ARRANGEMENT AND STRUCTURE OF SATIRES IN
HORACE, SERMONES BOOK I: SATIRES 9 AND 10*

by C. A. van Rooy
(University of South Africa, Pretoria)

The ninth Satire¹ consists of six sections, the scheme of which may be set out as follows in an anti-clockwise fashion:

(i) Introduction: vss. 1–5 (5 verses)
(ii) 1st main section: 6–21a (15½)
(iii) 2nd main section: 21b–43a (22)
(iv) 3rd main section: 43b–60a (17)
(v) 4th main section: 60b–74a (14)
(vi) Conclusion: 74b–78 (4½)

Within the framework of the introductory and concluding passages, the four main sections or scenes are clearly distinguished by the poet himself. The beginning of each is marked by a significant term or name in the first or second line (‘docti’, 6; ‘Viscum . . . Varium’, 22f; Maecenas, 43; Fuscus Aristius, 61); and the conclusion is in each case indicated clearly by the use of a ‘Schlussformel’ consisting of a sententia or of a proverbial expression.²

A relative symmetry is obtained by the more or less equal length of the horizontally corresponding sections (i) and (vi), and (ii) and (v); this may be extended to (iii) and (iv) if we arrange the centre-piece on the ‘lis’ theme separately (36b–43a = 7 verses): thereby section (iii) is reduced to 15 verses, roughly equal in length to that of (iv) (17 verses). Heinze has rightly pointed out that the theme of the lawsuit which finally leads to Horace’s escape is introduced in the middle of the poem. Now strictly speaking the ‘lis’ theme, as a sub-section of the second main section, starts at vs. 36b (‘et casu tum respondere vadato’); and it is probably no coincidence that this theme (7 verses) stands numerically exactly in the centre of the poem between vss. 1–36b (=35½ verses) and 43b–78 (=35½ verses).

It is probably significant too that the satires of Book I which are most symmetric in structure are 3, 6 and 9, and that all three deal in various ways with the theme of Friendship. At the same time we may note that the external scheme

---

*For references to the previous articles in this series, including acknowledgements to the Human Sciences Research Council in Pretoria, see AClass XIV, 1971, 67 n.*


2. On ‘Schlussformeln’ such as sententiae, cf. G. Maurach, Der Bau von Senevas Epistulæ Morales, Heidelberg 1970, 12 and n.4; and on the relevant passages in I,9, see Lejay.
and symmetry of I,9 is very similar to that of I,3, the difference being that if we arrange the centre-piece of the third satire separately, the horizontal numerical symmetry of its structure is exact.3

The task of showing how the ninth Satire, on the ‘Bore’ or ‘Pest’, links up with I,10 (and I,4) has been much furthered by the valuable recent interpretation offered by Vinzenz Buchheit.4 On the basis of the structural division given above, and of Buchheit’s preliminary analysis in his article, I shall first offer a summary of the poem. Thereafter I shall briefly consider Buchheit’s more detailed interpretation, and indicate not only on what points it requires reconsideration, but also how far important links between our poem and both I,10 and I,4 remain to be observed.

(i) Introduction, 1–5. Horace (accompanied by a slave boy, 10) is taking a stroll along the Via Sacra, lost in thought on his poetry (cf. Heinze on ‘nugurum’) when a fellow (‘quidam’) known to him only by name runs up, snatches his hand, and in a gushing manner addresses him as ‘dulcissime rerum’ – ‘my dear fellow’. He receives a cool reply from Horace.

(ii) First main section, 6–21a. Horace with subtle irony tries to shake off the intruder, a gossip and poetaster. The fellow, who calls himself ‘doctus’ (cf. ‘docti sumus’, 7), keeps chattering (‘garriret’, 13) and completely refuses to be put off. Poor Horace submits to his lot like a donkey under a heavy load.

(iii) Second main section, 21b–43a. The fellow makes a fresh approach by claiming to be as worthy of Horace’s friendship as Viscus and Varius (who belong to the same literary circle of friends as Horace5). He does so by claiming qualifications – despised by Horace, cf. I,4 and 10 – such as: ‘nam quis me scribere pluris / aut citius possit versus?’, 23b–24a: ‘for who can write more verses or write more quickly than I?’ To make matters worse, Horace upon enquiry learns that the fellow has no living relative: he has laid them all to rest, ‘omnis conposui’, 28a. Accordingly all that remains is for the man to finish off Horace, in accordance with the fate that an old Sabellian woman had prophesied to him in his youth, that a chatter-box (‘garrulus’, 33) would wear him out, and that he should steer clear of babblers (‘loquaces’, 33).6

At the fourth hour they arrive at the temple of Vesta and Horace has a flicker of hope when the subject arises of a lawsuit which the pest had to attend that

3. For the anti-clockwise structure of I,3, see A Class XI, 1968, 56. With its centre-piece arranged separately, we get the following scheme (cf. Rudd, Horace 8 on vs. 119):
   
   (i) 1–19a = 18 1/4 verses  
   (ii) 19b–24 = 5 1/4 verses  
   (iii) 25–67 = 43 verses  

   Centre-piece: 68–75 (8 verses)

   For the structure of I,6, see A Class XIII, 1970, 47f and n.4.

4. See the reference in n.1 supra, to be cited as Buchheit.

5. Cf. Sat. I, 5, 40; 6,55; 10, 44 and 83.

6. Heinze notes the stress carried by ‘garrulus’ and ‘loquaces’ at the beginning and end of vs. 33 respectively.
morning. When the poet refuses to assist him, the fellow decides to let the case go by default, and poor Horace once again submits to his lot: 'ego, ut contendere durum est / cum victore, sequor', 42b–43a: 'as for me, as it's hard to fight with one's victor, I follow'.

