To my knowledge no inquiry has been made, or appeared in print, on the subject of direct or indirect influence of the themes and content of the Eclogues of Vergil on the Satires of Horace. At present it is recognised only that Horace in his first book derived a selection of ten poems, as well as a bipartite division – with two introductory poems, 1 and 6 – from the Eclogues. As for contents, Hosius in his conspectus of parallel passages to the Eclogues, gives only five references to each of the two books of Satires, as compared with twenty to the Epodes and twenty-two to the Odes; and Weyman in his ‘Similia zu Vergils Hirtengedichten’, written to supplement Hosius, has added very little that merits consideration in the present inquiry.

That the themes and the language of the Eclogues, quite apart from the structure of the published book, should have influenced Horace in the writing of his Satires, is a priori both possible and probable.

The Eclogues were written during the period 42 to 38 (or 37) BC, and were

---

*The author wishes to express his thanks to the Council of the University of South Africa for a financial grant which enabled him to travel to various centres in Europe for completing the research on which inter alia the present article is based.


2. C. Hosius (ed.), P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica cum auctoribus et imitatoribus, Bonn 1915 (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, herausgegeben von Hans Lietzmann, Nr. 134) (to be quoted as Hosius). The parallels listed by Hosius between the Eclogues and the Satires, Book I are: (a) Eel. 2,34 ~ Sat. 6,89. (b) Eel. 4,7 ~ Sat. 5,102f. (c) Eel. 4,38f ~ Sat. 4,29. (d) Eel. 7,17 ~ Sat. 1,27. (e) Eel. 8,107 ~ Sat. 9,67. Of these (a), (c) and (d) may be regarded as certain examples of conscious imitation by Horace. In the case of (b) we shall have to take into account influence of both Lucretius and Vergil. It does not seem that imitation of Vergil, conscious or otherwise, can be established in the case of (e), Eel. 8,107 'nescio quid certe est' and Sat. 9,67 'certe nescio quid', since 'nescio quid certe est' is found already in Catullus 80,5. Parallels (a) to (d) will all be considered in the present paper.

3. Of the very limited number of 'similia' noted by C. Weyman in Horace, Satires, Book I, we can consider only the following as probably deliberate imitation on the part of Horace: Eel. 4,21f ~ Sat. 1,110; perhaps Eel. 4,38 ~ Sat. 10,38. Weyman's 'Similia' were published in Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie 34, 1917, nos. 6,9,10,38/39; 35, 1918, nos. 15/16, 17/18, 43/44; and they were continued in Wiener Studien 42, 1920/21, 169–173; 43, 1922/23, 98–100; 44, 1924/25, 114–117; 45, 1926/27, 122–6, 248–251; 46, 1928, 101–2; 48, 1930, 212–7; 49, 1931, 142–8.
published probably in 37; the Satires of the first book were written from about 40, the majority in the period 38/37 to 35/34, and Book I was published not later than 33 BC. In Sat. 10 Horace refers to the Eclogues as already published (vss. 44-45); and as a friend of Vergil, Horace would have had access to the Eclogues – not only by hearing them recited, but also by discussion – even before they were published; and he would have had a copy of the published text available not later than 37, i.e., before he wrote the majority of the Satires of his first book, certainly before he finally selected them and edited them for publication. Horace’s high opinion of the Eclogues is clear from the fact that he lists Vergil as bucolic poet among the foremost exponents of literary genres of his day in the tenth Satire (vs. 44f).

But, it may be asked, what would satiric poems have in common with bucolics? Quite apart from the fact that the employment of the hexameter in both genres facilitated borrowing from the one poet by the other, it is clear that Vergil combined realism with the pastoral, so that his bucolics contain a fairly strong element of topical allusion, parody and even outright satire. Moreover, both Vergil and Horace had a philosophical interest that was more or less strongly coloured by Epicureanism, particularly when they wrote their early works.

Within the limited scope of the present paper, which contains much of an exploratory nature, I propose to show that Horace in the first book of his Satires borrowed and adapted much from the Eclogues in a conscious manner,

4. Cf. Brooks Otis, Virgil, Oxford 1963 (to be cited as Otis) 97 and n.1. G. W. Bowersock in HSCP 75, 1971, 73–80 proposes to assign the lower terminus of composition to the year 35 ac by relating the invocation in Eel. 8 (vss. 6–13) not to C. Asinius Pollio and his (supposed) Illyrian campaign in 39 ac, but to Octavian and his Illyrian campaigns in 35 ac; though he grants the possibility (p. 80) that the invocation was composed and inserted several years after the completion of the rest of the Liber Bucolicorum.

5. Cf. Knoche, 48f; E. Burck, Nachwort und bibliographische Nachträge, in Heinze 384f; R. Syme, Sallust, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1964, 281. Unless otherwise indicated, all references to the Satires in the present article are to the first book, i.e. Sermones I.

6. For a similar situation in regard to Aen. II, see B. Kytzler on ‘Das früheste Aeneis-Zitat’ in Gedenkschrift für Georg Rohde (ed. G. Radke), Tübingen 1961, 151ff. Kytzler shows that although it is generally accepted that the Aeneid was only composed from 29 ac onward (p. 151), there is a close verbal imitation of Aen. 2, vss. 8–15 in Horace, Sat. II, 1, 8–15, though Book II is generally taken to have been published probably in 30 ac (cf. Knoche, 49), with the first satire composed last to serve as an Introduction to the book. Kytzler 157–9 adduces strong arguments for a probable overlap between the final editing of Satires, Book II and the commencement of the composition of the Aeneid. At the same time we know that Aen. 2 was one of the books composed earliest in the series, cf. Kytzler p. 159.

not only by way of verbal and thematic echoes, but particularly by way of contrast imitation. Claims of imitatio will of course raise the question of 'how like is like', and opinions on this question will vary in many cases. Fortunately the reputation of Horace, in the sense of his independence or originality, is not at stake; and so, for reasons of space, I shall not attempt in all cases to consider the question, 'how unlike is like'? Again, I shall not be concerned with the influence of authors other than Vergil (as bucolic poet) on Horace (as satiric poet), except where absolutely necessary. Finally, I shall consider how far the arrangement of Satires in Book I was influenced by the order of the Eclogues as a book.

* * *

Satire I. There can be no serious doubt that Sat. 1,27 –

sed tamen amoto quaeramus seria ludo

– shows direct influence of Ecl. 7,17, spoken by Meliboeus:

posthabui tamen illorum mea seria ludo.

