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1–8. As for the proscribed Rupilius Rex (‘King’), a man with a foul and venomous tongue – what manner the cross-breed Persius took vengeance on him is, I think, well-known to all blear-eyed patients and barbers. This Persius, a wealthy man, had very large business affairs [5] in Clazomenae, and now also irksome disputes with Rex. A harsh fellow he was, one that could well beat Rex in offensiveness: he was bold-faced, bombastic and so bitter of speech that he could outstrip the Sisennas or the Barri with his white steeds.

9–21. But to return to Rex. When he and Persius did not come to terms [10] – indeed when a conflict face to face has befallen men, they are all quite rightly as stiff-necked as they are brave (heroes): between Hector, son of Priam, and the dauntless Achilles the wrath was so deadly that in the end only death could part them, and for no other reason than that the courage which inspired both of them [15] was supreme; but if two cowards chance to quarrel, or an ill-matched pair meet in war, as did Diomedes and the Lycian Glaucus, the more reluctant man would give way and send gifts to boot – so, when Brutus as praetor held rich Asia, Rupilius and Persius clashed, a pair [20] as well matched as Bacchius and Bithus. Furious, they rush into court, each a wondrous sight to behold.

22–31. Persius sets forth the case: all the court laughs at him. He praises Brutus, and he praises his staff. ‘Sun of Asia’ he calls Brutus, and ‘healthful stars’[25] his suite – all but Rex, who, he said, had come like the Dogstar, the one hated by farmers. On he rushed like a winter torrent, whither the axe (of the woodcutter) is seldom brought. Then, in answer to his copious flow of sharp wit, the Praenestine retorts with abuse, the true essence of the vineyard, like some tough [30] and invincible vinedresser to whom the wayfarer – when loudly hooting at him ‘Cuckoo’! – had often yielded.

32–35. But the Greek Persius, when well souse with Italian vinegar, cries out: ‘By the great gods, Brutus, I implore you, since you are used to taking off kings, why don’t you cut the throat of this Rex? This, believe me, is just the task for you!’

* This article on Sat. I,7 in volume XIV (1971) of Acta Classica is the fourth in a series under the same general title. For the earlier articles, see AClass XI, 1968, 37–82 (on Sat. I, 1–4) and AClass XIII, 1970, 7–25 and 45–59 (on Sat. I,4 and I,10, and on I,5 and I,6 respectively). For acknowledgements to the Human Sciences Research Council in Pretoria, and also to colleagues, see AClass XIII, 1970, 7, note*.
The subject of the seventh satire\(^1\) is a 'lis' in the sense of a law-suit which turns out to be largely an exchange of invective, but is finally and rapidly decided by an urbane touch of wit. The parties involved are Rupilius Rex, who had been proscribed by the triumvirs in 43 B.C. and had fled to Asia Minor,\(^2\) and Persius, a half-Greek half-Roman businessman from Clazomenae. The case is presented as coming before Brutus who had usurped the province, and who as pro-praetor was holding court (while Horace was serving as tribune in his army). In a loose and tacit manner I,\(^7\) links up with I,\(^6\) where Horace maintains that people carp at him as a freedman's son because he had held a military tribunate (vss. 46–8).

The poem consists of four main sections marked by Horace in no uncertain manner: (i) vss. 1–8 (ii) vss. 9–21 (iii) vss. 22–31 (iv) vss. 32–35. While the beginning of the first two sections is indicated by the name Rex,\(^3\) the name Persius marks the beginning of the third and the fourth (in the last section 'Graecus', 32 = 'Persius', 33). Moreover 'postquam' etc. in the first line (vs. 9) of (ii) is balanced by 'postquam' etc. in the first line (vs. 32) of (iv); and the beginning and end of the second section is further marked by 'utrumque' and 'uterque' respectively at the end of the first and last lines of that section. Finally, the end of each section is marked by a typically Roman (or Italian) metaphor, simile or expression. It remains to indicate, at a later stage,\(^4\) how the long excursus or parenthesis (10–18a), which forms a subsection of (ii), is embedded in the content and structure of the poem as a whole.

---

1. On Sat. I,\(^7\) see L. Radermacher, *Wien. Stud.* 44, 1924/25, 210–8; Fraenkel, *Horace* 118–121; N. Rudd, *The Satires of Horace* (to be cited as Rudd, *Horace*) 64–7; R. Schröter, *Poetica* 1, 1967 (to be cited as Schröter), 8–23; and V. Buchheit, *Gymnasium* 75, 1968 (to be cited as Buchheit) 519–55, esp. 542ff. (briefly also in *Acta Phil.* Aenipontana 2, 1967, 29f.); and for background on the actuality of the political innuendo in Sat. I,\(^7\) see J. Dunkle, 'The Greek Tyrant and Roman Political Invective of the late Republic' in *TAPA* 98, 1967, 151–71. Schröter points out that although the key to the poem lies in the 'Homeric' parenthesis (vss. 10–18a), the whole poem has been composed as a Homeric parody; and for the Homeric 'originals' of a large number of terms and expressions in I,\(^7\), the reader should consult Schröter 15–18. The parodic detail, which has been considered by both Schröter and Buchheit, will not come up for discussion in the present chapter except where difference of opinion arises and where further elucidation is required.

2. On the problem of the identity of Rupilius, see *RE* 2. Reihe, I,\(^1\) (1914), col. 1231f.

3. Note that 'ad Regem redeo', 9 provides a formal link with the previous poem, 6,\(^4\) 'nunc ad me redeo libertino patre natum'. In both cases the expression serves to mark the beginning of the second section of the poem, and in both Horace adapts a halfline from Lucilius ('nunc ad te redeo', 1075W, 1227M, 1251K, cf. Fraenkel, *Horace* 103 and n. 2, 121). The fragments of Lucilius are cited according to the editions of Warmington, of Marx, and of W. Krenkel, *Lucilius Satiren*, 2 vols., Berlin 1970 (cited as Krenkel or in the case of fragments, as K).

A brief analysis of the contents may be added to this analysis of the main lines of the structure of the poem. This will serve the purpose of noting some of the points which will come up for comment when we turn to Vinzenz Buchheit’s recent interpretation of the significance of 1.7 as a subtle combination of Homeric parody and literary or stylistic criticism.

(i) 1–8. Horace proposes to tell of the reputedly well-known lawsuit between the proscribed Rupilius Rex, a Praenestine and a Roman ex-praetor, briefly but pungently characterised as ‘pus atque venenum’, and the ‘hybrid’ Persius, a wealthy business-man from Clazomenae more extensively characterised as an overbearing man with an extremely bitter tongue. On the face of it ‘hybrida’ means a half-Greek half-Roman, but the term probably requires more comment than it has received heretofore.

(ii) 9–21. Since these two stiff-necked men could not come to terms, they had to meet in battle like the (Homeric) heroes of old. When these were equally matched, like Hector and Achilles, only death could part them; but if unequally matched, as were Diomedes and the Lycian Glaucus, the less valiant (‘pigrior’) declines to fight and sends gifts into the bargain. Rupilius and Persius were well-matched and they stormed into the court of Brutus in a spirited manner.

(iii) 22–31. Persius sets forth the case in a florid Asianic style, signified by his terminology – e.g. he calls Brutus ‘Sun of Asia’ – and by the torrential flow of his address. The man of Praeneste, i.e. Rex, retorts to his salty wit (‘salso’, 29) with rustic abuse typical of a ‘durus vindemiamtor’, a tough vine-dresser.

(iv) 32–35. After being drenched with the Italian vinegar of the Praenestine, Persius – now significantly styled Graecus for the first time in the poem – wins the day by imploring Brutus, as traditional regicide, to cut the throat of this Rex.

Buchheit rightly observes that we are told nothing about the substance of the law-suit, and that the decision in favour of Persius (the outcome is anticipated as early as vs. 2) does not follow from the case itself. Despite the importance of the concluding pun, our main concern should be with the ‘How’, the manner of eloquence of both parties, and the artistic form and expression which it is given throughout the poem. Hitherto, he submits, it has escaped notice that the function of the majority of the ‘characterising terms’ in the poem is one of literary criticism, and that unambiguously so.

