of this kind of writing or ... in the moral conceptions that lie behind it'.

The question arises whether the dominating interest has not, in fact, shifted.25 Certainly, if we do not interpret style in the narrow sense as relating to:

25. I am indebted to Gregor Maurach for a most helpful discussion of this question. While I would agree that Horace's chief aim in writing satire was the aesthetic one of 'recte scribere' (I,4,13, cf. 'pulchra poemata', I,10,6 and 'bona carmina', 2,1,83), I cannot agree with Knoche when he infers from the three literary satires of Horace that our poet pursued – in contrast to the polemical writings of Lucilius – 'rein künstlerische Ziele' in his Sermones (Philol. 90, 1935, 374, n. 9, my italics; for other pronouncements, which cannot always be reconciled with each other, cf. Knoche, Die römische Satire, Göttingen 1957, 50, last paragraph, contd. on p. 51; and id., Gymnas. 67, 1960, 67). On the moral function of Horace's works, with special reference to Sat. 1,1–3, see most recently and briefly, K.H. Abel in A.M.A. 15, 1969, 39, where the function of the moral self-improvement of the poet is over-emphasised. On Horace's aims, see finally E. Burck, Nachwort (Satiren), 38f. and n. 1.
exclusively to ‘form’, it seems quite clear that the dominating interest in 1,10,9–15 lies not in moral function or conceptions. This is indicated clearly at the beginning of the poem where Horace – as opposed to 1,4 – starts with *stylistic* criticism (‘incompositus pes’). His positive stylistic requirements in vss. 9–15 consist of:

1. ‘Brevitas’, so as to achieve a free flow of content and avoid an entangled form that will weary the reader’s ears.

2. ‘Variatio’ of style employed: the ‘triste’ and the ‘iocosum’, in accordance with the style now of ‘rhetor atque poeta’, now of the ‘urbanus’. The demand of ‘brevitas’ is also made in regard to the style of the ‘urbanus’: ‘parcentis viribus atque extenuantis eas consulto’.

3. Of these means or styles, the ‘ridiculum’ is often more effective than the ‘acre’.

In fact, it is clear from the text and context that all three requirements are demanded with a view to an effective achievement of the critical aim of satire. But the emphasis falls on *style* and its *effectiveness*, and only at the end of the passage do we find a brief and explicit mention of the critical – and not exclusively moral – aim of satire (‘secat res’, vs. 15).

How does this compare with the beginning of 1,4, apart from the shift in the dominating interest from the mainly moral to the mainly stylistic? We have seen26 why Horace in 1,4 praises Lucilius without qualification for his ‘multa libertas’ and his humorous and critical qualities or faculties; and why on these points – with the stress on ‘multa libertas’ – he derives him essentially from Attic Comedy. He did so partly in accordance with the principle of weighing up ‘virtutes’ against ‘vitia’ as formulated in 1,3, and partly because he wanted to assert a distinguished literary tradition for Lucilius and – implicitly – for himself. As for Lucilius’ ‘vitia’, he immediately proceeds to balance his praise with criticism of style (8b–9a, etc.):

\begin{verbatim}
durus conponere versus, nam fuit hoc vitiostus:
\end{verbatim}

Now in 10,9–15 Horace deals with basically the same points, but in reverse order, and the question is, whether there is any real difference, or merely an amplification.

1. As against the negative criticism of Lucilius’ prolix and muddy style in 4,8b–13, Horace now deals *briefly* with the *positive* requirement of ‘brevitas’.

2. As against ‘magna libertas’ and ‘facetus, emunctae naris’, we now find the poet enlarging on the distinctive qualities of Attic Comedy, consisting in its ‘variatio’ in respect of style and means employed.

3. Not only does Lucilius lack this ‘variatio’ (this was omitted in 1,4, because there Horace wanted to *praise* Lucilius’ critical and humorous

faculty), but there is too much of the ‘acre’ instead of the ‘ridiculum’ in his satire. And so we find that in the fourth section of the poem Horace can no longer state absolutely, but only provisionally, that Lucilius was ‘facetus’ in the sense of ‘comis et urbanus’ (vs. 65).