(iv) Third main section, 43b–60a. The fellow now without further ado reveals his true purpose. 'Maecenas quomodo tecum?' 'How do you find Maecenas?' When Horace retorts, 'a man of few friends and right shrewd sense' ('paucorum hominum et mentis bene sanae'), thus declining to introduce him, the fellow persists in requesting an introduction as a means towards intrigue; and when the poet indignantly replies that Maecenas' house or 'circle' is free from scheming, his praises only serve to fan the desire of the obtrusive fellow to penetrate to it. Even Horace's supreme irony in assuring him that he is sure to succeed is lost upon him: he will resort to any possible form of intrigue and bribery to achieve his aim; and he tops off his determination with a learned quotation: 'nil sine magno vita labore dedit mortalibus', 59b–60a, 'nothing without much labour does life grant to mortals'. And so, as Heinze discerningly comments, he concludes as doctus by quoting the maxim of the Branchidae oracle. 8

(v) Fourth main section, 60b–74a. One last hope appears to Horace in the person of his friend Aristius Fuscus. His appearance is not accidental. Since he belonged to the same literary circle as Horace, Buchheit points out that he would be the right person to free Horace from this obstinate poetaster. Fuscus however sums up the situation and with obvious relish leaves his friend in the lurch; in fact, Horace is left 'sub cultro', 'under the knife'. 10

(vi) Conclusion. 74b–78. At this critical moment the accuser appears on the scene, calls upon Horace as a witness, arrests the fellow and amid uproar drags him off to court. Horace concludes with 'sic me servavit Apollo', 'thus did Apollo save me', a Latin rendering of the expression in the Iliad, τὸν δ’ Ἐξήμπαξέν Ἀπόλλων (20,443).

Before we proceed to a consideration of the literary theory and criticism contained in 1,9, the structure of the poem requires some further attention. While Buchheit gives a different structural analysis, he rightly refers to certain aspects of the ‘Rahmenkomposition’ of the poem. 11 To his observation of correspondences and differences between the opening and the closing scenes we

8. Ps. Phokylid. 162.
10. W. S. Anderson discusses the expression in AJP 77, 1956, 163f, and concludes that there is 'considerable justification for interpreting the victim under the knife as human, and for accepting Heinze's ingenious gloss: "wie ein wehrloses Schlachtopfer, bereit, den Todestoss zu empfangen".'
may add the following: 'forte', 1 ~ 'casu', 74; 'accurrir', 3 ~ 'concursus', 78; 'dulcissime (rerum)', 4 ~ 'turpissime', 75.

We may now turn to the skill employed by the 'garrulus' and supposed scholar in approaching Horace. At the beginning of the first main scene he apparently disregards Horace's question 'numquid vis?' and makes a bold statement: 'noris nos . . . docti sumus', 7. Lejay comments on 'nos': 'II prend le ton doctoral d'un auteur avec la Ire pers. du plur.'; and 'docti': 'Le mot désigne la culture littéraire, et souvent le talent poétique: 10,87' (and further references). What Lejay does not do is to draw our attention to the significance of the first person plural and the irony contained in the statement – or reply – of the man, which means: 'But you must know me – we are both poets'!

Perhaps the use of the plural 'docti sumus' is significant also in another way. The fellow makes his first approach by trying to infiltrate in a subtle manner the wider group of Horace's literary friends whom the poet calls 'doctos . . . et amicos' in Sat. 10,87. How does he make this attempt? By identifying himself with them (including Horace) by means of the plural 'docti sumus'.

When the man finds himself unsuccessful in regard to both (a) 'noris nos' and (b) 'docti sumus', he changes his approach at the beginning of the second main scene where (a) becomes 'si bene me novi', and (b) becomes 'non Viscum pluris amicum, / non Varium facies'. As regards (b) he drops the wider approach to Horace and, taking his cue from the poet's earlier reply (to 'docti sumus'), viz. 'pluris hoc . . . mihi eris', 7f, he gets down to details by means of a subtle word play on 'pluris'. Slyly he first mentions one of the less distinguished of the literary friends of Horace and Maecenas (Viscus) and slips in 'pluris amicum' before proceeding to a more distinguished name, 'non Varium'; then, by a clever repetition of 'pluris' he proceeds to specify his qualifications: 'nam quis me scribere pluris', etc.

12. While there are certain agreements, the analysis that follows is independent of Buchheit 535ff.

13. 'Nothing else is there', translation Rudd, Horace 77 (on 'numquid vis' see further n.14). On 'occupo' in the same line (vs. 6), Heinze compares 'occupat' in Epist. I, 7, 66. But note also the expression 'occupet extremum scabies' in Ars 417, and the context 'nunc satis est dixisse: ego mira poemata pango'. For the military significance of occupare, see Anderson, AJP 77, 1956, 153.


15. J. H. Waszink makes the very attractive suggestion (in conversation) that 'docti sumus', after 'noris nos', implies 'I am just as good a poet as you', the implication being – after Horace's ironically polite question 'numquid vis?' – don't be so conceited!

The second approach to Horace, if more specific than the first, remains an indirect one. The same applies to the third approach (as compared with the second), at least in its initial stage: the man's real aim is to get at Maecenas, but he wants Horace to act as intermediary (45b–48a). At this stage he reveals that he wants to reach the man at the top not as 'doctus' but simply for the purpose of furthering his own interests, at least as 'understudy' of Horace. Insensible to Horace's ironic exhortation to make a direct approach he drops every pretence, and only at 59b–60a does he revert to the role of the 'doctus' by way of perverting a 'dignified Greek oracular proverb' (one has to keep up appearances!), completely oblivious of the fact that he has irrevocably destroyed any hope he may have had of being admitted to the establishment.