In Vergil Meliboeus, intent upon his work, is invited by Daphnis to a singing match between Corydon and Thyrus. After consideration he decides to give priority to the competition; and the above verse occurs in the introduction to the poem (or, to the competition). In Horace the passage comes shortly after the introduction, and it is the final verse of a parenthesis which contains a programmatic statement on the style or spirit of his work. We have here a fine example of contrast imitation in Horace, the contrast being deftly achieved by 'amoto' and the change of verb. While Vergil said 'however, I put aside my serious work for their sport' (where 'ludus' or sport means a poetic competition or singing match), Horace is saying: 'however, let us put aside sport (jesting) and turn to serious matters'.

The above is the only parallel in the Satires noted by Hosius with reference to Satire I. There will no doubt be general agreement that here the satirist was consciously echoing part of the Vergilian verse; and perhaps the same holds good for a parallel noted by Weyman, viz. Hor. Sat. 1,110 ‘quodque aliena capella gerat distentius uber’, ‘(each pines away) because his neighbour’s she-goat bears a more distended udder’ ~ Ecl. 4,21f ‘ipsae lacte domum referent

8. On Horace's independence in regard to his literary allusions, see N. Rudd, The Satires of Horace, Cambridge 1966 (to be cited as Rudd, Horace) 25–33. F. Cairns, Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry, Edinburgh 1972 does not take into account such independence (often coupled with contrast imitation) when he gives his otherwise sound warning against undue postulation of imitation (p. 32).

9. Horace’s independence is further evident from Ars 225–226 where, with reference to a Satyr play following the production of a tragedy, the poet speaks of 'vertere seria ludo', meaning 'to pass from grave to gay'.
distenta capellae / ubera', 'of their own accord she-goats will bring home their udders distended with milk'. Vergil's verse is part of a description of an ideal situation, of the 'utopia' in which the new-born divine boy will grow up. Horace links his verse up with his main theme of every man complaining of his profession and seeing an ideal situation in the profession of others, vs. 1ff, cf. vs. 108f where he returns to his starting-point and illustrates it with the verse under discussion (110). It is fully possible, of course, that Horace made independent use of a proverbial expression.

Satire 2. The satirist deals here with the folly of extravagance, in particular of sexual excess in the form of adultery, and - in the second half of the poem - of adultery with high-born ladies. After adapting Callimachus' epigram containing a comparison of the lover with a hunter who scorns what is ready to hand, Horace in the concluding section (111–134) leads up as follows to his recommendation and description of the ideal 'call-girl', 109–116a:

hiscine versiculis speras tibi posse dolores
atque apestus curasque gravis e pectore tolli?
nonne, cupidinibus statuat nature modum quem,

quaerere plus prodest et inane absindere soldo?
num tibi cum faucis urit sitis, aurea quaeris puccula?
num esuriens fastidis omnia praeter pavonem rhombumque?

10. I do not propose to discuss here the relation between Epod. 16,49 and Ecl. 4,21f. Before proceeding to the second poem of Horace, I suggest - purely as an hypothesis which merits consideration - that, if Horace did not introduce his 'deus' in 1,15 of his own accord, he may have 'borrowed' him from Vergil's human 'deus' in Ecl. 1,6. In extant Greek literature, to my knowledge, a god in a context of discontent with one's lot does not occur before Maximus of Tyre of the second century AD (cited by Heinze, cf. also Rudd, Horace, 20). The other Greek parallels quoted by Rudd, 20–22, do not include a god, and the same applies to similar sentiments in Latin authors quoted by Rudé 20–22. The nearest that I was able to find to a god in a comparable context occurs in Cicero, De Off. 1,120 (the reference is given by Rudd 276, n.21): 'multo enim et firmior est et constantior (sc. natura), ut fortuna non numquam tamquam ipsa mortalis cum immortalis natura pugnare videatur'. G. C. Fiske, Lucilius and Horace, Madison 1920, 230 suggests that Lucilius may have introduced the god. My hypothesis that Horace's god is derived from the first Eclogue may find some support in two verbal parallels which appear in Sat. 1 and Ecl. 1 (amongst other Eclogues), and which can be shown to be typical of Vergilian and not of Horatian style. These are 'en' in Sat. 1,151 'si quis deus "en ego" dicit' etc., cf. Ecl. 1, vss. 12, 57 and 71, also in Ecl. 5,65; 6,69; 8,9 and 9,42 (variant for 'et'); and 'fortunatus' in Sat. 1,4 'fortunati mercatores', cf. Ecl. 1,46 and 51 'fortunate senex'. Neither 'en' nor 'fortunatus' occurs elsewhere in the Satires.

11. I have stated my views on Sat. 2 in AClass XI, 1968, 43–55, and cannot refer here to the volume of literature on it which has appeared in recent years.
'Do you suppose that with verses such as these, sorrow and passion and the burden of care can be lifted from your breast? Would it not be more profitable to ask what limit nature assigns to desires, . . . and so to part the "void" from what is "solid"? Or, when thirst parches your jaws, do you ask for cups of gold? When hungry, do you disdain everything save peacock and turbot?' (Fairclough, Loeb translation).

Horace then draws the conclusion in regard to the object of physical passion: go for the slave (girl or boy) who is ready to hand!

Heinze in his comment on the above passage refers to the underlying Epicurean theory of the 'void' and the 'solid', of the three kinds of desires, and to the rejection of those that are 'neither natural nor necessary' in the concluding verses of the passage quoted above (114ff); and he compares Lucretius 4,1063ff (on love) which concludes with 'et servare sibi curam certumque dolorem', 1067.12

That the Horatian passage – notwithstanding the plural in 'dolores' and 'curas'13 – contains echoes of Lucretius cannot be doubted. On the contrast between 'void' and 'solid' in Epicurean ethics, Heinze compares Cicero's ridicule of the Epicurean L. Piso.14 Now if we bear in mind Cicero's frequent use of the term 'modus', in the sense of a measure or limit which is not to be exceeded, we might go further and suggest that Horace – who also uses 'modus' with reference to 'cupidines' in vs. 111 in the passage quoted above – may have had in mind specifically Cicero, De Finibus 1,45: inanium autem cupiditatum nee modus ullus nee finis inveniri potest'.15 I believe however that we can come much nearer to the 'source' consciously employed by Horace, both in regard to 'modus' and to vss. 114–116 above, if we turn to the second Eclogue.

Ecl. 2 contains the love lament of the shepherd Corydon for the beautiful Alexis. It concludes with a self-exhortation to cease from madness, and the insight (or self-deception?) that the frustrated lover can find another 'Alexis', cf. 68–9 and 73:

me tamen urit amor; quis enim modus adsit amori?
aah, Corydon, Corydon, quae te dementia cepit?

invenies alium, si hic fastidit, Alexim.