5. On vs. 3 ‘omnibus et lippis notum et tonsoribus esse’, see Fraenkel, *Horace* 119, whose interpretation is accepted by Buchheit 542, n. 121; cf. also Schröter 19, who rightly links the verse with Lucilius’ line at the beginning of his poem (Book 2) on the trial of Scaevola by Albucius: ‘fandam atque auditam iterabimus [famam]’ (53W, 55M, 56K).

6. For an analysis of vss. 23–6, see E. Doblhofer, *Die Augustuspanegyrik des Horaz in formalhistorischer Sicht* (to be quoted as Doblhofer), Heidelberg 1966, 17–21.

What follows is a summary of Buchheit’s interpretation (p. 544ff.) of I,7 as a piece of literary criticism. Since the footnotes that illustrate and substantiate his interpretation are too copious to be reproduced here in toto, the reader is requested to consult them without fail.8

In the very first verse the introduction of Rupilius Rex as ‘pus’ and ‘venenum’ should be related to literary criticism, particularly with reference to two Catullan poems.9 Again, it is said of Rupilius as a ‘Praenestinus’, i.e. as a Roman, 28ff. – against the ‘Graecus’ (31) Persius – that as ‘durus vindemiator’ he flings abuse extracted from a vineyard at his opponent; when this kind of terminology is compared with specific Catullan poems and with similar expressions in the stylistic criticism of Cicero, of Quintilian and particularly of Horace himself,10 there can be no doubt about the purpose of these expressions.

The same is true of the characterisation of the more successful Graecus Persius. He has a sharp tongue (‘amari sermonis’), and he is ‘tumidus’: the latter is a term used since Callimachus (παχὺ as opposed to the ideal of the ἀσπινῶν, the poema tenue), and it became the usual expression from Lucilius to Horace for ‘grosse, wenig vollendete Dichtung und asianisch gefärbte Rede’. Similar to ‘tumidus’ is the term ‘turgidus’ used by Horace in Sat. 1,10,36ff.11 to criticise the swollen style of the epic poet:

\[
\text{turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona dumque diffingit Rheni luteum caput}
\]

– ‘while the turgid Alpman cuts Memnon’s throat and botches with mud the head of the Rhine . . . .’ In the second of these verses there is a definite allusion to the metaphor of the ‘fluvius lutulentus’, the ‘muddy river’, with which epic style was criticised since the time of Callimachus.12

The above interpretation is further supported by the description of Persius’ speech as a winter torrent in an inaccessible gorge (26b–27), a characterisation similar to ‘tumidus’ in its literary significance from the time of Aristo-

---

8. For the Homeric parody which forms an essential element of the stylistic criticism, see also Buchheit’s analysis of the content of I,7 on p. 542f., and cf. his n. 120: ‘Heranziehen ist ständig SCHRÖTER 15ff.’
10. See the literature referred to by Buchheit 544, n. 128. The passages in Horace are: Sat. 1,4,8 on Lucilius; Ars 446f.; Epist. 2,1,159f. where Roman ‘rusticitas’ is contrasted with Greek ‘ars’, cf. 156–60.
12. Cf. C. O. Brink, Horace on Poetry (to be cited as Brink, Horace) 159.
phanes and especially Callimachus;¹³ and by the Asianic style of vss. 23–5.

While it is true that the Greek Persius does not satisfy the artistic demands of Horace, he does have the quality of being 'salsus', i.e. he is witty ('geistreich'), as is proved by his pun at the end of the poem. That is why he emerges as victor from the contest. When in vs. 31 Greek salt and Italian pungency are opposed to each other, Horace's sympathy is, notwithstanding certain reservations,¹⁴ on the side of the 'sal Graecum'.

So far Buchheit, who next argues that the witty account of the legal contest between the Praenestine and the Greek, if correctly interpreted by him, was merely an external inducement for Horace to draw a comparison in an early work between the literary accomplishments of the Greeks and the Romans. To substantiate this conception of I,7 he appendes three sections (p. 564ff.) on 1) the favour accorded by Horace to the exemplaria Graeca in his Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica; 2) the function of Homeric parody in I,7, particularly in the parenthesis in the second section of the poem, as interpreted by him on p. 548–550; and 3) a comparison with Lucilius Book 2.

Here I must leave the exposition of Buchheit, partly for reasons of space, partly because I cannot follow him on some points. Leaving aside for the present Lucilius Book 2 to which I shall return in an Appendix, I cannot accept his interpretation of the parenthesis as regards 2); with regard to 1), I find that the most important passage which I consider to be relevant to a correct interpretation of I,7, viz. Sat. 1,10,9–17a, receives no consideration at all, except for a brief reference to vs. 9 in a foot-note (n. 134). The passage to which I refer concludes with the well-known lines (14b–17a):

\[
\text{ridiculum acri fortius et melius magnaque secat res. illi scripta quibus \textit{comoedia prisca} viris est hoc stabaat, hoc sunt imitandi.}
\]

'Great issues are usually resolved more forcefully and more effectively by wit than by castigation. This was the mainstay of the men who wrote Old Comedy; this is what makes them worth imitating' (transl. Rudd).

But to return to the poem itself. Buchheit has rendered us a most valuable service in pointing out that I,7 is closely related to the ninth as well as to the fourth and tenth satires. On the other hand I submit that his interpretation of some of the details of I,7 and in part of the significance of the poem as a whole, rests on two premises which are unacceptable. These are, firstly, the premise that 'ein Grossteil der charakterisierenden Termini \textit{eindeutig} literarkritische Funktion hat' (p. 544, my italics, cf. p. 548). I maintain that, on the contrary, the majority of these terms are ambiguous in their meaning.

---

¹³. Cf. Sat., I,10,62 on the 'ingenium' of Cassius, 'rapido ferventius amni'.
¹⁴. Cf. similarly Sat. 1,10,3b–4 and 7, also 9, on Lucilius. On Buchheit's references in n. 134, see n. 49 infra.
and that punning is not restricted to the concluding section of the poem; as regards the ambiguity of certain terms, this should be related to different levels of meaning with which the poem was composed (intentionally so, on the part of Horace). The second premise, which is demonstrably wrong, is the contrast Greek (Persius) – Roman (Rupilius) which Buchheit draws right from the beginning of the poem.\textsuperscript{15} In fact, the contrast down to the end of the third section, i.e. for 31 out of a total of 35 verses, is between a cross-breed, i.e. \textit{half-Greek}, half-Roman, Persius, and a \textit{Praenestine} (i.e. a Latin), Rupilius. Only in the last four lines, from vs. 32 (‘At Graecus’, significantly at the beginning of the verse) does Persius the ‘hybrida’ become a Greek, and for a very significant reason, as we shall see.\textsuperscript{16}

