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ABSTRACT

Famously warned by a fortune-teller to steer clear of the talkative (Sat. 1.9.33-34), Horace presents himself in Sat. 2.3 as the victim of the verbose new Stoic convert Damasippus. By far the longest poem in Horace’s second collection, the bulky Sat. 2.3 is largely made up of this neophyte’s long-winded lecture, ascribed by Damasippus himself to his Stoic teacher Stertinius (Prof. Snore). Although it is easy to divide the satire, on a formal basis, into portions ascribed to the various speakers, in practice it is difficult to separate Stertinius from his convert in the resulting speech-within-a-speech structure. The star-struck and passionate new convert Damasippus, I argue here, has learnt Stertinius’s lengthy lecture off by heart and is doggedly spewing it back at the hapless Horace who is, I suggest, inclined to start snoring himself. By way of explanation, I examine the monologising tendencies evident in Damasippus’s lecture in the light of some of the theories of the modern Russian thinker M.M. Bakhtin, in particular his theories of ‘addressivity’ and the idea of ‘authoritative’ versus ‘internally persuasive’ discourse.

In Sat. 1.9 Horace relates that when he once consulted a fortune-teller, he was advised that there was one group of individuals that he should especially do his best to avoid – the talkative: *loquaces, si sapiat, vitet, simulque adolvet aetas* (‘Once his age matures, let him, if he be wise, steer clear of chatter-boxes’, Sat. 1.9.33-34). In the context of Satire 1.9, this of course refers to the interloper – variously known as ‘the Bore’ or ‘the Pest’ – who doggedly pursues and plagues Horace until the latter’s eleventh-hour escape at the end of that poem.² The second book of Satires, however, sees Horace’s character

---

* I thank the two anonymous readers for their useful comments and suggestions. Earlier versions of this paper were read at the Classical Association of South Africa conference in July 2005, and at the University of KwaZulu-Natal Classics Colloquium in June 2006.
become the victim of a number of other loquacious bores, as the general trend of that book has the satirist retire from the role of main speaker to play the part instead of a Socratic-style listener and ironist.\footnote{For discussions of Horace, Sat. 1.9, see Anderson 1999:237-51 = 1956:148-66; Rudd 1961:79-96; Henderson 1999:202-27 (a revised version of Henderson 1993:67-93).}

In Sat. 2.3 Horace is the victim of the most talkative of the \textit{doctores inepti}, the longwinded and overly zealous new Stoic convert Damasippus. Damasippus has unfortunately been saved from the brink of suicide by the meddlesome Stertinius, a Stoic teacher who converted this failed businessman with a lecture on the paradox ‘every fool is mad’, the comforting argument being that if Damasippus is mad, as he apparently fears, so is everybody else apart from the Stoic sage. It is this lengthy lecture which Damasippus relays to Horace and which makes up the bulk of the huge Sat. 2.3. On either side this lecture is framed by attacks on Horace by the Stoic neophyte – criticism of Horace’s writing, or the lack thereof, at the start of the satire,\footnote{Remarking on the ‘strange world’ of Horace’s second book of \textit{Satires}, Anderson 1982:42 laments the fact that Horace ‘lets himself be crowded off stage by various fools who proclaim their warped ideas on various subjects, while the poor satirist meekly listens to them.’ In true Socratic style, however, the speakers of \textit{Satires} Book II are invariably allowed to make idiots of themselves, often being revealed as such by the satirist’s own well-placed comments or timely questions.} and a tirade on Horace’s personal habits and tendencies toward the satire’s end.\footnote{Sat. 2.3.1-16a.} While the professional attack at the beginning is unsolicited, the personal criticism at the end happens only after Horace has specifically asked Damasippus how all this relates to him.\footnote{Sat. 2.3.303-26.}

The speech-within-a-speech formula of Sat. 2.3 is particularly interesting, as the layers of speakers are multiple – at least threefold – and so the series of speakers is like a set of Russian \textit{matryoshka} dolls,\footnote{\textit{Stoic, post damnum sic vendas omnia pluris},/\textit{qua me stultitia, quoniam non est genus unum, insanire putas? ego nam videor mihi sanus} (‘My Stoic friend, as you hope to sell everything at a profit after your loss, with what folly, since there is not only one sort, do you think I’m mad? For to myself I seem sane’, 300-02; trans. Muecke 1993:55).} each appearing from...
within the discourse of the other. The satirist is dismantled to display the tiresome former businessman Damasippus, who in turn uncovers his long-winded Stoic guru Stertinius. The layers of speakers in Sat. 2.3 imply, in addition, successive layers of addressees and audiences: within the fiction of Sat. 2.3, Damasippus was the addressee of Stertinius’s speech, just as Horace is the audience of Damasippus’s transmitted version of that lecture (and we, in turn listen to Horace’s representation of his encounter with Damasippus). The interrelationship of these layers and the degrees to which speakers address their audiences, as well as their attitudes to the discourse that they are imparting will be the main areas of focus in this article.7 To assist me with this focus, I shall be summoning the assistance of two lesser-known theories concerning speakers, discourse and audiences put forward by the modern Russian thinker Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin and his circle.8 These theories concern, firstly, the idea of ‘addressivity’, and secondly, the concept(s) of ‘authoritative’ versus ‘internally persuasive’ discourse. However, there are a few other interesting issues to which it will first be necessary to pay brief attention.