'But love still burns me; for what bound can be set to love? Oh Corydon,
Corydon, what madness has seized you? . . . You will find another Alexis, if this one scorns you.

Apart from the fact that the ‘dementia’ of vs. 69 turns up in a different guise in Satire 2 – cf. ‘insanité’, 49 and ‘insanum’, 97 with reference to the lover – it seems quite clear that Horace has transferred Vergil’s terminology (‘urit’ and ‘fastidit’) on ‘amor’ to the comparable sphere of thirst and hunger (‘urit’, ‘fastidis’), and then applies his conclusion to the sphere of physical passion as indicated above.

Horace’s use of ‘modus’ in Sat. 2,111 (see above) is certainly not Lucretian, for in the De Rerum Natura ‘modus’ as a ‘limit’ is used only in the sphere of physics; and as for ‘fastidio’, the verb does not occur in Lucretius at all. On the other hand Horace’s terminology with reference to thirst is Lucretian as much as it is Vergilian, so that we may have to reckon with a conflation of ‘sources’ not only in vss. 109–110 but also in vss. 114–115a of Satire 2 (see the passage quoted above).

In conclusion I would suggest that there is an element of irony in Horace’s imitation of the Corydon passage in Ecl. 2, 68–9 and 73, and that he is making fun of the burning, fastidious love of Corydon for Alexis.

Satire 3. We pass by Sat. 3 and Ecl. 3, where—in two very different poems—the dominating themes are the role of ‘amicitia’ in Horace (closely related to ‘amor’, cf. ‘amatorem’ in vs. 38 and ‘amari’ in 71) and of ‘amor’ in Vergil, and turn to surer ground in regard to ‘imitatio’ of Vergil by Horace in Sat. 4.

16. The OLD fasc. 3 rightly lists Ecl. 2,73 ‘fastidit’ under fastidio no. 3 ‘to regard with disdain or distaste, scorn, turn away from’; the example from Horace, Sat. 2, 115 ‘fastidis’ is not cited by the OLD, but it falls under meaning no. 1 ‘to show aversion to (food or drink)’.

17. Cf. 1,964 ‘carent ergo fine modoque’ (of the universe as infinite) and 2,92 ‘spatium sine fine modoque’. Lucretius is cited here, as elsewhere in the article, according to the verse numbering in Cyril Bailey’s edition of the De Rerum Natura, Oxford 1947 and later reprints.

18. Cf. ‘urere’ used in DRN 4,874 of thirst, ‘sitis’, 875; also Horace’s ‘... urit sitis, aurea quaeris/pocula ?’ (Sat. 2,114f) seems to recall DRN 4,850 ‘et sedare sitim prius est quam pocula natum’. Here we may note briefly the difference between Horace and Lucretius in regard to the cups. In his refutation of the teleological view in DRN 4, 823–57 (e.g. no part of our body was made for use, but found its own function after creation), Lucretius points out that ‘the slaking of thirst was born before cups’ (vs. 850 above). Horace relates the cups, in dealing with thirst, to the Epicurean theory of desires, and argues that one does not need golden ‘pocula’ to slake one’s thirst. I do not propose to deal with the differences in ‘urere’ between Lucretius, Vergil and Horace.

19. It is just possible that there are two conscious echoes of Ecl. 3 in Sat. 3, cf. (i) Sat. 3,31–33 ‘rusticius ... , at tibi amicus’ and Ecl. 3,84 ‘Pollio amat nostram, quamvis est rustica, Musam’; and (ii) Sat. 3, 13,4f ‘vellunt tibi barbam/ lascivi puero’ and Ecl. 3,64 ‘malo me Galatea petit, lasciva puella’. The word ‘lascivus’ occurs only here in Satires Book I.
Satire 4. Hosius lists only Sat. 4,29 as a parallel passage to Ecl. 4,38f, and we shall note the significance of this echo at a later stage.

At the beginning of Ecl. 4 Vergil proposes – perhaps in an ironic, partly playful manner\(^{20}\) – to touch loftier themes than those of normal pastoral poetry:

Sicelides Musae, paulo maiora canamus.
non omnis arbusta iuvant humilisque myricae.

Muses of Sicily, let us sing of a somewhat loftier theme. Hedge and lowly tamarisk do not delight everyone. (Putnam)

Vergil's theme is that of the birth and education of a divine boy and the coming of a Golden Age. Towards the end of the piece the poet links up his somewhat lofty theme with the concept of divine inspiration: granted a long life and sufficient inspiration ('spiritus', 54), he would tell of the deeds of the divine boy, and neither Orpheus nor Linus nor Pan would surpass him in singing (55–9).

With this we may compare the fourth section (38b–63) of the fourth satire in which Horace treats in a preliminary manner of the question of the artistic form and status of satiric verse. Parallel (though at a lower level) to Vergil's 'arbusta ... humilisque myricae' is his concept that what he writes is 'sermoni propiora', 42, 'more akin to conversational language'; and though he leaves open the question whether satire is true poetry (63), he does imply that it is not poetry in the grand or divinely inspired style, 43f: 'If one has inborn talent ('ingenium'), if one has a divine spirit and tongue of lofty utterance ('mens divinior atque os / magna sonaturum'), to him give the glory of the name of poet.'

So Horace's provisional conclusion, confirmed by Sat. II,6,17, is that his satiric muse is, basically, a 'musa pedestris'.\(^{21}\) Similarly, but in the opposite direction, Vergil intimates that he is exceeding the usual level of his 'silvestris musa' (1,2) in the fourth (as in the sixth) Eclogue; in fact he does keep the poem within the framework and style of pastoral poetry, (cf. Ecl. 4, vs. 18–25, 28–30, 40–5 and 58–9; cf. also Ecl. 3,84, 'rustica, Musam' and 6,8 'agrestem Musam').

Despite certain parallelisms in terminology and concept,\(^{22}\) it would be difficult to find conscious imitation, or deliberate contrast imitation, of Vergil's pastoral theory in Horace's theory of satire either in their fourth poems or elsewhere. All that we may conclude on this point is that both poets dealt with

---

22. Cf. 'spiritus' in Ecl. 4,54 and Sat. 4,46; Ecl. 4,1 'paulo maiora canamus' and Sat. 4,43f 'os / magna sonaturum'. With Sat. 4,43 'mens divinior' cf. Ecl. 6,67 'divino carmine' (of Linus) and also 'divine poeta' in Ecl. 5,43 and 10,17.
a comparable theme of literary theory in their poems of opposite number: Vergil, as elsewhere in the Eclogues, mainly in an indirect manner, Horace in a mainly direct manner.