In our interpretation of the seventh satire it is essential to observe that (down to vs. 31) Horace – in Palmer’s words – ‘deals his thrusts impartially at both Persius and Rupilius’.\textsuperscript{17} Since Palmer does not substantiate this judgement, it will be necessary to do so in some detail. We should start by noting that – just as in \textit{1,9} – our poem has both a moral and a literary significance; and that in the first line the \textit{unit} ‘pus atque venenum’ has a purely moral significance.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{15} Buchheit 542 and 544.
\textsuperscript{16} It cannot even be maintained with Buchheit (552 n. 163) that Horace operates in the second \textit{half} of the poem with the term \textit{Graecus} for Persius.
\textsuperscript{17} As regards Rupilius, it is somewhat misleading to speak of him as \textit{Praenestinus} ‘d.h. als Römer’ (Buchheit 544). As inhabitants of Latium the people of Praeneste could be appropriately described as half-Roman half-Italian; and as for Horace, he merely calls Rupilius a ‘Praenestinus’ (vs. 28) and speaks of his Italian wit (‘Italo aceto’, vs. 32). Buchheit 544, n. 127 remarks, with reference to F. Leo and to Mariotti: ‘Als Pränestiner spricht er ohnehin kein besonders gutes Latein . . . Horaz knüpfte dabei an Lucilius an’, cf. Quint. I,5,56. I do not think that the Latin spoken by the Praenestini is relevant to the satire in any way (the same applies to the Latin of Persius, cf. Dobelhofer 21, n. 11). If the choice of Rupilius as \textit{Praenestinus} as opponent to Persius, the witty half-Greek, has a special significance, it would be relevant to his ‘Italum acetum’ or acid wit, cf. the fact that the Praenestines were regarded as boastful or insolent (cf. G. Radke, RE XXII,2, s.v. \textit{Praeneste}, col. 1552 with reference to Plautus, \textit{Bach}, 18 and Livy 42,1). Relevant to this is the implied ‘odium’ of Rupilius in our satire, cf. vs. 7 where Persius is described as ‘durus homo atque odio qui posset vincere Regem’; and see Heinze on the meaning of ‘odium’ here as ‘widerwärtiges Wesen und Benehmen’. On Horace at Praeneste, see \textit{Epist.} 2,2.
\textsuperscript{18} A. Palmer, \textit{The Satires of Horace}, London 1925, 205.
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To say – as Eduard Fraenkel does – that ‘there is nothing morally wrong with Rex’¹⁹ is a hazardous statement, for ‘pus atque venenum’ is a most pungent moral invective – and it was no doubt intended to be so by Horace. The reader tends to miss its significance because of the speed with which the poet skillfully leads him on and fixes his attention on the ‘hybrida . . . Persius’. Lewis and Short correctly translate ‘venenum’ in 7,1 as ‘virulence’, and rightly explain the evident meaning of ‘pus’ in the relevant fragment of Lucilius²⁰ and in the Horatian line as ‘designation of a malicious person’. Horace no doubt derived the term ‘pus’ from Lucilius, but he uses it only once in his writings, and we have to turn to the fourth satire (mainly on the moral function of satire) to find comparable terms to the unit ‘pus atque venenum’ and to enlarge on its meaning.

The first expression is ‘lividus et mordax’ in 4,93a, where Horace puts the question: ‘Do I seem to you malicious and a (back)biter?’ The term ‘lividus’, i.e. ‘malicious’ is comparable to the adjectival use of ‘pus’ in 7,1. This is followed by a passage which contains a close parallel to the whole expression ‘pus atque venenum’. In 4,95bff. Horace proceeds to give an example of a malicious person who puts up a pretence of defending a friend:

\[ \text{defendás ut tuus est mos:} \]
\[ \text{me Capitolinum convictore usus amicoque} \]
\[ \text{a puero est, causaque mea permulta rogatus} \]
\[ \text{feci, et incolúmis laetor quod vivit in urbe;} \]
\[ \text{sed tamen admiror quo pacto iudicium illud} \]
\[ \text{fugerit'. hic nigrae sucus lolliginis, haec est} \]
\[ \text{aerugo mera.} \]

‘You would defend him after that manner of yours: “I have been a comrade and a friend of Capitolinus since we were boys, and at my request he has done much for my sake. I rejoice that he lives in our city unconvicted²¹ – but yet I do wonder how he was acquitted on that trial”. Here is the very ink of the cuttlefish, here is pure malice’²².

That we have in this passage an elucidation of ‘pus atque venenum’ seems clear: ‘nigrae sucus lolliginis’ is parallel to ‘venenum’; and ‘aerugo’ like ‘pus’ denotes ‘malice’, apart from the fact that it includes the concept of


²². For the meaning of ‘aerugo’ here, cf. OLD s.v. 2 ‘A canker, or malignant condition of the mind . . . (of malice or jealousy) . . . *HOR.* S. 1.4.101.’

²³. Both ‘pus’ and ‘aerugo’ denote malice, and ‘aerugo’ includes the concept of poison,
poison,\textsuperscript{23} As for Horace’s aversion to this kind of ‘vitium’, it is sufficient

At first sight the poet’s brief but damaging blow at Rupilius in the second half of the first verse is balanced by the more extensive thrusts at Persius in the last three verses of the first section (6–8):

\begin{ex}
durus homo atque odio qui posset vincere Regem,\textsuperscript{24} confidens, tumidus, adeo sermonis amari, Sisennas, Barros ut equis praecurreret albis.
\end{ex}

I strongly suspect, however, that Horace’s charge against Persius starts already with ‘hybrida’ (vs. 2) in the sense that – apart from its face value, and whatever the correct etymology of the word (probably unknown to Horace) – it \textit{alludes} to high-minded and insulting \textit{hybris} in the conduct of the half-Greek. That Horace attached a special meaning to ‘hybrida’ is suggested not only by the hyperbaton ‘hybrida …. Persius’, but by the emphatic position of the word at the beginning of the second verse. Moreover, ‘hybrida’ used adjectivally does not merely balance ‘proscripti’ at the beginning of vs. 1. The two opposing forces at the very outset of the poem are ‘Regis Rupili pus atque venenum’ and ‘hybrida … Persius’ (in a chiastic form). Accordingly ‘hybrida’ would be most colourless and ineffective if Horace intended it to have merely its face value. Standing as it does in emphatic juxtaposition to ‘pus atque venenum’, it most probably alludes to the chief characteristic of Persius which comes up for (mainly) moral censure. This interpretation is in agreement with the portrayal of Persius on a wider canvas as ‘durus … odio … confidens, tumidus’,\textsuperscript{25} as well as with the regal metaphor\textsuperscript{26} of the white horses (of his ‘sermo amarus’) with which he could outstrip a Sisenna or a Barrus – people who, as the context implies, were notorious ‘maledici’ (Porphyrio) or slanderers.

If the above interpretation is in fact correct, it follows that Schröter’s explanation of the term ‘hybrida’ and of vs. 8 will require reconsideration. He maintains\textsuperscript{27} that Persius is expressly called ‘cross-breed’ also by way of contrasting him with Rex: according to \textit{epic} protocol, then, Persius is \textit{not} of equal rank with Rupilius. Secondly, Schröter maintains that on the \textit{epic} \textit{parodic} level the metaphor in vs. 8 is also (i.e. like ‘hybrida’) wrong. Coming

\begin{notes}
\item \textsuperscript{23} Heinze 83 ‘aerugo aber übersetzt iōς in dem Doppelsinn von ‘Rost’ und ‘Gift’, und geht auf den giftigen Neid’, etc.
\item \textsuperscript{24} The last word of vs. 6 no doubt contains a pun, \textit{Regem – regem}.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Cf. Heinze 131, who briefly interprets the \textit{moral} significance of these terms. On ‘tumidus’ with reference to ‘tyrants’ in Seneca and Tacitus, see Opelt 167 and 194.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Cf. Heinze 131 on ‘equis albis’. But Heinze is mistaken in so far as he maintains that in antiquity white horses are not attested as being considered particularly fast. On \textit{epic} level, see Verg. \textit{Aen.} 12,84 cited by Palmer.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Schröter 16.
\end{notes}
as it does from the Roman 'triumphus' on the 'quadriga' drawn by white horses, it suits a Rex better than Persius, particularly because of the concealed thrust at Caesar; for Caesar was the first to be granted the honour of a triumph with a team of white horses.

As against this I submit that on the parodic (and moral) level Persius, as a kind of tyrannus, is at least the equal of Rex. In fact, he 'out-rexes' Rex by virtue of being a rex superbus, and for this reason, if for no other, he is described with more epic breadth and censured more extensively than Rex. Finally, since Persius qua 'hybrida' is also a cross-breed, there is nothing 'wrong', on the epic (parodic) and literary levels, with describing him in terms of both Greek and Roman metaphor.