Now Rudd has rightly argued that in formulating the ideal style for satire in I,10, Horace quite evidently did not exclude ‘the element of astringent criticism’ from his satire.27 This element includes, under the term ‘acre’, the criticism of opponents by name;28 i.e., it includes the ‘libertas’ of Lucilius (though not his ‘magna libertas’, since Horace after I,2 did not satirise any important living person by name); and so in the very tenth satire we find the poet practising within his own limits (cf. 4,103, ‘liberius’) this ‘libertas’ in vss. 17–19, 36–37, 59–63, 78–80, and 90–91. In this regard Wili has rightly pointed out that ‘die 10. Satire (zeigt) die kräftigsten persönlichen Angriffe neben der frühen zweiten Satire’.29

So far we have not found any real development, but rather an amplification, in Horace’s conception of Lucilius and in his theory (and practice) of satire. In regard to Horace’s own style it is worth noting here Fraenkel’s observation that in the brilliant finale to I,2 – probably the earliest in order of composition – there is ‘a racy elegance and a perfection of rhythm ... Not even at this early stage did Horace fall short of the high stylistic standard for the writing of satires on which he insists in a later satire (I,10,9f.)’.30 In regard to structure the present author has further shown that already in I,2 Horace had attained to a mastery over form.31

Brink has made the following very sober and, in my opinion, entirely correct pronouncement: ‘The first literary satire lays the foundation for all of Horace’s literary criticism ... The critical basis [in I,10 and II,1] remains but the purpose is more specific in each case’.32 Brink limits himself to a consideration of points that amplify the earlier position. Here we should note that in I,10 new stylistic judgments crop up which had not been considered in I,4, either because the earlier piece was concerned mainly with the moral requirements of satire, or because in I,10 there may have been a real development in Horace’s judgment of Lucilian satire.

An example of the first kind occurs in the second section of I,10, that viz. which deals with parity of Latin diction. Since the subject of this section (vss. 20–30, with 31–35 as an appendix) concerns ‘Latinitas’, it quite correctly appears in the second member of the pair which deals mainly—and henceforth exclusively—with style or stylistic demands. I have suggested in a tentative
manner that here too a link may be found with I,4, i.e. that 'pater Latinus' (10,27) links up with Horace's 'pater optimus'(4,105). If this interpretation is correct, Horace is implying that his satire with its Roman moral root in his father (I,4), will express itself in pure Latin language (I,10); and that in this respect he will avoid the example of his Graeco-Latin exemplar, Lucilius.

In the third section of I,10 (vss. 36-45) we encounter Lucilius as the 'inventor' of the genre, while at the beginning of I,4 he had been characterised as essentially dependent on Attic Comedy (particularly its outspoken moral criticism), except in regard to literary form. The difference is easily explained if we bear in mind that the greater part of I,4 deals with the moral function of satire, and that Horace's specific purpose here was to establish a distinguished literary lineage for satire. In the relevant section of I,10 his purpose is different. He is concerned with contemporary literary genres and with expert exponents of these: while he regards it as his own task to improve on the work (style) of his predecessors in satire ('melius ... scribere', 47), he acknowledges Lucilius as the 'inventor' of the genre, and only as such does he regard him as his superior ('inventore minor', 48).33

Certainly Horace did not come to grasp the fact that Lucilius was the 'inventor' (in an unqualified sense) of the new type of polemic 'satura' only when he wrote I,10, though it is only here, and in II,1,62ff. that he acknowledges him as such.34

We next find that in both pieces, I,4 and I,10, Horace criticises Lucilius for being 'lutulentus' and longwinded (4,9–12; 10,36–7 implicitly, 50–1) and for his rough versification (4,8ff.; 10,1–2, 9–10, 56ff.). However, in the fourth section of the later piece we encounter what is clearly a new feature of the poem. This is the constructive principle that if Lucilius lived in the age of Horace, he would perfect his style (67b–71, cf. 72–3); and it is a principle that is combined with positive appreciation of Lucilius' stylistic ability compared with that of his predecessors (65b–67a, cf. 51–55).