We may next consider whether there are any significant similarities in the education of the ‘puer’ in the two poems, noting of course the contrast between the divine boy of Ecl. 4 and the boy of lowly origin in Sat. 4 (but one who went to the same school as the sons of the highborn, as we learn from Sat. 6,71–8).

After sketching briefly the process from the birth of the divine boy to his assumption of power and his rule ‘patriis virtutibus’ in 4,11–17, Vergil distinguishes three stages in his growth and education:

(i) 18–25: the boy as an infant, receiving gifts of nature;
(ii) 23–36: the stage of the ‘schoolboy’ and youth who can read of the famous deeds of heroes and the exploits of his father, and so learn what ‘virtus’ is, 26–7:

\[\text{at simul heroum laudes et facta parentis iam legere et quae sit poteris cognoscere virtus.}\]

(iii) 37–45: the stage of manhood, introduced as follows: ‘Next, when by now the strength of years has made you a man’, 37:

\[\text{hinc ubi iam firmata virum te fecerit aetas.}\]

Now despite the fact that in Vergil the accent falls more directly on the child, and in Horace initially more directly on the father, it seems clear that Horace distinguishes two steps in his own education which are comparable to the second and third stages of Vergil’s ‘puer’ (the first stage, of course, is not relevant in Sat. 4)\(^{24}\):

1. Boyhood and youth, 105bff, when ‘insuevit pater optimus hoc me, / ut fugerem exemplis vitiorum quaeque notando’, ‘my most excellent father accustomed me to this, by branding as infamous the several vices, that I might avoid them’; and where this moral training is based on the principle of maintaining the ancestral custom: ‘traditum ab antiquis morem servare’ (117).\(^{25}\) This is also the stage of the elder schoolboy at Rome, cf. 6,7ff.

---


24. Cf. however the parallelism Sat. 1,110 ~ Ecl. 4,21f noted by Weyman and quoted above under Satire I.

2. Manhood, 119b–20, briefly compressed in less than two verses: ‘when years have given strength to your body and mind, you will swim without the cork’:

\[
\text{simul ac duraverit aetas} \\
\text{membra animumque tuum, nabis sine cortice.}
\]

This stage (linking up with the former) is taken up again at 129b–133a.

That there is an outline parallelism between Horace’s stages 1 and 2 and Vergil’s (ii) and (iii), is manifest. That this is not due to the commonplace nature of the theme or to coincidence is made clear by the following. During the second stage of the divine boy and the coming of the Golden Age we hear that a few traces of sin will lurk behind, e.g., the temptation of men to hazard the sea in ships, 31f:

\[
\text{pauca tamen suberunt priscae vestigia fraudis,} \\
\text{quae temptare Thetim ratibus . . .}
\]

In the third stage, however, these traces will disappear, for, says the poet at 37ff: ‘Next, when by now the strength of years has made you a man, even the merchant himself shall quit the sea, nor shall the ship of pine exchange her merchandise:

\[
\text{hinc ubi iam firmata virum te fecerit aetas,} \\
\text{cedet et ipse mari vector, nec nautica pinus} \\
\text{mutabit merces.}
\]

If any traces of doubt lurk behind in the reader’s mind as to whether Horace had Eclogue 4 and the education of the divine boy consciously in his mind when he wrote Satire 4, he may note that in this very satire the satirist seems clearly and deliberately to have adapted Vergil’s phrase ‘mutabit merces’ at Sat. 4,29: ‘hic mutat merces’. In Vergil the verse forms part of the education account, stage three.

Except in the last instance we have no ‘imitatio’ of terms or phrases in the two pieces, but an ‘imitatio’ of themes. Throughout Horace maintains his independence, for while in Ecl. 4 the theory (indirect) of bucolic poetry or style is a minor theme, the theory of satire (presented mainly directly) is the major theme in Sat. 4; and conversely, while in Vergil the education of the divine child is the major theme, in Horace the subject of his own education is a minor

26. Ps.-Acro ad Sat. I,4,29 notes: ‘Ita Maronis illud nec nautica pinus Mutabit merces’. Apparently Ps.-Acro did not know of an earlier occurrence of the phrase ‘mutare merces’. In our transmitted Latin literature at any rate the phrase occurs first in Ecl. 4,39, and thereafter in Horace, Sat. 4,29; cf. Thes. L.L. VIII, 850, 74–76, where the Horace reference is not included in the list of references which come after the Eclogues.
(though very important) theme linked on to his theory of satire. Finally, while Vergil says ‘nor shall the ship of pine exchange wares’ (4,39), Horace says of a merchant that ‘another exchanges his wares’ (4,29). In both cases the verb ‘mutare’ means ‘to exchange, barter, sell’, but the respective contexts are different: in Vergil it forms part of the account of the education of the divine boy, in Horace it is an example of the cardinal evil of ‘avaritia’ (cf. Sat. 4, 25ff).

**Satire 5.** In regard to the subject of ‘imitatio’, the fifth Satire or ‘Journey to Brundisium’ is well known as an ‘aemulatio’ of a piece by Lucilius.27 Hosius however notes as a parallel to Ecl. 4,7 – ‘iam nova progenies caelo demittitur alto’ (‘now a new generation descends from high heaven’) – the following passage in Sat. 5 (vss. 102f):

> nec, si quid miri faciat natura, deos id
> tristis ex alto caeli demittere tecto.

‘And if Nature works any wonder, the gods do not send it down from their high heavenly home when in sullen mood’.

Now the commentators observe that the preceding Horatian verse – 5,101 ‘non ego; namque deos didici securum agere aevum’, ‘not I; for I “have learned that the gods lead a life free from care”’, – is a parody of Lucretius DRN 5,82, cf. 8,68: ‘nam bene qui didiceru deos securum agere aevum’. That in the two following lines, quoted above (102f) Horace had also Lucretius in mind (besides Ecl. 4,7 ?) is suggested by the fact noted by Lejay28 that Lucretius uses ‘tecta’ of the heavens, cf. DRN 2,1109ff: ‘unde / apparet spatium caeli domus altaque tecta / tolleret a terris procul ...’: ‘and from them too the mansion of the sky might gain new room and lift its high vault far away from the lands’; and it is confirmed by the Lucretian formula ‘de caelo demittere’ in DRN 2,1154, ‘de caelo demisit’. In fact, Horace need not have had Vergil in mind at all, since his phrase ‘ex alto caeli demittere tecto’, 5,103, may easily have been conflated from Lucretius ‘de caelo demisit’ and ‘caeli domus altaque tecta’ – with a change from plural (‘altaque tecta’) to singular and a preposition ‘ex’ instead of ‘de’ governing ‘alto ... tecto’.