We come next to the second section of 1,7 where 'molesti', vs. 10, in the excursion (10–18a) provides a formal link with 'litis ... molestas’ in vs. 5. As 'molesti' Rupilius and Persius are now compared with 'fortes', Homeric heroes who meet in battle, and the first example given in mock-heroic language is the conflict between Hector and Achilles. Rudd has correctly interpreted the significance of vss. 11–13: 'The gigantic shadows of Hector and Achilles are thus projected behind the squabbling litigants. Perhaps we may go further and suggest that it is Achilles' shadow which looms over the halfbreed Greekling Persius, while Hector's falls on his Roman descendent Rex'. That it is right to exercise some caution in identifying specific epic characters with Persius and Rex becomes quite clear in the third section of the poem, when Persius calls Rex the Dog-star ('Canem', 25); for, reduced to epic level, this would give an equation Rex = Achilles.

28. See again n. 25. Heinze also rightly suggests that with 'equis albis' Horace 'scheint auf die superbia regia des Persius zu zielen'.

29. Schröter 16 suggests: 'Üppiger als Rupilius aufgeputzt wird Persius, weil er nachher siegen soll'.

30. The literary significance of 'tumidus' in vs. 7 derives from Greek literary metaphor, cf. Buchheit 539 and n. 131, also p. 539. As for 'equis albis', it is both a Greek and a Roman metaphor (cf. the references in Heinze), and therefore suits the 'cross-breed' Persius particularly well.

31. Rudd, Horace 65. For what it is worth, I draw attention to the similarities in Horace's account of Persius in Sat. 1,7 and his portrait of Achilles in Ars 121–2:

impiger, iracundus, inexorabilis, acer,
\begin{itemize}
  \item[iura neget sibi nata, nihil non arroget armis,]
\end{itemize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item[Cf. also Carm. 2,4,3f. 'insolentem Achillem'.]
\end{itemize}

32. Cf. Schröter 18: 'Wenn ... Rex der verhasste Hundstern ist, so mag Horaz an das Gleichnis des von ihm zitierten Kampfes zwischen Achill und Hektor gedacht haben (X 25), in dem der heranstürmende Achill wie der Verderben bringende Hundstern erscheint (vgl. A 61–66 und E4–7)'. While I accept Schröter's interpretation as correct, his unexplained second and third references require elucidation. In II. XI,61–6 it is Hector, a Trojan, who is called a 'baneful star', vs. 62, though not explicitly the Dog-star; and in 5,3–6 it is said that Athena kindled from the helm and shield of Diomedes (i.e. a
In vss. 16–18a of the excursus we have a second concrete example from epic poetry, where ‘dispares’ such as Diomedes and Lydian Glaucus meet in battle, and where ‘discedat pigrior’, ‘the more reluctant man would give way’. Since so far the pair consisting of Rex and Persius, as well as that of Hector and Achilles, has been presented as ‘pares’, the purpose of the second epic example is to draw a contrast and to heighten the suspense. By way of ironic misinterpretation of the actual happening in the *Iliad* (6,119ff.) Horace chooses Diomedes and Glaucus as an example of an ill-matched pair.33 While the misrepresentation seems to have been traditional by this time,34 Horace may have had an additional reason for choosing this example. Diomedes is mentioned in Sat. I,5,92 where we are told that he founded Canusium (after he supposedly came to Italy):35

\[
\text{qui locus a forti Diomede est conditus olim.}
\]

Perhaps he had a special significance for Horace because of his traditional colonising activity in the poet’s own beloved Apulian country (cf. I,5,77f. on Apulia).36

In the concluding lines of section (ii) Horace returns to the conflict between Rupilius and Persius. It is quite clear that he is considering them both on a par (cf. vs. 19f.) and that he is dealing with both impartially: of both it is said that ‘in ius *acres* procurrunt’. The impartiality is maintained down to the end of the third section, and it is significant that whereas Persius in vs. 6 had been styled ‘durus’, Rupilius is now characterised as ‘durus’, 29.

Before we turn to a consideration of the literary significance of the poem as a whole, and of the fourth section in particular, it remains to point out a literary allusion in a term not treated as such by Buchheit. I am referring to the term ‘acres’ in lines 20b–21 where it is said of Rex and Persius: ‘*Furious*, they rush into court, each a wondrous sight to behold’:

\[
in \text{ius } *acres* \text{ procurrunt, magnum spectaculum uterque.}
\]

Greek) a flame ‘like to the star of harvest-time’ (again only implicitly the Dog-star, and then only by way of comparison). Only in Book 22 do we find the actual term, when Achilles advancing against Hector – to fight him in single combat – appears to Priam like ‘the dog of Orion’, the bringer of fever to mortals. That Horace had this reference in mind is practically certain, as he is also concerned with single combat face to face (7,11) in the excursus.

33. When in *II.* 6,119ff. Diomedes and his hereditary guest-friend meet on the battlefield, they decline to fight and exchange armour as a sign of friendship; but Glaucus gets the worst of the bargain by exchanging gold armour for bronze.
34. Cf. Heinze on ‘disparibus’, vs. 16, and see Schröter 15 and n. 19.
35. Vs. 92 was ejected by Bentley, unjustifiably. On Diomedes in Apulia, see briefly Lejay on Sat. 1,5,92 and T. J. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks*, Oxford 1948, 182f.
36. A comparison may be drawn between the pair Glaucus-Diomedes in 1,7 and another ironically illmatched pair, viz. Horace and the ‘garrulus’ in 1,10.
It now remains to show that Horace in the seventh satire practices the literary theory of 10,9–17a in a most subtle manner. A brief hint was made in this direction by Rudolf Hanslik, but the correspondence – even in regard to terminology – has not been worked out in any detail.

Firstly, our poem is a model of 'brevitas' (cf. 10,9 'est brevitate opus', etc.), and that not merely because it is the shortest piece in the collection (35 verses). After a brief introduction which provides the minimum setting required (1–3), we are given a more extensive though rapid sketch of the combatant who will prove to be the victor, Persius (4–8). Next we expect a portrait of Rex (who has been briefly if damagingly sketched as 'pus atque venenum'), and 'ad Regem redeo' in vs. 9 suggests that this is what we are going to get. But in fact Horace seems to lose his way by plunging into an excursus in which he compares the law suit between Persius and Rex with heroic combat between Homeric heroes, and so reduces it to the level of the 'iocosum' (cf. 10,11 'saepè iocosó') by means of epic parody.

The relatively long parenthetic excursus – just over one quarter of the poem – does not constitute a stylistic vitium, for two reasons. Firstly, it is embedded in the main body of the poem by means of a number of links which satisfy the demands of structural unity: 10 'molesti' ~ 5 'molestas' (both at the end of the verse); 14 'causam' ~ 22 'causam'; 14 'in utroque' ~ 9 'inter utrumque' and 21 'uterque'; and perhaps 16 'disparibus' ~ 19 'par'. Secondly, the main function of the excursus – apart from being a skilful exercise in Homeric parody – is to raise the suspense of the reader, in agreement with the demand formulated in 10,12–14:

```
defendente vicem modo rhetoris atque poetae, interdum urbani, parcentis viribus atque extenuantis eas consulto.
```

`... taking the role now of an orator and poet, now of a clever talker`
who keeps his strength in reserve and carefully rations it out’ (transl. Rudd).41

The style of the excursus – by way of Homeric parody – is very much that of the orator and poet, while throughout the poem Horace rations out his material most carefully. He has told us nothing about Rex except of his attributes as ‘pus atque venenum’. After feigning a return to Rex in vs. 9 he increases the suspense by changing openly and completely to the epic plane. The outcome of the contest has been anticipated in vs. 2, but – as frequently happens in an epic poem when we are told the outcome beforehand – it is prolonged in various ways. Thus we are told of Persius ‘... qui possit vincere Regem’ (vs. 6). Next, in the excursus, we are offered an example of epic combat suggesting that Persius (≈Achilles) will be the victor, but at the same time it is suggested that the combatants are ‘pares’ or equally matched (cf. ‘quod virtus in utroque summa fuit’).42 This is followed by a second example, which serves as a contrast; but the moment Horace returns to the main story he employs a pun by referring to Rupilius and Persius as a ‘par’, i.e. a pair, though at the same time it suggests ‘pares’ as the comparison with the gladiators shows. Furthermore, both are ‘acres’, both a ‘magnum spectaculum’, so that the reader is kept in complete suspense about the outcome.