It is tempting to see this principle of the stylistic requirements of the poet's (= critic's) own time not only as a new feature in I,10, but as a development in Horace's conception of Lucilian satire and in his standards of literary criticism – of which it remains a feature, as Brink has emphasised.35 On the other hand its presence in I,10 may be readily explained without recourse to any theory of a radical change or development in Horace's literary theory after he had composed I,4. The fact of the matter is that in

33. On (a) the 'narrower argument' of the 'imitator' (Horace) and the 'inventor' (Lucilius) as distinguished from (b) the wider subject of the technical sufficiency of satire, see Brink, *Horace* 165. Note how 'melius scribere', 47 links (a) with (b), and cf. 'recte scribere' in 4,13.

34. See further, also on the relation of 10,48 to 10,66 ('Graecis intacti carminis auctor'), *Van Rooy, Studies* pp. 53,45 n.6 and 82 n.4.

35. Brink, *Horace*, 166, n. 3.
the earlier piece Horace does not give us a ‘carefully balanced essay in literary theory’ or criticism; in particular, he is concerned there with literary ‘vitia’ (and ‘virtutes’) as such. In the later piece, on the other hand, we do have a mainly balanced essay in literary criticism, and this would quite naturally explain why he now introduces a comparative principle which manifests historical sense and perspective.

We have seen that in both satires Horace criticises Lucilius by implication for being eager for publicity amongst the masses (4,14–21a, 73–74a; I,10, 73–74a). That Horace himself was not eager for publicity (4,22b–23, 73–74a; 10,38–9, 73–74a) is partly a pose in both pieces, but partly true in the sense that he did not write for the ‘vulgus’ or ‘turba’. Certainly his profession that he did not want to publish may be regarded as a pose in both poems (4,71–2; 10,74b–76a).

While there may be difference of opinion on the interpretation of these passages, it will be generally agreed that in part of I,4 Horace did pose as a timid spirit anxious to avoid offence (e.g. vss. 17–8). While it is important to recognise this pose for what it is, it is equally important to recognise that Horace is not really lacking in confidence in I,4 in regard to the spirit of satire. There is nothing ‘apologetic’ about the opening passage of I,4, which consists of true praise and a firm statement, if an overstatement. If this is recognised, doubts will arise about the implication of Rudd’s statement — for the fourth satire — that Satire 10 shows that Horace ‘no longer needs the protection of Lucilius. He can stand on his own feet’.

We have found that in Sat. I,10, composed as one of a pair with I,4, Horace employed some of the same techniques as he did in composing and (or) editing 1 and 2 and 3 and 4 respectively as pairs. These methods include allusions or repetitions by means of the use of the same word(s) and names, of similar phrases, and of the same or similar themes within the larger theme. In addition, I,4 is quoted — indirectly or directly — three times in I,10; and in both pieces Horace employs the method of ‘substitute’ criticism of Lucilius.

36. Rudd, Horace 85.
37. Contra Rudd on Sat. 10, cited by Van Rooy, Studies, 86 n. 68.
38. Rudd, Horace 92.
39. Rudd, Horace 94. Fraenkel, Horace, 128 draws an even more marked distinction between the fourth and the tenth satires.
40. In addition to the examples given in the text above, note e.g. that ‘capsis’, used of Cassius in 10,63, links up with ‘capsis’ used of Fannius in 4,22 (the word ‘capsa’ does not occur elsewhere in the whole of the Satires). Note further ‘turba’ at 4,25 and 143 and at 10,67 and 73; and the key-word parcere in 4, vss. 35, 107 and 127 and in 10,13.
   As for names, that of Petillius (Capitolinus) occurs only at 4,94 and 10,26; the cantor Tigellius Hermogenes links not only 3 and 4 as a pair, but also 4 and 10 (4,72 and 10,80 and 90). Finally, Fannius is found only at 4,21 and 10,80.
41. Cf. 10,1 ‘dixi’ which alludes to 4,8b; 10,4 which refers not only to 4,7b–8a (Heinze), but more particularly to 4,5f.; and 10,50f. which refers to 4,11.
There are, of course, important differences between our present pair on the
one hand and the previous pairs on the other hand. While the first four
satires all deal with different subjects, 4 and 10 are both concerned with
the theory of satire in general and the satire of Lucilius and of Horace in
particular. Despite the general similarity of theme, they are marked by
differences in regard to content, structure and theory; though, as we have
seen, the latter (on theory) with perhaps one exception are to be regarded
merely as amplifications or as additions in so far as Horace had a different
purpose in each of the two pieces, or simply could not deal with every topic
relevant to his theme in one piece or 'chapter'.