**Satire 6.** The main themes in Sat. 6 are the evil of ‘ambitio’ and an account of Horace’s education, with the emphasis on the didactic role of his father. The main theme of Ecl. 6 is a story about Silenus and an account of his ‘mythological’ song.

We may note that the sixth pieces of both Vergil and Horace have the secondary function of serving as introductions to the second halves of their

---

27. See on this most recently Rudd, *Horace* 54–6.
books. There can be no doubt that Horace took as example the most recent work with a double proemium, none other than the Eclogues which was also a collection of ten poems. It is clear, however, that the opening of Ecl. 6 as an introductory poem had no direct influence on the opening of Sat. 6. The sixth Eclogue starts as follows: 'Prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu . . . Thalia': 'My Muse is the first who deigned to sport with Sicilian verse'. The opening word 'prima' serves a double function. On the one hand it signifies the beginning of the second half of the book, just as 'Extremum (laborem)' at the beginning of Ecl. 10 introduces the last poem in the collection. On the other hand it expresses the pride of the poet who claims to be the first to sing Sicilian bucolics (in Latin poetry). 29

Horace's method is quite different. At the beginning of Sat. 6 he signifies the poem as a second introduction by means of a second 'invocation' of Maecenas: 'Non quia, Maecenas . . . '; and Fraenkel has rightly noted that the vocatives, here and at the beginning of the first satire ('Qui fit, Maecenas . . .'), can have only one meaning: 'the book as a whole and, by way of reminder, its second half are dedicated to Maecenas'. 30

Satire 7. On the narrative level the subject of the seventh satire is a 'lis' in the sense of a lawsuit which turns out to be largely an exchange of invective, though it is finally, and rapidly, decided by a brief touch of wit. The parties involved are Rupilius Rex, a Praenestine with Italian wit (cf. 'Italo aceto', 32), and Persius, a half-Roman half-Greek who wins the contest as 'Graecus' (vs. 32), i.e., with Greek wit.

The subject of Ecl. 7 - on the narrative level - is a singing contest between the shepherds Corydon and Thyrsis.

A certain parallelism between the seventh poems of our two poets seems evident. In the first place, both pieces are couched in the form of a 'certamen' or contest. Secondly, both very probably contain a kind of theory of poetry in a disguised and playful manner, and 'gestalthaft', not theoretical: Ecl. 7 of

---

29. On Ecl. 6.1–2, see C. Fantazzi, AJP 87, 1966, 171ff.

In regard to Sat. 6.89 'nil me paeniteat sanum patris huius', Fraenkel concludes a note on the meaning of 'paenitet' with the question: 'did Horace perhaps borrow the whole phrase nil me paeniteat from an earlier poet, possibly Lucilius?' (Horace 5f n.6). The recovery of further fragments of Lucilius may throw light on this question. Hosius notes the Horatian verse as parallel to Ecl. 2.34 'nec te paeniteat calamo trivisse labellum'. Formally however there is a closer relation between the Horatian verse and Ecl. 10.17 'nec te paeniteat pecoris, divine poeta'. Of course, in neither of the Vergilian passages does 'paeniteat' have exactly the same meaning as in Horace (where 'nil me paeniteat' means 'never would I be dissatisfied').
Vergil’s theory of pastoral poetry, and Sat. 7 of Horace’s moral and literary theory of satire as propounded mainly in Sat. 10.1–17a. In both pieces the contest is decided in favour of the best contestant, i.e., of Corydon, the best pastoral poet (or exponent of a particular kind of pastoral), in Ecl. 7, and of Persius, the best ‘saturist’, in Sat. 7.

Despite the parallelism of themes, we shall not find any explicit verbal imitation on the part of Horace. We can note contrasts, but without being able to say whether they are contrast imitations or not. While Thyrsis’ songs occasionally amount to parody of what pastoral poetry should not be (e.g., vss. 35–36, parody of Priapus’ statue), Horace makes use of epic parody in his account of both Rex and Persius, to show what satire should not be. Again, while in Sat. 7 both competitors are morally reprehensible (vss. 1–8) in terms of Horace’s moral theory of satire, it is clear that in Vergil only Thysis (the loser) has faults of a moral nature: like Persius (nevertheless as ‘Graecus’ the winner in Horace) he is arrogant and bitter of speech (see Sat. 7, vss. 2 and 6–8, and Ecl. 7.25f and 41). Finally, Horace implies at the outset that Persius is going to be the winner (vs. 2, ‘quo pacta sit Persius ultus’), but he does deal impartially with both contestants up to vs. 31: only in the last four verses does he turn the scale in favour of Persius (now as ‘Graecus’, vs. 32). In Vergil Thyrsis implicitly asserts his victory in advance (vs. 25 ‘Pastores, hedera nascentem ornate poetam’), but Vergil tilts the scales in favour of Corydon from the beginning, and in the latter part of the contest Thyrsis is learning from Corydon’s example.


32. On Sat. 1.7 as a subtle, concealed piece of literary or stylistic criticism, see AClass 14, 1971, 67–87, with reference to V. Buchheit in Gymnast. 75, 1968, 542–55; cf. also Buchheit’s n. 120 on p. 542: ‘Heranzuziehen ist ständig SCHRÖTER 15ff.’, i.e. R. Schröter in Poetica 1, 1967, 8–23 (important on the epic-parodic element in Sat. 7); and W. S. Anderson, AJP 93, 1972, pp. 10,11.

33. See Schröter cited in n.32.


35. Despite ‘videre tibi amarior herbis’, Ecl. 7.41 (cf. Sat. 7.7 ‘adeo sermonis amari’) it is more likely that Horace borrowed some of his terminology on this point from Lucilius than from Vergil, cf. Buchheit (n.32 supra) 545,n.129: ‘verbindet man sermonis amari (V.7) mit salso multoque fluenti (V.29) [sic for vs. 28], so wird man an Lucil. 1244M ore salae expiravit amaran erinnert (=Hom. Od. 5,322), ein Text, der sicher literarkritisch zu verste­hen ist’.

Satire 8. The eighth satire is, briefly, a parody of the god Priapus and of the Priapeum as a literary genre, and a satire aimed at ridiculing the witches Canidia and Sagana.

In the Eclogues the god occurs at 7,33f (‘Priape’, 33), where he is said to watch over a poor garden (‘custos es pauperis horti’, 34); with this we may compare the common burial-place for paupers at Sat. 8,10 (‘hoc miserae plebi stabat commune sepulcrum’) and contrast 8,7 ‘novis ... in hortis’, the Gardens laid out by Maecenas on the old pauper cemetery on the Esquiline Hill. Standing as he does in the new Gardens, Priapus says that he is nowadays worried by the witches who vex human souls with incantations and drugs, ‘carminibus ... atque venenis’, 19: as soon as the roving moon (‘vaga luna’, 21) has appeared, the witches come to gather bones and harmful herbs.