* * *

Buchheit rightly maintains that, as in the case of many poems of Horace and of the Augustan poets in general, the real, underlying assertion or meaning of our poem is a concealed one. As regards 1,9, the merit of Buchheit's interpretation is twofold: apart from gathering together for the first time some previously noted but isolated parallels with a literary implication between the ninth and tenth satires, he observes further links between these poems and Horace's literary theory elsewhere, and penetrates to the underlying literary significance of the poem as a whole, linking it up with Homeric parody.

In what follows I shall concern myself not with parody (except in passing) but with the links between 1,9 and both 1,10 and 1,4. In fact, 1,9 is almost as closely linked with the fourth as with the tenth satire; but while its significance is both of a literary and a moral nature, the chief underlying emphasis is on stylistic requirements, and for this reason 1,9 is naturally placed before 1,10.

Buchheit starts with a consideration of 'sic me servavit Apollo'. This alludes not only to the expression in the Iliad 20,443, where Hector is saved from Achilles by the intervention of Apollo, but also to Lucilius' use of the Homeric phrase (i.e., in Greek) in a situation which we cannot determine accurately. Horace uses the verse as a means of parody in transferring it from a lofty epic plane to a very different and lower sphere. But the expression 'sic me servavit Apollo' contains more than that, for it alludes to Sat. 10,20–30 where Lucilius is criticised for his mixing of Greek with Latin. It is an implicit criticism of Lucilius' verbatim use, in so far as Horace not only freely translates

17. Cf. the emphasis on 'hunc hominem', 47, as opposed to 'paucorum hominum', 44.
18. The expression is drawn from Anderson in AJP 77, 1956, 163.
20. Buchheit 532. To appreciate the full significance of his enquiry, the reader should carefully study his article cited in n.1 supra, especially pp. 532–542.
21. Fr. 231 Marx, 267 Warmington, 238 Krenkel.
the original saying, but gives it a new form suitable to its dramatic context.\textsuperscript{22}

Buchheit next refers to W. S. Anderson's enquiry which starts from a previously ignored factor. The original context of the Homeric saying is a battle scene, and Anderson has shown that, though this may not be apparent on the surface, Horace has employed throughout I,9 a large number of epic and martial expressions relevant to Homeric battle.\textsuperscript{23} This not only provides a new level of interpretation, but it shows that the concluding words of I,9 are embedded in the structure of the satire as a whole.

Anderson, of course, is fully aware that there are different levels of composition in the poem.\textsuperscript{24} Thus it will not be sufficient to say, e.g. (on the military level) that 'Horace must perish ignobly at the hands of a garrulus (33) ... In fact, the anteclimatic end of the prophecy, with its mock-epic tmesis quando ... cumque (33), reveals the weapon which, above all others, is deadly to Horace: meaningless verbosity. Accordingly he criticizes Lucilius for talkativeness in S., I,4 and 10; he attacks Hermogenes for his lack of literary discipline in I,2 and 3; and he sets up as his own great artistic ideal brevitas'.\textsuperscript{25}

Buchheit proceeds further on the literary level of interpretation and considers the relevant background against which we should appreciate the ninth satire. He finds it in the literary agon or contest, e.g. that between Aeschylus and Euriptides in the Frogs of Aristophanes, and in an epigram of Lukillios (A.P. 11,136) in which an allusion to Homer is combined with the metaphor of the literary agon. Against the same background, in the wider forensic-rhetorical sphere, he refers to Horace's epic parody in Sat. I,5, 51b–53a (the invocation of the Muse in narrating the 'pugna' between the two jesters) and the whole of Sat. I,7.

As regards our poem, I,9, Buchheit maintains that Horace has to defend himself less against a 'garrulus' than against a fellow who presumes to have the poetic gift ('der sich das Dichtertum annasst', 535). However, since Buchheit's aim—if I understand him correctly—is to interpret I,9 as an agon (and as a parody of this genre) on the literary level between Horace as poet and the 'garrulus' as poetaster, he first turns to Horace as poet. The significant passages to which he refers first are the opening and concluding scenes. In the former we have Horace meditating on his poetry ('nescioquid meditans

\textsuperscript{22} For further differences suggested by Buchheit, on which the reader may not always be able to follow him, see his article 533–4. On 'sic me servavit Apollo', see also Fraenkel, \textit{Horace} 118.

\textsuperscript{23} Anderson, \textit{AJP} 77, 1956, 148–66. Fraenkel, \textit{Horace} 118 noted only the warlike notes of the concluding scene of I,9. The main results attained by Anderson are summarised by Buchheit 534, n.91. The military metaphor is, of course, frequently no more than implicit, cf. Rudd, \textit{Horace} 79.

\textsuperscript{24} See now also Rudd 80 on the 'world of civil law' and its terminology which lies 'between the worlds of conversation and heroic action'.

nugarum', cf. Heinze's note) when disturbed by the 'garrulus'; and at the close of the poem it is (implicitly) the poet Horace who is saved by Apollo.

At this stage of the argument I would submit that the opening lines of I,9 may be appreciated more fully in the light of the passage which forms the last section of I,4, viz., vss. 129b–143 which link up with the previous scene (103b–129a). There Horace appeals for his freedom of speech to the habit derived from his father of avoiding 'vitia' by branding them with practical examples (105b–106):

insuevit pater optimus hoc me,  
ut fugerem exemplis vitiorum quaeque netando.