It has been frequently maintained that the main and only point of the seventh satire lies in its conclusion. Thus e.g. V. Sack speaks of ‘die Darstellung bis Vers 31 – die ja nur der Vorbereitung des Schlusswitzes dient’.43 That this is misleading should now be quite evident. It is only from the point of view of the content (on the narrative and, as we shall see, on the literary level) that the refined and jocose point – both ‘urbanum’ and ‘iocosum’ – at the end of the satire is the main issue. From the artistic or stylistic point of view the central part, the epic parodic parenthesis, is the main issue for Horace, and should be so appreciated by us. Rudd implicitly expresses disappointment at ‘a lengthy and highly wrought parenthesis designed to build up atmosphere’.44 In fact, the parenthesis is a masterpiece, a tour de


42. Note how the parity between Hector and Achilles is suggested stylistically by putting their names at the beginning and end of the line (vs.12):

inter

_Hectora_ Priamiden, animosum atque inter _Achillem_

43. Volker Sack, _Ironie bei Horaz_, Diss. Würzburg 1965, 69, and more explicitly on p. 68.

44. Rudd, _Horace_ 67.
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force in which Horace gives a most successful parody of the torrential style of epic poetry, while on the other hand he does not fail to satisfy the requirement of ‘brevitas’ – ‘ut currat sententia’ etc. – by the very smoothness which he obtains by letting the sense flow from one line to the next.\(^{45}\)

We may next note that each main section of the poem ends with a Roman picture, and that the relevant metaphor completely accords with the level of suspense. Thus in vs. 8 Persius is pictured as the potential ‘superior’ of slanderers like Sisenna and Barrus (observe how ‘Sisennas, Barros ut ... praecurreret’ balances ‘qui posset vincere Regem’, vs. 6, which sets the tone of suspense). Towards the end of the second section ‘uti non compositum melius cum Bitho Bacchius’ not only brings back the contest between Rupilius and Rex to the Roman level,\(^{46}\) to which the general reader would be more accustomed, but probably also explains the significance of ‘Rupili et Persi par’ as alluding to the fact that they were ‘pares’.

At this stage the reader may expect to be told – at ‘long’ last – something more about Rex. But once again it is Persius who takes the stage (vs. 22, beginning of third main section), and while he does not have the gift of ‘brevitas’ (cf. ‘ruebat’ etc. and ‘multo ... fluenti’), the style and content of his address is an object lesson in the application of Horace’s precept ‘sermone opus est modo tristi, saepe iocoso’, ‘you need a style which is sometimes severe, often jesting’. The court finds him ‘iocosus’ – ‘ridetur ab omni conventu’ – not only for his Asianic terms and style, but because he is ‘salsus’, cf. 28; while against Rex he employs the ‘triste’ in calling him a ‘Canis’ or Dog-star, ‘Canem illum,/invisum agricolis sidus, venisse’ (25b–26.).\(^{47}\)

Only at vs. 28, about four-fifths through the poem, does Rex take the floor, and in four lines we are given a brief and graphic portrait of this Italian ‘type’ and the rustic abuse with which he stems the tide of the salty Persius. The outcome is still in the balance, for as against Persius (vs. 6) –

\[
dlus homo atque odio qui posset vincere Regem
\]

we find that the Praenestine is (29b–30):

\[
dlus vindemiar et invictus ...
\]

The term ‘vindemiar’ is well chosen here. While it serves to allude to the rustic type of abuse hurled at Persius, and links up with the ‘Italian vinegar’ of vs. 32 (‘Italo ... aceto’), the term also signified a star.\(^{48}\) Thus we find

\(^{45}\) Rudd, *Horace* 107 on Horace’s versification in general.

\(^{46}\) On the significance of this, cf. Schröter 19 who has well characterised the differences between our poem and ‘straight’ epic parodies of Greek literature.

\(^{47}\) On ‘invisus’ used in criticism of monarchs in Seneca, see Opelt 165, n. 94.

\(^{48}\) Elsewhere we find only the spelling ‘vindemitor’ for this star; so Pliny, *N.H.*
Persius charging Rex with being the Dog-star, hated by farmers; and the Praenestine countering his charge by appearing as a (different) star himself, on the narrative level as a 'vindemiator (i.e. an agricultura invictus)', with a different kind of bite, that of the Italian vinegar.

Finally, in the briefly drawn conclusion Persius, now as 'Graecus', emerges as victor on the strength of his gift for punning. According to Buchheit he gains the victory because he is 'salsus' (vs.28), i.e. witty: when Greek salt and Italian pungency are contrasted in vs. 31, Horace's sympathy is on the side of the sal Graecum notwithstanding certain reservations (in I,7) which accord with certain precepts at the beginning of Sat. 1,10 on the ‘sal multum’ of Lucilius and the need of ‘brevitas’.49

This takes us down to verse 9 ('est brevitate opus') in 1,10 – i.e. to the first verse of the crucial passage 9–17a – and is correct so far as it goes. However, I submit that the key to the understanding of the rather sudden and unexpected outcome of the contest in I,7 – when Persius becomes a ‘Graecus’ and gains the victory by means of humorous puns – lies in the conclusion of the relevant section in the tenth satire (14b–15):

```plaintext
ridiculum acri
fortius et melius magnas plerumque secat res.
```

‘Jesting (ridiculum) often resolves (lit. cuts up or off) important issues more forcefully (fortius) and more effectively (melius) than sharp criticism (acri’).50

The significance of this precept to our understanding of I,7 seems apparent when we observe the following equation and paralleleisms: ‘ridiculum’ = the puns in 7,33–5; ‘acri’ ~ ‘acres’ 7,21; ‘fortius’ ~ ‘fortes’ 7,11; ‘melius’ ~ ‘melius’ 7,20.51 It should also be clear that, while we achieve the same result as Buchheit in explaining the victory of the Greek Persius with reference to the ‘exemplaria Graeca’ (Ars 268; et. Sat. 1,10,16f., not considered by Buchheit) we can give a better account of it in terms of the formal precept with which Horace sums up the success of Old Greek comedy and holds it

---

49. Buchheit enlarges on the ‘Einschränkungen’ (p. 546) or reservations in n. 134: ‘Vgl. ähnlich sat. I,10.3.9.’ In 3f. Horace refers to his praise of Lucilius’ ‘sàl multum’ at the beginning of Satire 4; in vs. 9 the need for ‘brevitas’ is stated.

50. For the meaning of ‘acer’ here, cf. OLD s.v. acer, 8 (so also in Sat. II,1,1 ‘nimis acer’): 'strict, stern, severe, harsh'.

51. ‘Melius’ like ‘acer’, is a key word in Horace’s moral and literary terminology. I quote the relevant passages in I,4, I,7 and I,10:

4,135 ‘hoc faciens vivam melius’.
7,19f. ‘non compositor melius cum Bitho Bacchius’.
10,14f. ‘ridiculum acri / fortius et melius magnas plerumque secat res’.
10,47 ‘melius quod scriberepossem’.
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up as a model for imitation by the satirist. Persius, a half-Greek half-Roman, and Rex, a Praenestine or Italian, were both ‘fortes’ (vs. 7) and ‘acres’ (vs. 21); but Persius as Greek won the contest, because on the strength of the ‘ridiculum’ contained in his ‘sal Graecum’ his performance in the final round was ‘fortius’ and ‘melius’ than the ‘acre’ of the ‘Italum acetum’ of Rex.52

It remains to consider the details of the ‘ridiculum’ contained in 7,33–5:

Persius exclamat ‘per magnos, Brute, deos te oro, qui reges consueris tollere, cur non hunc Regem iugulas? operum hoc, mihi crede, tuorum est’.