Thus we have seen that the subject of 'Latinitas' is introduced in 10 for
a quite natural reason: it is a topic which concerns *style*. Horace will not
follow Lucilius in his excessive use or importation of Greek words. The
question arises - as in regard to other aspects of Horace's theory of satire -
how far the critic practised what he preached. M. E. Keirns gives a summary
of her inquiry into 'The Use of Greek Words in Horace's Satires and
Epistles', concluding as follows: 'In his use of Greek words, Horace's
standards seem to have been moderation and appropriateness. Our final
estimate is that (of 219 possible Greek words) only 90 are really Greek
words; the thorough Latinization of 129 is indicated by form, meaning and
extent of use'.

The ideal of moderation brings us back, finally, to its opposite number,
*insania*, which - as we have seen - echoes through Satires 2,3,4,5,6 and 10.
For Horace *insania* in I,2 means a reckless extravagance, mentally and (or)
materially, and it is manifested by all extravagant characters who do not
observe *modestia* or a *modus* in the sense of moderation. This means that the
*insanus* does not observe the right measure, as is clearly shown by the link
between 2,76f.:

\[
\text{tu si modo recte dispensare velis ac non fugienda petendis inmiscere}
\]

and 2,96-7:

\[
\text{si interdicta petes, vallo circumdata (nam te hoc facit insanum), multae tibi tum officient res’ etc.}
\]

It seems clear that the *insanus* is the person who cannot 'recte dispensare', cf.
'procedere recte' (2,37). Neither the verb *insanire* nor the adjective *insanus*

---

42. *TAPA* 63, 1932, lvii-lviii; see also Rudd, *Horace* 111–5, and especially 117 on A.P. 48–53.
occurs in the first satire; but we have encountered the same doctrine in its positive aspect in 1,106f.:

\[
\text{est modus in rebus, sunt certi denique fines quos ultra citraque nequit consistere rectum.}
\]

In the third satire the *insanus* is once again explicitly the person who goes to extremes, either in punishing a slave or *even a friend* for a trivial offence. According to Horace the master of the slave would be ‘*insanior*’, 83 than the (crazy) jurisconsult Labeo, while the one who refuses to forgive a friend for a trivial offence would act ‘*furiosius*’, 84.

The theme of the *insanus* in the sexual or marital sphere is encountered again in the fourth satire, thus linking it with the second. *Insania* is not used in I,4 with reference to the writing of satire, but its opposite number does crop up very clearly. Horace is concerned with the art ‘*scribendi recte*’, vs. 13, a principle Lucilius failed to observe by his excesses, in particular his proliﬁcity and his rough versification.44 Naturally Horace would not have wanted to style Lucilius ‘insanus’ on account of his stylistic shortcomings or excesses. In I,10, however, in developing the theme of Lucilius’ overfondness for Greek words, he goes on to speak of his own *insania* (cf. ‘*insanius*’, 34) in trying to write Greek verses. Once again the term occurs in a context which implies going to an extreme. Otherwise the term does not appear in the tenth Satire.45 But the conclusion of the *Ars Poetica* (vs. 453ff.) leaves us in no doubt as to the sentiments of Horace about the long-winded poet whom he there calls ‘*vesanum*’ . . . *poetam*’, 455, one who is raving mad (‘*furit*’, 472) and reads his victims to death (‘*occidit legendo*’, 475).46

In conclusion, there is perhaps no passage in I,10 which better illustrates *moderation*, as the chief literary principle in Horace’s theory of satire, than vs. 9–15, starting with ‘*est brevitate opus*’ and concluding with ‘*ridiculum acri fortius*’.