Since the relevant scene also throws light upon other passages in the ninth satire, I shall quote the greater part of it (4,129b–139a):

ex hoc ego sanus ab illis,  
perniciem quaecumque ferunt, mediocribus et quis  
ignoscas vitiss teneor. fortasss et istinc  
largiter abstulerit longa aetas, liber amicus,  
consilium proprium. neque enim, cum lectulus aut me  
porticus except, desum mihi: 'rectius hoc est; -  
hoc faciens vivam melius; - sic dulcis amicis  
occurrem; - hoc quidam non belle: numquid ego illi  
inprudens olim faciam simile?' haec ego mecum  
compressis agito labris; ubi quid datur oti,  
inludo chartis.

'Owing to this (training) I am sound from all ruinous faults, though I am subject to moderate and pardonable failings. Who knows, even from these much will be deducted by a long life, an outspoken friend, my own reflections. For when I recline upon my little couch, or take a stroll in the colonnade, I do not neglect my interests: "This is the more correct course – by acting so I shall live a better life – this is how I shall be agreeable to my friends when I go to meet them – this was not nice of so and so; is it possible that at any time I may thoughtlessly do something similar?" These are the things that I meditate upon with lips shut tight; and when I have a little leisure, I trifle with my papers'.

What light can the concluding portion of I,4 now throw upon the opening section of I,9? Most probably that the subject of Horace's meditation (in the sense of 'composing' verses) when he went for a stroll along the Via Sacra, would be of the kind described in 4,134b–137a, i.e. moral topics; and that this, together with such faults as he observed in actual life, would be incorporated
into his ‘nugae’ – in the sense of his satiric verse – as soon as he had the required ‘otium’ to do so. 27

The opening verses of our poem therefore seem to concern Horace not merely as a poet, but implicitly as a poet with a moral function. There is nothing in the concluding verse ‘sic me servavit Apollo’ which conflicts with this. Though we have less definite evidence here, it is undoubtedly Apollo as (Greek) patron of poets and Saviour god (i.e., implicitly with a moral function) who intervened and saved Horace. 28 However that may be, we shall find confirmation of the moral significance of the poem in the third main scene (vss. 43b–60a) which also forms the most important single section of the satire.

As regards the obtruder, Buchheit proposes to establish that in I,9 (qua literary agon) Horace as poet has to defend himself rather against a poetaster than against a ‘garrulus’. While I am much indebted to his argument and some of his references, I shall now argue that the essential contest in the satire is between Horace, as a poet who is a model of ‘brevitas’ and member of a circle with high moral principles, on the one hand, and on the other hand a poetaster who is a model of ‘garrulitas’ and, moreover, completely lacking in moral scruple.

There are a number of passages in the poem in which we find references and probable allusions to the ‘quidam’ as would-be poet. The first occurs in vs. 7, ‘docti sumus’, which has been considered above, and which links up with 10,87. The second occurs in vs. 22ff, where the pest compares himself with Viscus and Varius, 29 and substantiates his claim to Horace’s friendship as follows (23b–25):

\[
\text{‘nam quis me scribere pluris aut citius possit versus? quis membra movere mollius? invideat quod et Hermogenes, ego canto’.}
\]

‘For who can write more verses or write more quickly than I? Who can move

27. Note also the following probable parallels or contrasts between the opening scene of I,9 and the closing scene of I,4:

\[
\begin{align*}
4,137–9 & \text{ haec ego mecum ... agito} & 9,2 & \text{ nescio quid meditans nugurum} \\
4,135f & \text{ sic dulcis amicis/occurrem: hoc quidam non belle} & 9,3 & \text{ accurrunt quidam notus mihi nomine ...} \\
& & 9,4 & \text{ ‘dulcisissime terum’ cf. 9,59 occurram in trivis}
\end{align*}
\]


For various alternative interpretations of the significance of ‘sic me servavit Apollo’ which have been proposed, see Anderson, \textit{AJP} 77, 1956, 149f, who rightly suggests that the most adequate interpretation would synthesize them into a coherent whole. Anderson, p. 149, points out that ‘as the god who watches over poets and concerns himself with principles of justice, Apollo can be regarded, on the supernatural level, as the agent effecting Horace’s release from the garrulus’. It is futile to attempt to associate Apollo in 9,78 with a specific Roman monument of the god, cf. Anderson 150f (with reference to other literature) and 166.

29. For other references to Viscus and Varius, see n.5 supra.
his limbs more nimbly? And, something that even Hermogenes might envy, I sing'.

Buchheit points out parallel passages for 23b–24a (the 'quidam' as 'Lucilianer') not only in Satires 4 and 10 but elsewhere in Horace, and rightly observes that from such an 'all round artist' no serious poetry may be expected. As for the man's dancing ability, he reminds us that it was hardly a matter of pride for a free Roman. To this we may add that 'quis membra movere mollius' suggests an ironic pointer to 10,57–59, 'negarit i versiculos... magis factos et euntis mollius': the fellow is concerned with the 'mole' in the wrong genre! And when he calls upon the cantor (Tigellius) Hermogenes as a witness to his gift for song, this provides a link with both the literary satires (4,72 and 10, vss. 80 and 90).

The next passage concerns 26b–28a, where Horace asks the man whether he has a mother or other relatives for whom he must preserve himself. Buchheit comments that the boastful boor does not understand the criticism behind this ironic question, and that his reply, 'omnis conposui', 'I have buried them all', contains a catchword which brilliantly exposes his reputed poetic gifts. This is an ingenious observation, though we cannot be sure that a deliberate pun was intended by Horace.