Practically all commentators from Porphyrio till the present day have found the point of the passage in the pun: ‘reges . . . Regem’. Porphyrio comments: ‘urbanissimus iocus’, i.e. it is a ‘most polished joke’, and he finds the explanation in the plural ‘reges’ and in the ‘Bruti’ in the plural, understood in Brutus: Tarquinius Superbus had been driven into exile by D. Iunius Brutus (from whom Brutus the ‘republican’ claimed descent), and Julius Caesar, who seemed to aspire to kingship, had been murdered by the latter Brutus.

In our appreciation of this pun as a ‘ridiculum’ it is of utmost importance that we should not judge it by our own tastes, and not call it a ‘poor pun’ as Palmer does when he refers to its origin in a retort made by Cicero on Clodius some years before in the Senate.53 Palmer, of course, does recognise that puns were popular at Rome – we should specify that puns on names were extremely popular among Romans54 – but he does not appreciate the fact that in the Roman world of the second half of the last century B.C. the pun on ‘rex’ was in fact a very polished (and most popular) joke.

Now in the last three lines of 1,7 there are further puns of which one is contained in ‘per magnos... deos’, while the other has so far escaped notice in regard to its probable stylistic significance. As for ‘the great gods’, Buchheit argues that in the context of an allusion to Caesar, who estimated his Trojan-Julian descent so highly, there can be no doubt that ‘magni di’ alludes to the Trojan penates.55 He therefore finds a double paradox in

Persius' appeal to Brutus, and translates: 'Bei den troischen Stammgöttern bitte ich dich, Brutus, der du doch Übung hast im Erlegen von Königen. Warum strangulierst du nicht auch diesen Rex? Das wäre, glaube mir, eine Tat für dich'.

Now on the narrative level Persius' request to Brutus is quite clear. 'Tollere' contains a pun, the origin of which goes back to Cicero, and plays on the double meaning of 'tollere', viz. 'to make away with' and 'to elevate'. On the narrative level Horace has the first of these meanings in mind: 'Since you are accustomed to making away with kings, why don't you cut the throat of this King?' But in view of the evident literary significance of I,7 we may suspect that Horace also alludes to the literary significance of 'tollere' found in Satires 4 and 10. There the poet criticises the muddy style of Lucilius in the lines (10,49f.) –

at dixi fluere hunc lutulentum, saepe ferentem
tollenda relinquendis

– which harks back to 4,11:

cum fluere hunc lutulentus, erat quod tollere velles;

'As he flowed with a muddy stream, there was (always) something that you would wish to expunge'.

If indeed this is relevant to our poem, the stylistic significance of Persius' request would be: 'Since you are accustomed to making away with Kings, why don't you butcher this King (by expunging him)?'

While Schröter and Buchheit have pointed out the way to the interpretation of I,7 as an artistic piece of Homeric parody with a subtle literary significance, the present article attempts to show that the specific stylistic importance of the poem lies in identifying it as a disguised formulation of, as well as an exercise in, the literary precepts of the first section of I,10, more particularly of vss. 9–17a on Old Greek Comedy as 'exemplar' held up by Horace for the writing of Latin Satire. In the light of this passage, and of the clarification of the puns contained in the poem, it becomes possible to appreciate I,7 more fully as one of the most artistic and most subtle satires written by Horace.

Schröter has rightly pointed out that the military terms – explicit or implicit – in I,7 are due not merely to Homeric parody, for it is well-known

56. Buchheit 551 and 543.
58. That 'tollere' here does contain such a pun, is perhaps supported by the fact that 'iugulare' (cf. 7,34 'iugulas') also has a literary significance in Sat. 10,36 (cf. also 'porrecto iugulo' etc., Sat. 3,89), and see my article on Satires I,4 and I,10 in AClass XIII, 1970, nn. 14 and 46, end cf. Porphyrio on I,10,36.
‘dass die Römer ihr Leben gern unter dem Bild des Bauern und Kriegers sehen. So ist die Tätigkeit auf dem Forum und im Senat ganz gewöhnlich eine ‘pugna’, ein ‘proelium’;’ and Buchheit in emphasising the close relation between I,7 and I,9 has rightly included the parallel usage of military terms.59 It remains to note that I,7 has the same kind of legal setting and terminology as I,9, and that this too is typically Roman.60

SATIRES I,7 AND I,8

Buchheit has shown that the seventh satire is closely related to the ninth, as well as to the literary satires, I,4 and I,10; and we have seen that 7 and 10 form a pair in so far as 7 practices the literary theory of 10, 9–17a (within the context 1–17a) in a very close manner. Satires 7 and 10 therefore form a disjunct in the sense of a non-consecutive pair; a more obvious pair of this kind is constituted by 4 and 10, both of which explicitly deal with Horace’s theory of satire.

Now so far we have seen, in our analysis of the arrangement of satires in Book I,61 that the first six satires form conjunct or consecutive pairs – 1 and 2, 3 and 4, and 5 and 6 respectively – by reason of a very similar structure in one case (1 and 2), and in all three instances by virtue both of similar themes and of a number of significant verbal links between the two poems; and we have sufficient grounds to conclude that these satires were written and/or edited as pairs by Horace. That the same holds true of 9 and 10 is clear from Buchheit’s recent interpretation of 9 as enunciating in practice some of the main points of the literary theory of 10;62 and in an article in Acta Classica XV (1972) further inquiry will be made into Satires 9 and 10 as a pair.

59. Schröter 21f. quoting Cic. Ad Att. I, 16 as an example; Buchheit 547 on military terms and expressions in I,7. For references to literature on the subject of military terms in Roman authors, see Buchheit 534 n.92; see also Anderson, AJP 77, 1956, 148–166 on the extensive use of terms with a military significance (explicit or implicit) in I,9. Anderson’s most important examples are summarised by Buchheit 534, n. 91, cf. Rudd, Horace 77. See also briefly, Fraenkel, Horace 118; and E. Paludan (with reference to A. Spies, Militat omnis amans, Diss. Tübingen 1930) on military terms in Latin love elegy, Class. et Med. 4, 1941, 226–8, but with a wrong conclusion drawn from Spies on p. 228.

60. For legal terms in I,7 or terms which are ambiguous and have a legal allusion, cf. ‘quo pacto’ 2; ‘litis’ 5; ‘convenit ... iure’ 10; ‘capitalis’ 13; ‘in ius procurrunt’ 20f.; ‘exporrit causam’ 26; ‘cessisset ... compellans’ 31. For legal terms in I,9 see Rudd, Horace 80. J.O. Mosely in TAPA 66, 1935, XXX (summary) argued that Horace used legal phraseology to a greater degree than any other contemporary poet (e.g. the word ‘ius’ with its compounds occurs 111 times in his writings., For legal terms in Latin elegiac poetry, see briefly E. Paludan, Class. et Med. 4, 1941, 225f.

61. See the references to AClass XI, 1968 and XIII, 1970 in note* supra.

In our consideration of such an arrangement we are left with 7 and 8, and the question arises whether these form a conjunct pair in any significant sense or senses, comparable to the more or less fundamental links between the other pairs. At first sight this does not seem to be the case, particularly as some of the more evident similarities apply more or less equally to Satire 9, thus enabling us to group 7, 8 and 9 together rather loosely as a triad of amusing anecdotes. Rudd's observation that I,8 'resembles I,7 in being a tale of comic revenge', is applicable also to I,9; and in all three pieces parody, Homeric or otherwise, plays an important role. Apart from the parody of Priapus himself and the Homeric parody, we have a parody of the genre, the Priapeum, in I,8 just as we have - in a concealed manner - a parody of the literary certamen in 7 and 9. Again, all three poems conclude, briefly and effectively, with a surprising climax. There is a 'dramatic reversal of roles' at the end of 8 and 9, and also at the end of 7 in the sense that while Horace deals impartially with both Rupilius Rex and Persius down to vs. 31, he suddenly grants the victory to Persius as Graecus in the last four verses.