Thus we find the theme of witchcraft turning up in Sat. 8 as in the second part of Ecl. 8, in which Alphesiboeus sings of the magic charms employed by Amaryllis to bring back her lover Daphnis from the city. In Vergil Alphesiboeus begins the song of the deserted maiden by calling for water, and for soft wool to wreath the altars; for the burning of rich herbs (‘verbenas’, 65, cf. ‘herbas atque venena’, 95) to awaken with magic rites the lover’s passion; also for songs (‘carmina’, 67) which can draw the moon even from heaven, 69.

In Sat. 8 Horace fetches the witch Canidia together with her companion Sagana from the fifth epode, and they soon proceed to a defixio. They have two dolls, of which the larger — representing Canidia — is made of wool, ‘lanea et effigies erat’, 29, cf. Ecl. 8,75 ‘effigiem’; the other is a smaller waxen figure representing the unfaithful lover.

In both poems the waxen images are thrown into the fire, an act followed in both by incantations and acts (Ecl. 8,80ff; Sat. 8,43ff) which in the satire are not specified. When in the latter Priapus breaks wind (‘pepidi’, 46) the witches are taken by surprise, and they lose their herbs and magic love-knots (‘incantata ... vincula’, 49f, cf. Ecl. 8,78 ‘Veneris vincula’) as they flee in terror.

Heinze has noted that Horace had examples of this type of witchcraft in the second Idyll of Theocritus and the eighth Eclogue of Vergil. However, he rightly observes that Horace could have obtained his exact knowledge of magical rites either by word of mouth or from books on sorcery that were generally available. The question therefore arises whether — despite a number of similarities noted above — our poet was at all indebted to the second song in Ecl. 8 for any of the details that appear in Sat. 8. The problem is complicated by the fact that he wrote three poems on Canidia, probably in the following...
order: *Epode 5, Sat. 1,8* and *Epode 17*: and we know, e.g., that Horace need not have drawn the Moon of *Sat. 8,21* and *35* from *Ecl. 8*, since she appears already in *Epode 5,45f* in a description which is closely parallel to the *Eclogues* passage.⁴⁰ Accordingly it would be appropriate to leave open the question of how far there may be direct echoes of the Vergilian poem in the Horatian satire; but to note that both poets dealt with a partly similar theme involving witchcraft in their eighth poems.

*Satire 9.* The ninth Satire is the well-known story of Horace and the ‘Bore’ or ‘Pest’ who accosted him when he went for a stroll along the Via Sacra. *Eclogue 9* has the same setting as *Ecl. 1*: the expropriations in the North. The theme is discussed by Moeris and Lycidas, with special reference to Menalcas, and with songs which are an encomium on the poet and on poetry.

Despite the difference in theme and also in tone between the ninth pieces of our poets – in *Ecl. 9* Vergil does not tell the truth with a smile⁴¹ – we can see how Horace took over some Vergilian details which suited his purpose, and how he remoulded these completely.

In *Ecl. 9,23–5* we have the young shepherd Lycidas singing a song of Menalcas in light vein. The elder and more serious Moeris objects to it (vs. 26), and prefers to sing a very different kind of song by Menalcas, one in which politics enters bucolics (27–9, the appeal to Varus to intercede on behalf of Mantua in the matter of the expropriations ordered by Octavian). Lycidas wants Moeris to continue singing him pastoral poetry (cf. 30–32a), and he speaks in a forthright, almost impudent manner, 32b–34a:

> et me fecere poetam
> Pierides, sunt et mihi carmina, me quoque dicunt
> vatam pastores.

‘Me too the Pierian maidens have made a poet; I too, have songs, me also the shepherds call an inspired poet’.⁴²

I submit that in the ninth satire of Horace the forward young pastoral poet of Vergil partly inspired the description of the pushing ‘garrulus’ who imposes himself on Horace and claims to be a poet, cf. ‘noris nos . . . docti sumus’, 7, 40.

---

⁴⁰. *Ecl. 8,69* ‘carmina vel caelo possunt deducere lunam’ ～ *Epode 5*, 45f ‘quae sidera excastra voce Thessala / lunamque caelo deripit’ (cf. 17,5 and 78). For this parallel, and also *Ecl. 8,80f. ～ Epode 5,81f*, see Ladewig-Schaper-Deuticke, *Vergils Gedichte, Band I*, Berlin 1915, 68 and 76 respectively.
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where 'doctus' means a poet. When this approach fails, the babbler ventures to compare himself with particular poets who were members of the Circle of Maecenas, 22 f:

\[\text{si bene me novi, non Viscum pluris amicum,}
\text{non Varium facies.}\]

‘If I know myself well, you will not put a higher value on the friendship of Viscus or Varius’ (Anderson).

Now this is most probably a contrast imitation of the young Lycidas who in Vergil proceeds to say that he does not believe the shepherds who call him a 'vates' or inspired poet, 34b, cf. 35f:

\[\text{nam neque adhuc Vario videor nec dicere Cinna digna.}\]

‘For as yet I think I sing nothing worthy of either Varius or Cinna’.

Note the contrast in treatment between Vergil and Horace. In the former a young poet after being a little too pert or forward, withdraws somewhat, perhaps underestimating his poetic gifts; in the satirist a would-be poet becomes more brazen at every new approach. As for the name Cinna, it is changed by Horace to Viscus for obvious reasons (cf. also Sat. 10,83).

In submitting that we have here a probable piece of contrast imitation, I do not suggest that Horace’s 'garrulus' was not ultimately inspired by a real person or by real incidents. If on the other hand anyone doubts whether the treatment of the 'garrulus' in Sat. 9 was partly inspired by incidents in the Eclogues, attention may be drawn to the contest in Ecl. 3, where Menalcas says to Damoetas, 49–50:

\[\text{numquam hodie effugies; veniam, quocumque vocaris.}
\text{audiat haec tantum – vel qui venit ecce Palaemon.}\]

‘By no means will you escape today (i.e., this time);
I will meet you wherever you call me. Only let someone hear this (contest) – or the one who is coming up, lo and behold, Palaemon’.

With this we may compare Sat. 9,57ff: ‘“non, hodie si / exclusus fuero, desistam; tempora queram,” / . . . (60b) ecce / Fuscus Aristius occurrit . . .’