We come, fourthly, to the prophecy of the old woman—'a splendid piece of parody' (Ed. Frankel)—which concludes as follows (33–34):

'garrulus hunc quando consumet cumque: loquaces, si sapiat, vitet simul atque adoleverit aetas'.

'A chatterbox some day will wear him out: babblers let him avoid, if he be wise, as soon as he grows up'.

'Garrulus', of course, harks back to 'garriret', 13, and links up with 4,12, 'garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem' and other passages listed above.

30. Or, omitting the comma after Hermogenes: 'Hermogenes himself might envy my singing'.

31. Buchheit 536, n.100. He compares Sat. I,4, vss. 9ff, 16 ('videamus uter plus scribere possit'), 21; I,10, 50ff, 80. (vs. 80, cf. 90, concerns Hermogenes; in 50ff I should limit the reference to 58–61. The metaphor of the muddy river, cf. I,10, 50, also 36f, is not relevant to I,9, though Buchheit 539 introduces it into his discussion of the poem). Buchheit further refers to Epist. 2,1,117 ('scribimus indociti doctique peennata passim'), 167, 224f; 2,2,110 (cf. further references to Callimachus); Ars 291ff (on the Latin poets found lacking in 'limae labor et mora'), 382ff, 417f. 'Der aufdringliche Dichterling ist daher mit jenen Dichteren zu vergleichen, die wie Lucilius garruli und piger scribendi ferre laborem (sat. I,4. 12) sind und sich mit garrirre begnügen, das ernsthafte Arbeit ausschliesst (vgl. sat. I, 4, 12, 41). garrulus heisst bei Horaz z.B. Cervius, der nach Grossmutterart Geschichten erzählt (sat. 2, 6, 77), oder der ineptus Crispinus (sat. 1, 3, 139), der mit dem Vielschreiber (sat. 1, 4, 14) identisch ist'. To these references we may add Sat. I, 1, 120–1 on Crispinus.

32. Buchheit 537. For 'conponere' in its literary sense in the Satires, cf. I, 4, 8 'durus conponere versus', II, 1, 3 'conposui' and 63 'conponere'; cf. also I, 10, 1 'inconposito... pede' (of Lucilius' verse). On a possible pun in 'deducam', vs. 59, see infra n.41.

33. Cf. n.31 supra.

45
In the present context, however, Buchheit rightly links it with the theme (in literary criticism) 'if words could kill', to which he had previously briefly drawn attention elsewhere. Buchheit now differentiates between the passages that illustrate this theme, and notes that it forms part and parcel of Callimachean literary criticism. In Horace it is found not only in the above passage, but in the *Ars* 445–476 where Horace finally ridicules the insane poet, the verse-monger who is incapable of 'limae labor', vs. 291, 'the toil of the file'. Twice he is described in words which literally echo verses in *Sat.* 1,9, viz. in *Ars* 455f, 'vesanum tetigisse timent fugiuntque poetam / qui sapiunt', 'those who are wise fear to touch an insane poet and do flee him' (cf. 9,33f); and 475, 'quem vero arripuit, tenet occiditque legendo', 'when indeed he lays hold of a man, he holds him fast and reads him to death' (cf. 'arreptaque manu', 9,4).

We turn next to the obtruder's impudent question: 'Maecenas quomodo tecum' (43), to which Horace replies firmly: 'paucorum hominum et mentis bene sanae'. Buchheit interprets this pronouncement 'auch als literarisches Urteil', and he bases his interpretation partly on a comparison with a passage in *Sat.* 1,6; but I submit that the real meaning is simply: 'Maecenas is a man of few friends, and he is sensible enough (not to admit you)'; and that, like the whole section down to vs. 59a, it has a purely moral significance. Heinze interprets briefly and correctly as follows: 'mentis bene sanae charakterisiert die vorsichtige Bedächtigkeit des *cautus adsumere dignos* (1,6,51), wie die Verbindung *pro bene sano ac non incauto* I,3,6, zeigt. Let us consider these

34. Cf. Gnomon 37, 1965, 691: *Anth. Pal.* XI, 131, 135, 136, 204; *catal.* 2; *Ars* 475; *Epod.* 14,5 ('occidis saepe rogando'); Catullus 44, 12; 14, 19ff; *Priap.* 61, 13.
35. Buchheit 540, cf. n.115.
36. *Sat.* 1,6,51–64. For Buchheit's argument, see next note.
37. Buchheit's argument on p. 540 may be summarised as follows:

1. The qualities 'paucorum ... sanae' characterise both Maecenas and (cf. I, 6, 51–64) his circle.
2. The circle consists of poets.
3. Therefore the pronouncement is also a literary judgement ('zumal die Satire insgesamt einen literarkritischen Tenor hat' – which, I submit, is not altogether correct. The satire has both a literary and a moral 'Tenor').

The conclusion does not follow, firstly, because both in 9, 44 and in 6, 51–64 the qualities characterise only Maecenas; and secondly, while the members of the circle may be regarded as reflecting the qualities of the leader, the context in 9, 45ff and parallel passages in both 6, 51–65 and 3, 58b–62 show that we are concerned with a moral judgement.

With reference to 9, 49 'domus hac nec purior ulla est', I submit that Buchheit's attempt (540f and n.116) to show that 'auch mit purior dürfte neben dem sittlichen ein literarischer Aspekt gemeint sein' does not convince. Even 'doctior' (9, 50) does not affect the exclusively moral significance of 9, 43b–59a, cf. Heinze on 'ditior aut doctior'. Of course, Horace would not have been admitted to the circle merely 'vita et pectore puro' (6, 44), i.e. if he had not also been a good poet. But the last-mentioned qualification is relevant neither in 1,6 nor in the present context in 1,9. Büchner, *Horaz* 122 links 9, 49b–50 also with 5, 40b–43; cf. also ibid. 124 on the relation of 9 to 5.