44. Cf. the article by Cynthia Dessen, *AJP* 88, 1967, 78–81 showing that the theme of literary and moral *discipline* vs. a lack of *moderation* – both reﬂected in Horace’s skilful imagery and terminology – uniﬁes the greater part of Satire 4.

45. For the signiﬁcance of the use of *insanus* and related terms in Sat. 1,5 and 6, see *infra*, p. 57ff. In Satire 10 ‘*de mens*’ is found at vs. 74.

46. The doctrine contained in *A.P.* 455–6 and 475 is found already in Sat. 1,9, vs. 4 and 33–4, as V. Buchheit has shown (*Gymn.* 75, 1968, 539 and n. 1). It is also found in 1,3,88f. ‘*amaras / porrecto iugulo historias captivus ut audit*’, and it is implied in 1,10,36 ‘*turgides Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona*’. 25
APPENDIX

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ADDENDA TO 'ARRANGEMENT AND STRUCTURE OF SATIRES IN HORACE, SERMONES, BOOK I, WITH MORE SPECIAL REFERENCE TO SATIRES 1–4'

I should like to take this opportunity of adding some (mainly early) titles as bibliographical addenda to the above-mentioned first article (AClass XI, 1968, 37–82) in this series on the composition and structure of Sermones, Book I. In chronological order they are the following:

General
4. I have not seen the continuation of Knoche's enquiry (no 1 supra) by H. Wieland, Beobachtungen zur Bewegungsführung in den Satiren und Episteln des Horaz, Diss. Freiburg/Breisgau 1950 (typescript) cited by Burck, Nachwort 373, n. 2.

Satire 1

Satire 2

On links between Sat. 1 and Sat. 2
11. On the subject of names linking Satires (cf. my note 28 in A Class XI, 1968, 55), add Iuppiter at Sat. 1, 20 and Sat. 2,18; the name does not occur elsewhere in Sermones, Book I.

Satire 3

Satire 4
14. In AClass XI, 1968, 57 I have made the division of Sat. 4 into sections, dealing alternately with the moral function and the artistic form of satire, too tidy by using the term 'mainly' only with reference to section (ii), vss. 8b–21a: 'mainly on artistic form'. The
term 'mainly' should apply to all sections, and this correction has been made above, p. 7.

On the structural difference between Sat. 4 and Sat. 10, see very briefly Hanslik, *Comm. Vind. III*, 30.

15. On Sat. 4, vss. 78b–104, see briefly Wili, *Horaz* 80.

16. In *AClass XI*, 1968, 62 I have accepted the variant reading and punctuation (so also Kiessling-Heinze) at Sat. 4, 34b–35:

\[
\text{dummodo} \text{ ecutiat, sibi non, non cuiquam parcret amico;}
\]

- instead of the vulgate (vs. 35) 'excutiat sibi, non hic cuiquam parcret amico'. G. L. Hendrickson, *AJP* 21, 1900, 128 accepts a different reading, but rightly points out that the satirist, as Horace finds that people conceive of him, is none other than the coarse and inconsiderate θαμολόχος whom Aristotle describes (Eth. Nic. IV 14, 1128a36): οὐτὲ ἐαυτοῦ οὔτε τῶν ἄλλων ἀπεχόμενος, ἐκ γέλωσι τοιήσει.'

On links between Sat. 3 and Sat. 4

17. Kiessling-Heinze 46, rejected by Hanslik, *Comm. Vind. III*, 29, who argues (27ff.) that Sat. 3 must have been written after Sat. 4. The generally accepted view that Sat. 3 in its original form follows closely after Sat. 2 (see briefly Wili, *Horaz* 91, n.l.) and precedes 4 is substantiated by the many echoes of Sat. 3 in Sat. 4, cf. *AClass XI*, 1968, 56–68. To these echoes I would now add 3, 16 'huic parco, paucis contento' (ironic) and 3,49 'parcius hic vivit: frugi dicatur' ~ 4,107f. cum me hortaretur, parce frugaliter atque/ viverem uti contentus evo' etc.

On the subject in general, reference may now also be made to W.S. Anderson, Recent Work in Roman Satire (1962–68), in *CW* 63, 1970, 188f.
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