There are, of course, a number of links, more implicit than explicit, between satires 8 and 9 which do not occur in 7. In both 8 and 9 we encounter a guardian deity. In 8 Priapus, as combined scarecrow and guardian deity, watches over the new gardens constructed by Maecenas on the Esquiline on the old site of a paupers' cemetery, and puts to flight the trespassing witches Canidia and Sagana. At the end of 9 Apollo - as guardian of true poets and of high moral principles - puts in a brief appearance to save Horace from the clutches of a poetaster and schemer. In 8 Maecenas figures in the background, in fact he is not even mentioned directly; in 9 he is mentioned in the third main scene (vss. 43b-60a), but in the poem as a whole he also remains very much in the background. Finally, witches' drugs

---

63. On Sat. 8 see Fraenkel *Horace* 121–4; Rudd, *Horace* 67–74; and briefly V. Buchheit, cited n. 66 *infra*, 63f. A detailed interpretation of Sat. I, 8 by W. S. Anderson is forthcoming in *AJP*.


68. On the allusions to Maecenas in I,8, see briefly Buchheit in *Studien zum Corpus Priapeorum*, München 1962, 64 n. 3, with references to other literature, especially Fraenkel, *Horace* 123f., who concludes that Horace, 'in describing the happy transformation, pays a handsome compliment to the friend who has brought it about'. The relevant portion in I,9 (especially vss. 48b–52a) is also a handsome compliment to Maecenas, but, of course, explicitly so.
figure in both pieces (8,19 ‘venenis’; 9,31 ‘venena’). It may be significant that elsewhere in Book I ‘venenum’ occurs only in the seventh satire (‘pus atque venenum’, vs. 1), but there in a metaphorical sense.69

So far it does not seem that there are any particularly close connexions between 7 and 8 exclusively. However, when we look at the structure of the two pieces, we find that a number of more or less close parallels may be observed. The structure of 1,8 may be briefly analysed as follows:70

(i) 1–7 (= 7 vss.): description of Priapus (who introduces himself).
(ii) 8–16 (= 9 vss.): description of the new Gardens, formerly a paupers’ graveyard.
(iii) 17–22 (= 6 vss.): Priapus’ complaint about his nocturnal visitors.
(iv) 23–36 (= 14 vss.): description of Canidia and Sagana practising their nocturnal magical rites on the god’s terrain.
(v) 37–50 (= 14 vss.): after a break at vs. 37–9, there follows a transition (40–45) to the climax in vss. 46–50, viz. the conclusion when Priapus, by loudly breaking wind, sets the witches to flight.

Now Rudolf Hanslik has shown71 that, despite the natural connections between the first three scenes,72 the second scene may formally be regarded as an excursus comparable to the excursus in the second main section of 7 (vss. 10–18). This he demonstrates as follows. In the first scene the special task of Priapus is to ward off thieves (fures, 4) and birds (volucris, 6) from the new gardens, vs. 7. After the second scene (8–16) the third section (17–22) starts as follows, 17f.:

\[
\text{cum mihi non tantum furesque feraeque suetae} \\
\text{hunc vexare locum curae sunt atque labori} -
\]

‘For myself, ‘tis not so much the thieves and beasts wont to infest the place that cause me care and trouble’ (transl. Fairclough).

From the formal point of view, Hanslik stresses the fact that ‘furesque feraeque’ (vs. 17) link up with ‘fures’ and ‘volucris’ in the first scene, while he points out that in accordance with a stylistic principle observed by Geffcken,73 one word is varied, though in the present case the alliteration

69. For the meaning of ‘venenum’ in 7,1 (‘virulence’), see Lewis and Short s.v.
70. The construction of the first half of the poem is clear, cf. Heinze on ‘novis . . . in hortis’ (vs. 7): ‘Man beachte wie durch das eine Wort novis geschickt von der Selbstvorstellung des Priap (1–7) zu der Schilderung des Ortes (8–16) übergeleitet wird, an die sich dann aufs ungezwungenste die Klage über seine nächtlichen Besucher reiht (17–22): damit ist der Dichter bei der Erzählung, auf die er es abgesehen, angelangt’. In the second half of the piece various divisions are possible.
72. See n. 70 supra.
effected in ‘furesque’ – ‘feraeque’ could have been partly responsible for the change. From this it follows that the intermediate scene, vss. 8–16, with its description of the Esquiline, may formally be seen as an excursus, such as we find also in 7,10–18. It may be worth noting, in addition, that the ‘excursus’ has 9 verses, and that this corresponds exactly in length with that of the parenthesis in Sat. 7 (vss. 10–18 = 9 vss).

Next Hanslik observes that, as in I,7,74 an ever-increasing suspense is built up in I,8, here by the incantation scene – until the completely unexpected solution occurs at vs. 46:

\[ \text{nam displosa sonat quantum vesica pepidi.} \]

We should note, of course, an important structural difference in the position of the revenge motif in 7 and 8. In I,7 it occurs at the very beginning of the satire, in vs. 2:

\[ \text{hybrida quo pacto sit Persius ultus ...} \]

– while in I,8 it only appears at vs. 44f. just before the climax in vs. 46 cited above, cf. 44b–45:

\[ \text{et ut non testis inultus} \]
\[ \text{horruerim voces furiarum et facta duarum.} \]

This, however, does not make the eighth satire a superior work to the seventh.75 We have seen that despite the fact that the outcome of the contest is anticipated in 7,2, it is prolonged in a most skilful manner; and that the level of suspense is increased throughout until we reach the brief climax in the last two verses. In fact, the parallelism ‘ultus’ ~ ‘non inultus’ provides a fairly close link between 7 and 8, the difference being that by way of ‘variatio’ Horace has put the revenge motifs at the beginning and end of the poems respectively.

Finally, there are a number of terms which in Sermones, Book I occur only in the seventh and eighth satires. The most significant of these, ‘ultus’ and ‘non inultus’, have already been noted. Others are ‘vexare’ and ‘salubris’;76 and I suggest that, by a device found also elsewhere at the beginning of a satire and in the conclusion of the satire immediately preceding, the term ‘deus’ links together Satires 7 and 8. Cf. 7,33 ‘per magnos ... deos’ with 8,3 ‘maluit esse deum. deus inde ego ...’.77

---

74. See also Hanslik, \textit{Comm. Vind.} 3, 1937, 23 on the similarity and difference in structure between 7 and 8 on the one hand and 9 on the other hand.

75. \textit{Contra Rudd, Horace} 67.

76. Cf. 7,15 ‘duo si discordia vexet inertis’ and 8,18 ‘hunc vexare locum’; 7,24 ‘stellasque salubris’ and 8,14 ‘Esquiliis ... salubribus’.

77. Instances of similar links between the conjunct pairs 1/2, 3/4 and 5/6 are: the beginning of Sat. 2 which is continuous with the conclusion of Sat. 1 (see \textit{A-Class XI}, 1968,
In conclusion it is clear that up to and including Sat. 8 in *Sermones*, Book I, the most fundamental principle in the structure of the book consists in a grouping of conjunct pairs; but that in contrast to the meaningful links between the satires which constitute the first three pairs, those between 7 and 8 are tenuous and superficial. Satire 7 is most closely related to Satire 10, where vss. 9–17a are fundamental to a full elucidation of the literary significance of the *certamen* between Persius and Rex. It remains to consider Satires 9 and 10 as a pair.

**APPENDIX: SAT. 1,7, LUCILIUS BOOK 2, AND CICERO**

There is sufficient internal evidence to conclude that Sat. 1,7 is an *aemulatio* of the second book of Lucilius which apparently contained only one satiric piece, on a law-suit brought (and lost) by the ‘hellenomaniac’ Titus Albucius against the jurist Quintus Mucius Scaevola in 119 or 118 B.C. on a charge of extortion in Asia. The relation between the two pieces – in regard to similarities as well as differences – has been considered most recently by Schröter and (independently) by Buchheit. While on the literary level a substantial part of 1,7 becomes a literary agon, the Lucilian fragments contain only three lines of literary criticism in which Scaevola satirises Albucius’ rhetoric with its mixture of Greek words and its Asianic style, likening it to a wriggly mosaic pavement. The stylistic criticism in both poets concerns the relation of the Romans to the *exemplaria Graeca*; and this probably applies partly also to the longer fragment of Lucilius on Albucius satirised as a hellenomaniac by the true Roman Scaevola and his *cohors* at Athens. Cicero in quoting the passage, compares Albucius to a writer who in literary matters ‘wants to be called downright Greek’: ‘qui se plane Graecum dici velit’.