38. Buchheit 540, n.114 observes: 'Zum sprachlichen (my italics) Verständnis vgl. KISSLING-HEINZE z. St.' (i.e. on 9, 44); but Buchheit's interpretation of the significance of 9, 44 does not accord with the parallel references given by Heinze, cf. also Buchheit n.115.
passages in some detail. In 6,50ff Horace says that no one should grudge him his friendship with Maecenas, especially as the latter is cautious to select as friends only worthy men, such as hold aloof from base ambitio, 51–52b:

præsertim cautum dignos adsumere, prava ambitione procul.

Horace then tells the story of how he was introduced to Maecenas, and after a long wait was invited to join his circle of friends. The great thing (‘magnum’, 62) for him was that he was chosen by Maecenas by virtue of ‘vita et pectore puro’, 64.

We have now seen the significance of ‘cautus’. The phrase which provides the link with ‘bene sano’ occurs in 3,58b–62:

hic fugit omnis
insidias nullique malo latus obdit apertum,
cum genus hoc inter vitae versemur, ubi acris
invidia atque vigent ubi criminis; pro bene sano
ac non incauto fictum astutumque vocamus.

‘Another escapes every trap and never leaves himself open to malicious attack, for we are engaged in a life where envy is sharp and slander active. Instead of saying he’s a wise fellow and no fool, we call him insincere and crafty’ (trans. Rudd).

‘Cautus’, or ‘non incautus’ in the above passages means ‘circumspect’, with a moral reference; and since ‘non incauto’ is connected to ‘bene sano’ as homogeneous in meaning (the same applies to ‘fictum astutumque’), we may expect the phrase ‘mentis bene sanae’ in 9,44 to have the same meaning as its counterpart (likewise used of Maecenas) in 6,51f, viz., ‘cautum dignos adsu­mere, prava / ambitione procul’. The moral significance of the third main section of the ninth Satire, as well as the parallelisms of our piece with the relevant sections of I,6 and I,3, is confirmed by the evident prava ambitio and the implicit invidia (cf. 3,61) of the obstruer. Only in the very last lines of this third section does a literary allusion crop up in a very disguised manner (59b–60a): ‘nil sine magnò / vita labor dedit mortalibus’, where the catchwords are ‘magnum’ and ‘labor’. In fact, ‘magnum’ is a key-word which

39. Observe the parallels and opposites to ‘singultim paucà lecutus ... respondes, ut tuus est nos, / paucà: abeo’ (6, 55b–61b) in 9, 1–14. There is probably also a deliberate contrast between the fact that Horace’s introduction to Maecenas was not a chance affair (‘non ... casu’, ‘nulla ... fors’, 6, 52–4, on which cf. Rudd, Horace 41), while his encounter with the ‘garrulus’ was – from his point of view – purely by chance (cf. ‘forte’, 9, 1). See also Rudd, Horace 83.

40. Cf. Rudd, Horace 83 on the pest’s ambitio and invidia, and see Büchner, Horaz 113.

41. Since this significant line (on the literary level) is immediately preceded by the boor’s ‘deducam’ – ‘I’ll escort him’, i.e. Maecenas – it is probable that ‘deducam’ contains a deliberate pun with reference to the literary meaning of the word, ‘to compose’, as used by Horace in, e.g. Sat. II, 1,4 ‘mille die versus deduci posse’; cf. Epist. II, 1, 22ff: ‘cum lamentamur non apparere labores nostros et tenui deducta poema filo’.
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plays a significant part in Horace's ironic vocabulary in general, and particularly in the present section (43b–60a) where 'magnum adiutorem' near the beginning (vs. 46) and 'magnum narras' at the centre (vs. 52) prepare the way for the fellow's use of magnum in the concluding line: 'nil sine magno . . . labore' (vs. 59f). Of this rendering of the oracular proverb — οὐδὲν ἄνευ καμάτου πέλει ἄνδρόσιν εὐπέτεις ἔργον — Anderson observes: 'It is perhaps significant that the unscrupulous garrulus has perverted the neat hexameter unit as well as the moral basis of the original'. We should note further that with this maxim the 'garrulus' does not merely revert to playing the role of the 'doctus (poeta)'. Horace himself, I suggest, has returned from the moral to the literary sphere with an ironic contrasting echo to the well-known passage on Lucilius, 4,8b–13a:

durus conponere versus.

nam fuit hoc vitiosus: in hora saepe ducentos,

ut magnum, versus dictabat stans pede in uno;

cum fleret lutulentus, erat quod tollere velles;

garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem,

scribendi recte (cf. vs. 20: usque laborantis).

The 'garrulus', who claims to be 'non piger', is now ironically exposed as representing the class of would-be poets who not only have a false sense of literary values (cf. 'ut magnum'), but are completely ignorant of what true 'labor' in the literary sphere consists of, such as the 'toil of the file' ('limae labor', Ars 291), or as Horace puts it in 10,72–73:

saepe stilum vertas, iterum quae digna legi sint

scripturus, neque te ut miretur turba labores.

'Often you must erase, if you mean to write what is worthy of a second perusal; nor should you labour for the admiration of the crowd'. Finally, the 'garrulus' in the context exposes himself as completely lacking in the moral qualities which the true poet should have. Horace expresses this sentiment quite clearly in Epist. II,1,119b–122b, despite the fact that his tone there is that of 'ridens dicere verum'.