‘“if I am shut out today, I shall not give up; I shall look for the right times” . . .
lo and behold Fuscus Aristius is coming up . . .’

Apart from the general parallelism between the two passages there are two words (used in conjunction, or in fairly close conjunction) that make it practically certain that Horace modelled his Aristius Fuscus theme in Sat. 9 partly on the umpire theme involving Palaemon in Ecl. 3: firstly the emphatic modal
‘hodie’ after the negation in ‘numquam’ and ‘non’ (though these terms are used differently); and secondly the use of ‘ecce’ (with the introduction of a third party) in both passages, a word that occurs very seldom in Horace, and only twice elsewhere in the whole of the Satires (1,4,13 and II,3,264).

None of these imitations – mainly thematic, partly verbal – whether by way of contrast or otherwise, detract from the independence of Horace or from the well-deserved reputation of his ninth Satire. In this regard we may note that while Moeris in Ecl. 9 had to cope with a young poet who would not stop singing, Horace has to cope with a babbler and social climber who would stop at nothing to gain entrance to the Circle of Maecenas. But while in a quasi-contest Moeris effectively cuts Lycidas short with a brief ‘desina piura, puer’, Horace in a parody of a contest is saved, in a brief, rapid stroke, by Apollo.

Satire 10. There seems to be a kind of parallelism between a section of Sat. 10 as a ‘literary’ satire and parts of Ecl. 6 and 10 as ‘literary’ Eclogues. The divine singer of Ecl. 6 probably gives a specimen list of good poetry in the sense of Alexandria; and Ecl. 10 is ‘a garland woven from a catalogue of Gallus’ poetry’, the whole poem being a tribute to him as the creator and acknowledged master of love elegy. It is very likely that Horace had these ‘models’ in mind when he wrote Sat. 10, 36–49, a section which consists mainly of a catalogue of contemporary genres and their chief exponents, and concludes with a tribute to Lucilius as the ‘inventor’ of satire.

In fact, the first two lines of this section in Horace are probably significant in so far as they suggest a conscious link between the tenth poems of our two poets. Horace starts off the four lines preceding his catalogue with his well-known criticism of an epic poet and his turgid style, 36f:

turgidus Alpium iugulat dum Memnona dumque
defingit Rheni luteum caput, haec ego ludo.

‘While the turgid poet of the Alps cuts the throat of Memnon and disfigures with mud the head of the Rhine, I am playing with these trifles’. Now in Ecl. 10, 46ff Gallus describes the hardy and heartless Lycores who ventures far

---

44. Note the force of 'canamus' at the end of vs. 61, and of the repeated 'cantantes' at the beginning of vs. 64 and 65.
45. This is O. Skutsch's interpretation of the song, cf. HSCP 73, 1969, 163f. For references to other interpretations, see Otis 137, n.1.
46. Cf. Skutsch, ibid. 166.
47. K. Witte, Phil. Woch. 47, 1923, col. 1077, n.6 finds a conscious parallelism (not evident to the present author) between Ecl. 6,3f and Sat. 10,31f. Both are a recusatio, but in very different ways. See further Fraenkel, Horace 134f on the use and meaning of the rare verb 'intermiscere' at Ecl. 10,3 and Sat. 10,29f.
from her fatherland and gazes upon the Alpine snows and the frosts of the Rhine, 47:

Alpinas a! dura, nives et frigora Rheni (vides)

Apart from the sarcasm and irony contained in the two Horatian verses as a piece of literary criticism, I suggest tentatively that part of Horace's sport (cf. 'haec ego lud') is to make fun of Gallus' love for a Lycoris flitting about the Alps and the Rhine in winter. Despite the differences in detail and in significance between the two passages, the parallel 'Alpinus' ~ 'Alpinas' in conjunction with 'Rheni' ~ 'Rheni' can hardly be ascribed to mere coincidence. 48

Note that while in Vergil the pair 'Alpinas . . . Rheni' is stressed at the beginning and end of the verse, the pair 'Alpinus . . . Rheni' in Horace is stressed by the fact that both terms occupy the second place in the line.

* * *

Before drawing some conclusions, brief consideration has to be given to the question whether it was in fact Horace who imitated Vergil, and not Vergil who imitated Horace (in the majority of parallel passages we do not know of any common source, e.g., Lucretius or Cicero, which may have been utilised by both poets independently of each other). Now with regard to the probable dates of composition and of publication of the two works, we saw at the beginning of this inquiry that Horace could have imitated Vergil already before the Eclogues were published.

Next, it is most unlikely that Vergil, at the time the more senior of the two poets (though by far not as important as he later became in the Circle of Maecenas), would have imitated Horace on such a scale even if the Eclogues were published as late as 35 BC.49 At this stage Horace was still very much the junior partner in the friendship; and it was probably out of admiration and out of respect for Vergil, coupled with gratitude after 38 BC when he became a member of the Circle of Maecenas, that he paid him the compliment of a fairly large scale 'imitatio' of themes and passages from the Eclogues in his first book.

Our poet's attitude to Vergil during this early period is very clearly reflected in the first book of Satires. On the journey to Brundisium Horace joins up with Plotius, Varius and Vergil, of whom he testifies: 'animae qualis neque candiores / terra tulit, neque quis me sit devinctior alter', 5,4lf: 'never has the earth borne more upright souls, and no man could be more bound to them than I am' (Anderson). In Sat. 6,54f it is 'optimus Vergilius' who first introduced

48. Neither name occurs elsewhere in the Satires. On the Horatian passage, see the commentators and pseudo-Acro. I read 'defingit' with Heinze for the reasons which have been stated by him. On the problem of the identification of the poet whom Horace wittily calls 'Alpinus', see Rudd, Horace, 289f, n.52.
49. See n.4 supra.
him to Maecenas; in 10.44 Horace lists Vergil as the leading pastoral poet of the day, and in the conclusion of the same piece the name of Vergil appears amongst those of others whose approval Horace hopes to gain for his work (vs. 81).

Much has been written about the (earlier and later) friendship of Vergil and Horace. However, with reference to the above sentiments expressed by Horace, and also to later and even stronger sentiments (e.g., in Odes 1,3,8 where Vergil is ‘animae dimidium meae’, ‘half of my life’ or ‘partner of my soul’), Duckworth has rightly maintained that ‘these phrases, illuminating as they are, do not tell us what we wish to know about the associations of the two poets and the extent to which each influenced the ideas and writings of the other. Vergil does not speak of Horace, and Horace says all too little about Vergil’. 51

It remains to consider briefly the question how far the above analysis of the relation between the Eclogues and Satires, Book I may be regarded as profitable, apart from the fact that we gain a greater appreciation of Horace the satirist, by noting how he recasts in his own manner what he borrows and assimilates from Vergil as bucolic poet.