---

44 with reference to e.g. 1,105 and 2,12); 3,140 ‘si quid peccaro stultus’ ~ 4,3 ‘si quis erat dignus describi, quod malus ac fur’; 5,104 ‘Brundisium longae finis chartaeque viaeque est’ and 6,2 ‘incoluit finis’, where ‘finis’ is used in different senses.

78. A close relation between 7 and 8 was largely precluded by the nature of the subject-matter of 8 (magic, cf. the *eighth* Eclogue of Vergil. I shall consider the relation between Sat. 1,8 and *Ecl. 8* elsewhere).


82. Fr. 87–93W, 88–94M, 89–95K: ‘Graecum te, Albuci, quam Romanum atque Sabinum’ etc. Cicero, *De Fin.*, I,8 quotes the passage in a literary context which is concerned with Roman as opposed to Greek *exemplaria*; but M. Puelma has rightly noted the moral and social implications in pointing out that it was ‘ein schweres Vergehen gegen den ge-
It is highly probable that in Lucilius the *graecising* Albucius lost his case very largely because of the damaging ‘cultural’ criticism which the true Roman Scaevola inflicted upon him. By way of contrast the *Graecus* Persius wins his case against the Italian Rupilius Rex because of the refined wit contained in his puns in the conclusion of Sat. I,7. It seems justified to conclude with Buchheit that ‘Horaz kehrt also die Gewichte um. Bei aller Einschränkung gehört seine Sympathie dem *sal* des Griechen, das er der *rusticitas Romana* vorzieht. Man darf und muss daher den bewussten Bezug auf Lucilius als eine kritische Distanz des Horaz verstehen’.83

The two fragments of Lucilius, Book 2, which contain stylistic criticism – the one explicitly, the other implicitly – both occur in Cicero, the first (comparing Albucius’ style to an intricate mosaic pattern, see n. 80) in the *De Oratore* 3,43,171. Now it is true, on the one hand, that Cicero had a strong influence on Horace’s view of satire.84 On the other hand it is clear that Horace’s subtle stylistic criticism in Sat. I,7 is applicable quite as much to Cicero (as champion of Latin vs. Greek *exemplaria* in general, and of Lucilius in particular) as it is concerned with Lucilius. This seems clear from the context in which Cicero in *De Finibus*, Book 1 quotes the second and longer fragment of Lucilius on Albucius’ enmity to Scaevola for being mockingly saluted with the Greek ‘chaere’ by him and his cohort in Athens.85 Before quoting it in par. 9, Cicero in par. 4ff. defends his philosophical writings against those who prefer to read Greek literature, and criticises the Latin writers who *completely* neglect the works of Latin authors; and he goes so far as to say that, notwithstanding the excellence of Sophocles’ *Electra*, he would regard it worth while to read the inferior Latin translation of Atilius. In par. 7 he affirms that he will not, like Lucilius, refuse the reading of his works by some people, and expresses the wish that that poet’s famous *Persius* were alive now: ‘Nec vero, ut noster Lucilius, recusabo quo minus omnes mea legant. Utinam esset ille Persius!’ At the end of par. 7 his argument is not quite clear, but Reid correctly interprets it as follows: ‘the *doctissimi* of Lucilius were not sufficiently *docti* to induce him to give a fine finish to his writings, and his themes were slight, and afforded an opening for *urbanitas* rather than *doctrina*’.86

---

83. Buchheit 553, and cf. 552 n. 162 *contra* Krenkel!, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 80) 264.
84. Cf. briefly Rudd, *Horace* 96.
85. See n. 82 *supra*.
The Persius briefly mentioned in the *De Finibus* is none other than Gaius Persius to whom Cicero in the *Brutus* refers as the ‘litteratus homo ... whom Lucilius calls very learned’. The relevant fragment (635W, 592–3M, 594K) is quoted by Cicero in the *De Oratore* where he says that Lucilius, a learned author who displayed most polished humour (‘perurbanus’), used to say that he wanted to be read neither by the very ignorant (‘indoctissimi’) nor by the very learned (‘doctissimi’):

> Persium non curo legere, Laelium Decumum volo.88

I don’t care for Persius to read me, but I do want Decimus Laelius to do it (transl. Warmington).

The outcome seems clear. Cicero, despite his praise of Lucilius (cf. also *De Fin.* I, parr. 8 and 9), differs from Lucilius who avowed that he wrote only for the moderately learned like Laelius. By way of contrast Cicero wants every one (‘omnes’) including the very learned, like Persius (par. 7), to read him. In the same way he attempts to strike a balance by insisting that *good Latin exemplaria* rank equally with *good Greek exemplaria*. This is implied by his insistence in par. 8 – given in the form of a rhetorical question – that given an adequate theme and a refined and dignified style, anyone would read a Latin work, unless he wanted to be styled downright Greek, like Albucius in Lucilius.89

The difference between Horace and Cicero now also seems clear. In Sat. I,7 it is by virtue of his ‘urbanitas’ that Persius as *Graecus* wins the contest against the Praenestine Rupilius Rex whose wit does not rise above the level of the ‘italum acetum’. While Cicero prefers Latin to Greek authors, or at any rate puts good Latin models on a par with Greek ones, and praises the humour of Lucilius most highly, Horace is concerned with Greek models exclusively. Thus he recommends in I,10,9–17 (the key to I,7) that the Latin satirist should use the Old Greek comic writers as stylistic models, just as later e.g. he insists on a wider scale that Roman poets should handle Greek *exemplaria*, night and day.90 To that extent he may have regarded Roman

---

88. See *De Orat.* 6,25 where Cicero explains Persius as ‘the most learned of our people’, but Decimus Laelius as ‘virum bonum et non inlitteratum, sed nihil ad Persium’.
89. *De Fin.* 1,8: ‘Res vero bonas verbis electis graviter ornateque dictas quis non legat? Nisi se plane Graecum dici velit, ut a Scaevola est praetore salutatus Athenis Albucius’. On Albucius as ‘Graecus’, cf. also Cic., *Brutus* 131 ‘doctus enim Graecis T. Albucius vel potius plane Graecus’, and *De prov. cons.* or. 15, where Albucius is described as ‘Graecum hominem atque levem’. Both passages are cited by Buchheit 552, n. 160.
90. *Ars* 268f. ‘vos exemplaria Graeca / nocturna versate manu, versate diurna’.
poets as ‘hybridae’ in the literary sense of the word, i.e. as literary ‘cross-breeds’ who despite their ‘vitia’ can learn from the Greeks stylistic ‘virtutes’ such as the truly ‘urbanum’ (unlike Lucilius whose characterisation by Cicero as ‘perurbanus’ is implicitly rejected by Horace).91

We have, of course, no means of proving that with his victorious Persius as Graecus, Horace is alluding not merely to the relevant passages of Lucilius but also to the Ciceronian contexts in which they have been transmitted to us. But perhaps it is not too fanciful to suggest, in conclusion, that Horace derived the name – and no more – of his Persius in Sat. I, 7 from the Persius rejected by Lucilius. If so, he may represent not only Horace’s predilection for the sal Graecum, but also the learned reader92 who was excluded by Lucilius, included by Cicero, and preferred by Horace. For us at any rate, if not for Horace, the Persius of I, 7 – derived in name from the ‘valde doctus’ of Lucilius – may provide a pointer to the limited number of ‘docti ... et amici’ whom Horace in the last section of Sat. I, 10 required as his ideal readers.

91. Likewise Horace, in the verses immediately following Ars 268f., rejects the unqualified praise of the ‘numeri’ and ‘sales’ of Plautus by earlier Romans.
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