It remains to consider the last main section where Aristius Fuscus appears on the scene to provide Horace with a last — but rapidly lost — ray of hope. The link which this scene provides with 1,10 is perhaps more significant than the fact that Fuscus there appears (vs. 83) amongst the 'docti . . . et amici' (vs. 87), and may therefore be expected to rescue Horace. Musurillo points to 'the mischievous Aristius Fuscus, who, like many a character from Roman comedy, 42. The following are a few examples from Sermones, lib. 1: 3, 136 'magnorum maxime regum'; 6,72f 'magni / quo puere magnis e centurionibus orti'; 7,21f 'magnum spectaculum uterque'; 10, 21f 'at magnum fecit, quod verbis graecae latinis / miscuit', cf. 10, 35 'magnas Graecorum malis inplere catervas'. See also 4, 10 cited above.
43. AJP 77, 1956, 163.
leaves the hero in the lurch'. Now this would be particularly appropriate if, as a scholium in Porphyrio maintains, Fuscus was a writer of comedies. Buchheit also rightly speaks of the 'witzige Komik' of the scene. But the key to a fuller significance of the scene may be found in 10,41 where Horace speaks of Fundanius, the chief comic poet of his day, as one who is able 'comis garrire libelles', i.e. able to give urbane descriptions in his chatty plays. Now this provides a hint to what Horace is doing in the present section: he is presenting an urbane 'garrulus' ironically assisting a boorish 'garrulus' instead of helping Horace.

When Aristius takes his leave, he begs to be excused on the ground that it is the thirtieth Sabbath, and that one should not insult the circumcised Jews. Contrary to Horace he has religious scruples, since he is 'unus multorum', 'one of the many'. It is perhaps not too fanciful to suggest that the reference to the Jews in the Fuscus scene links up with the concluding verses of the fourth Satire (140–143) –

multa poetarum veniet manus, auxilio quae
sit mihi (nam multo plures sumus), ac veluti te
Iудaei cogemus in hanc concedere turbam

—and to find in these verses an amusing contrast: Horace is jokingly using the solidarity of the Jews to represent the class of poets as a large crowd ('multo plures sumus', 142, cf. 'turbam', 143) which in contrast to Aristius Fuscus (as 'unus multorum' in a different sense) will come to his aid.

* * *

From the analysis given in the earlier part of this chapter it is evident that the introductory and closing scenes of 1,9 are distinguished from the main body of the satire by their parallel as well as their contrasting expressions; and that the beginning of each of the four main sections is clearly indicated by a significant term or name in the first or second line ('docti sumus'; Viscus, Varius; Mae-

---

44. CB 40, 1963–64, 66.
45. Lejay on Sat. I. 9, 61. On Aristius as grammaticus, see R. G. M. Nisbet, CQ 9, 1959, 74f.
46. Buchheit 532.
47. In his note on 'garriret' (9, 13), Heinze should not have compared 10, 41. With 'ridens dissimulare' (9, 66) cf. 'eludente' in 10, 41.
48. On the question whether this expression is nonsensical or meaningful (in either case a joke), see the commentators, and most recently Musurillo, CB 40, 1963–64, 69 n.13 and Büchner, Horaz 120, n.14. See further n.49 infra.
49. As regards Hanna Szelest's interpretation of the three passages where Horace refers to the Jews (4, 104–3; 5, 99f; 9, 69f), in Römische Satire, Rostock 1966, 543, column 2, I agree that they are ironic in tone, but disagree that they contain 'ein ... verächtlicher Ton des Autors'. Horace is simply roping in the Jews, their 'superstition' and solidarity to amuse his audience or readers; cf. M. Chirat, 'Horace et les Juifs' in BFS 41, 1962–63, 256. On the Jew Apella of 5, 100 and 'the circumcised Jews' of 9, 70, cf. Rudd, Horace 146f.
cenae; Fuscus Aristius). The conclusion of each of these sections is apparently also marked by a significant term or phrase which has not to my knowledge been fully observed. I suggest that in all four cases they contain or conceal—in a most ironic manner—a literary significance which becomes clear when we relate them to passages in Satires 10 and 4.

The first main section concludes with (20–21a):

\[
\text{demitto auriculas, ut iniquae mentis asellus} \\
\text{cum gravius dorse subiit onus.}
\]

'Down go my ears, like a sulky young donkey's, when he supports a load too heavy for his back'.

This appears to point forward to Horace's well-known pronouncement on 'brevitas' and the consequences of a lack of 'brevitas'—the latter being the supreme 'vitium' of the 'garrulus' in the literary sphere—in 10,9f: 'est brevitate opus, ut currat sententia, \textit{neue/impediat verbis lassas onerantibus auris}': 'You need terseness, so that the thought may run freely on and not become tangled in a mass of verbiage which will weigh heavily on the listener's ear' (transl. Rudd).

The conclusions of the two middle sections seem to point back to equally significant passages in the fourth satire which criticise two of the main literary 'vitia' of Lucilius, his harsh versification and his prolixity. Thus 9,42b–43a—

\[
\text{ego, ut contendere durum est} \\
\text{cum victore, sequor.}
\]

'As for me, as it's hard to fight with one's victor, I follow'.

—recalls 4,8, '\textit{durus componere versus}', Lucilius 'harsh in the composition of his verses'; while 9,59b–60a—

\[
\text{nil sine magn}o \\
\text{vita labore dedit mortalibus}
\]

'Nothing without much toil does life grant to mortals'

—links up ironically with 4,12f '\textit{garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem, / scribendi recte}', 'a chatterbox, lazy to bear the toil of writing, i.e., of writing correctly'.