Firstly, with regard to themes, language and terminology, it is clear that Horace ‘is separated from Lucilius’ 52 not only by Lucretius, Cicero and Catullus (to mention no others), but also by Vergil as a pastoral poet.


51. Duckworth, ibid., 283.

52. Cf. Rudd, Horace 112 who (on the subject of technical terms) reminds us that ‘Horace is separated from Lucilius by Lucretius and Cicero’. A study of key concepts in the Eclogues and Satires, Book I, would show that the authors of both works use the term ‘insanus’, with ‘demens’ (and ‘furiosus’ once in Horace, Sat. 1,3,85 ‘furiosius’) as synonyms, as well as the corresponding verbal and substantive forms ‘insanire’ and ‘dementia’ (with ‘furor’ in Vergil only, Eel. 10,38 and 60) to indicate an extravagance on the part of people who do not set a ‘modus’ or limit to their desires and ambitions. In Vergil the terms are used mainly in regard to love (exceptions are Ecl. 3,36 and 9,43). I have illustrated elsewhere in detail how these terms occur as key-words in Horace, Sat. Book I to indicate excess (or lack of modesty or moderation) in the spheres of sexual love (Sat. 2; cf. Sat. 4,27 and 49) and of punishment (Sat. 3,80ff) (see AClass XI, 1968, 46,49,51,54f); and likewise in regard to political ambition and the signs of office (Sat. 5 and 6) (see AClass XIII, 1970, 51f and 57f). The terms are finally used with reference to the sphere of language and literature in Sat. 10,34 and 74. While Vergil and Horace may have been independently interested in the Stoic concept of modus, the one mainly in the sphere of love, the other in the whole sphere of morality, including love, we cannot rule out the possibility that Vergil’s usage of the relevant terms may have influenced Horace in the composition of his Satires (whatever other ‘sources’, e.g. Cicero, may have been employed here). In this connection it may be significant that Horace and Vergil both start their usage of these terms against an Epicurean background with reference to passionate love in their second poems. It is certainly probable that the subject would have come up in their talks and discussions.
Secondly, a significant pattern emerges from the partly certain, partly probable imitations established above, viz. that of a mainly though not exclusively ‘linear’ relation\(^{53}\) between the majority of the ten poems of both poets, notwithstanding their differences in respect of theme and genre. This pattern is based on an apparently deliberate linear parallelism of main and/or minor themes and/or other details in all except the first, third, fifth and sixth pieces of our two poets. Such far-reaching parallelisms between poems of opposite number, accompanied in most cases by apparently conscious *imitatio*, cannot be explained by, or ascribed to, mere coincidence.

Thirdly, the pattern of imitation throws some light, even if it does so in a one-sided manner, on the difficult subject of friendship, literary and otherwise, between Horace and Vergil. In particular it shows how fruitful such a relation could be – and certainly was – for Horace, though the possibility cannot be excluded that there was some understanding between the two poets in regard to the order or organisation of poems in their books.\(^{54}\)

However that may be, the above enquiry throws some new light on book composition by two friends and poets in the early Augustan period. Horace apparently not only borrowed from Vergil’s *Eclogues* the concept of an organised book of ten poems, including a bipartite division marked by two introductory poems, but in at least six pieces (Satires 2, 4, 7, 8, 9 and 10) he either imitated (i.e., in 2, 4, 9 and 10) with great originality some themes and expressions of (mainly) the opposite number of the *Eclogues*, or wrote an independent poem on the same type of theme (7 and 8).

This does not mean that the arrangement of Satires in Book I is determined mainly by the order of poems in the *Eclogues*. Horace has blended with supreme artistry the Vergilian formal pattern (10 poems, 1–5 and 6–10, with 1 and 6 as Introductions), as well as more than half of the thematic order, with his own scheme of triads (1–3, 4–6, 7–9, with 10 as Conclusion) and of pairs of satires.\(^{55}\) As in the case of Vergil’s book, the structure of the first book of Satires must have become a ‘leading consideration’ at some stage in the poet’s mind and work; and this must have caused a certain amount of rewriting and reshaping

---

\(^{53}\) By a *linear* relation or parallelism I mean one based on a numerical congruence, thus *Ecl. 2* – *Sat. 2*, *Ecl. 4* – *Sat. 4*, etc.

\(^{54}\) Here it is possible to quote Moritz (see n.50 supra) 187 *ou of context*, and to note that Horace’s poems could contain ‘references and allusions to Virgil’s poetry which Virgil himself and the ‘inner circle’ would be bound to understand, but which might well escape the notice of at least part of the wider audience, though without their being aware that something was being withheld from them’.

(apart from exclusion) of satires with reference both to the structure of the book and the internal structure of the poems. 56

In conclusion, we do not have to seek far for 'explanations' why precisely in four of the Satires of Book I 'linear' thematic or other parallels cannot be established as in the case of the other six pieces. In the case of Sat. 3 it is clear that it occupies a special place between Sat. 1 and 2 on the one hand and Sat. 4 on the other hand. After the strong moral criticisms of the first two pieces, the third satire is concerned with the requisites of 'aequitas' or fairness in criticising the faults of others. Horace lays down two principles of fair criticism, of which the first is that we should weigh a friend's virtues against his faults (and turn the scale in favour of the virtues, if they are in fact more numerous), and that we should weigh a friend's faults against our own. Complementary to this is the second principle, which states simply that we should minimise the faults of our friends at any rate. 57 At the same time Horace prepares the way for his moral and literary theory of satire in the fourth piece, in which he applies exactly the same two principles, as I have attempted to show elsewhere. 58

Finally, that the fifth satire should have been an 'imitatio' or 'aemulatio' of a Lucilian 'Iter' is a natural sequence of the fourth satire: after criticised Lucilius' style in I,4, Horace in I,5 pays his predecessor in the genre the compliment of imitating one of his pieces, and at the same time shows how it 'should be done'. As for the first Satire, it contains one certain and one possible imitation only of passages in the seventh and fourth Eclogues respectively, 59 while the sixth pieces in both poets form a formal introduction - but in different ways - to the second half of the book. But taken together the first and sixth Satires have a special significance in so far as they are introductory poems which deal mainly (but in the sphere of private morality) with two of the main evils of Roman society, viz. 'avaritia' and 'ambitio'; and for this reason they are closely related thematically and as a pair - in the sphere of Roman literature - to Lucretius and Sallust. 60

57. For a more detailed consideration of these principles, see AClass XI, 1968, 56f.
58. Ibid., 60f and 64f.
59. See further note 10 supra.
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