Finally, we have seen that at the end of the fourth main section Horace is left in the lurch by Aristius Fuscus, 73b–74a:

\[
50. \text{That these links with 4, 8ff are not simply imaginary, is shown by (a) 'ut magnum', 10} \\
\text{(b) 'garrulus', 12 (c) a proposed contest (cf. 'contendere', 9,42) as to 'uter plus scribere possit',} \\
\text{16, cf. 'usque laborantis', 20.}
\]
fugit improbus ac me
sub cultro linquit.

'The rascal runs away and leaves me under the knife'.

It seems likely that in 'sub cultro' we have a cunningly concealed link with 10,36 (in its literary sense):

turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona ...

'When the turgid Alpman cuts the throat of Memnon ...

* * *

We have seen that 1,9 forms a pair with 1,10 (and, to a lesser extent, 1,4) in the sense that it reflects its literary theory in a manner which is usually deftly concealed and often extremely ironic. At the same time it accords with the positive literary theory of 1,10,9–15 in a variety of ways. It is a model of 'brevitas', e.g. in the effective opening and concluding scenes; its style is that of 'the orator and poet' in so far as it contains brilliant epigram parody, and is in fact a parody of a literary agon: instead of fighting, Horace is continually on the run. Its main style is that of the 'urbanus' in Horace's ironic conversation with and handling of the 'garrulus', and in the comic scene with Aristius Fuscus. Finally, its whole spirit is that of the 'ridiculum', or of 'ridentem dicere verum' (I,1,24), and most successfully so, particularly as Horace in I,9 'laughs at himself, appearing in turn as the harassed soldier, the dejected prisoner, and the helpless victim'. So much, apart from the pointers at the end of the first main section, for the relation between I,9 and the first section of I,10 (i.e., vss. 1–19).

In regard to the second section of I,10 (vss. 20–35), we find the practice of Lucilius 'verbis Graeca Latinis miscere' parodied in the concluding sentence of I,9: 'sic me servavit Apollo'; as regards the third section (10,36–49), we have found a probable link between 'sub cultro' and 'iugulat', while 'comis garris libellos' is nicely illustrated in the Aristius Fuscus scene in the ninth satire. Coming to the fourth section of I,10 (vss. 50–77) we find a contrasting echo of 'quis membra movere/mollius' (9,24b–25a) in 'mollius' with reference to versification; and finally, in the fifth section (10,78–92) two names reappear from I,9 (Hermogenes Tigellius and Fuscus), while 'doctos ... amicos' links up with the 'docti sumus' and 'amicum' in the previous satire.

51. Cf. supra n.10.
53. Rudd, Horace 84.
54. For an analysis of Sat. I,10, see AClass XIII, 1970, 8ff.
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The significance of I,9 in the sphere of literary criticism should not lead us to underestimate the moral significance of certain parts of the poem, and indeed of the satire as a whole. While this is only implicit in the first two verses (which probably link up with the moral precepts of the closing section of I,4) and in the final verse (Apollo as Saviour with a moral function), it becomes quite explicit in the third main section which is not only the most important part of the whole poem but has a purely moral significance – except, of course, for its concluding line (59b–60a) where the ‘garrulus’ reverts to the role of the ‘doctus’ by perverting the moral significance of the original maxim which he renders in Latin.

Rudd rightly remarks that it is clear throughout that the pest’s attentions are inspired not by a genuine liking and respect, but by ‘invidia’, and even more plainly by ‘ambitio’ which is illustrated by 9,56–60. Here we may recall that the parallel passages in 3,58b–62 and 6,49–64 are crucial, as we have seen, for interpreting the moral significance of the third main section of our poem; and that these passages also refer by name to the two moral vices manifested by the ‘garrulus’ in the ninth Satire.

While Anderson, Rudd and Buchheit have respectively elucidated the military, juridical and literary levels of interpretation of the ninth satire, the special merit of Buchheit’s contribution lies in his unfolding of the significance of the poem as a whole in regard to Horace’s literary theory and his use of epic parody. In the analysis and interpretation given above I have attempted to show that the concealed literary theory of the poem is both more limited and more extensive than argued by Buchheit: more limited in so far as the third main section – on Maecenas and his ‘circle’ – has a moral and not a literary significance (except for vs. 59b–60a); and more extensive in so far as the sententious expressions which terminate the four main sections probably all contain pointers to Horace’s literary theory. In addition I have argued that the moral significance of the poem only becomes fully clear when it is linked with parallel passages in I,4 (the literary satire which is mainly concerned with the moral function of satire) and in the two other satires which have friendship either as exclusive theme (I,3) or as a main theme (I,6, Maecenas and friendship); and that the relevant sections in the two last-mentioned pieces high-light the ‘invidia’ and ‘ambitio’ of the infamous intruder. And so the agon in I,9 is both a literary agon (and a parody of that genre) and a moral contest, and Horace is saved by Apollo as champion of high literary as well as of high moral principles.

55. Rudd, _Horace_ 83. We might note here that Sallust’s description of ‘ambitio’ in the _bad_ sense of the word suits the obtruder completely: ‘sed primo magis ambitio quam avaritia animos hominum exercebat, quod tamen vitium propius virtutem erat. nam gloriam honorem imperium bonus et ignavus aequus sibi exoptant; sed ille vera via nititur, huic quia bonae artes desunt, dolis atque fallacibus contendit’ (Cat. 11, 1f). With regard to Sat. I,10, we note that in contrast to the ‘garrulus’, Horace’s relation to his friends is free of ‘ambitio’ (vs. 84 ‘ambitione relegata’).
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