In the outermost layer of Sat. 2.3’s onion-like structure Horace as writer relates to us, his readers and audiences, the interaction which his character ‘Horace’ within the Satires had with Damasippus on the occasion of the latter’s largely unwelcome cornering of the poet while on retreat in the

always female dolls; they may also represent male figures, and even (rather amusingly) Soviet politicians.

7 Due mainly to space constraints, but also because of my particular focus, I shall not be paying much attention to the actual nature of the Stoic philosophy spouted by Damasippus-Sertinius. For an in-depth discussion of the characterisation of Damasippus as an enthusiastic but inexpert Stoic convert, see Bond 1998:82-108.

8 Although perhaps best known for his theories on ‘dialogue’ and ‘Carnival’ in literature, Bakhtin (1895-1975) also developed, mostly on his own but sometimes also in association with others in his circle, a number of other theories related to his ideas on ‘dialogue’. Bakhtin argued that all natural discourse exhibits the tendency to engage in a type of ‘dialogue’ with earlier and future discourse. Likewise, all good works of literature, according to Bakhtin, tend also to be engaged in a ‘conversation’ with previous as well as later works of literature. The concept of ‘addressivity’, also expounded in posthumously published works attributed (although this has sometimes been disputed) to his ill-fated friends Medvedev (1985) and Voloshanov (1973), has to do with the orientation towards an audience that is a constant feature of ‘dialogic’ discourse (it is always addressed to someone). ‘Authoritative’ discourse, as we shall see later, tends to be discourse that is not ‘dialogic’ in nature but which exhibits a hold over its recipients, whereas ‘internally persuasive’ discourse is of a ‘dialogic’ nature, and allows its recipients to engage with it, and make it their own, as it were.
country. Some scholars have questioned the link between Damasippus’s criticism of Horace in this first section of Sat. 2.3, and the lecture on the topic of madness that ensues. However, the purpose of this first section is, in my view, to expose the stylistic philosophies of both Damasippus and Horace, which are just as important in this satire as the moral philosophy is. Damasippus introduces the satire with some very un-Horatian literary criticism, but it is only from line 16 when the poet himself responds, that it is confirmed for us — if we hadn’t worked it out already — that this speaker is no Horace and certainly no Callimachean. Damasippus spends approximately the first 15 lines of the poem complaining about the fact that his addressee Horace does not compose enough poetry fast enough or often enough, but this criticism is in itself an inverse literary statement placed by Horace in Damasippus’s unsuspecting mouth, which shows only too clearly that the poet, true disciple of Callimachus that he is, is writing carefully and slowly, editing his work as he goes along. Just as Damasippus himself was repented for his Stoic conversion by complete financial and emotional breakdown, so, I would suggest, the motive behind Damasippus’s highlighting of Horace’s struggle to write poetry is a much-misguided attempt to break down the poet’s artistic esteem, thus guaranteeing, the Stoic hopes, a conversion. But Horace’s own good-humoured response to Damasippus —

---

1 This is how most scholars have interpreted *huc fugisti* (Sat. 2.3.5) — Horace has ‘taken refuge’ out on his farm on the occasion of the Saturnalia (see e.g. Rudd 1966:173). The cosy *silia*, ‘little country house’ to which Damasippus refers (Sat. 2.3.10), and which Horace has evidently been longing for, bears this out. That Horace is said to have packed and brought study material with him (Sat. 2.3.11-12) is another motivation for regarding him as having left the city. The unsympathetic Stoic busybody Damasippus (since Stoic philosophy encouraged interest in the affairs of others) is unconcerned that he may be interfering with Horace’s ideal Epicurean ataraxia at the latter’s supposedly solitary rural retreat. The gift of the Sabine farm is, of course, famously treated in Sat. 2.6 (*Hoc erat in votis ...*).

10 See Rudd 1966:175-76. Rudd points out that, given Damasippus’s eventual claim that Horace’s composition of poetry calls his sanity into question (Sat. 2.3.321-22), ironically ‘the very activity which Damasippus enjoined at the beginning now turns out to be a form of madness’ (1966:176). What is being played with here, however, is the philosophical idea (later a literary *topos*) that some degree of insanity was essential for composing poetry (cf. *AP* 295-98).

11 For Horace’s Callimachean leanings in his *Satires*, see Freudenburg 1993:104-08.

12 Oliensis 1998:53 has suggested that Damasippus has other things on his mind: ‘When Damasippus delivers his harangue, he may be angling not only for respect but also for sympathy and, perhaps, an invitation to dinner ... Perhaps Damasippus even hopes to win himself a position in Horace’s household as a philosopher-in-residence.’
wishing that the gods might bestow a haircut (literally, a barber) on the bristly reborn philosopher – indicates that he does not take the preceding attack on him as poet seriously.

Damasippus’s patent misunderstanding of Horace’s compositional modus operandi places, at the start of Sat. 2.3 already, a question mark over his credibility as speaker. Ironically, also, Damasippus’s complaints that Horace does not write enough are made at the start of what is by far the longest satire of both collections (well over 300 lines where most of the sermones are just over 100). Since most of Sat. 2.3, however, is to be understood as spoken not by ‘Horace’ himself but by Damasippus, relaying a letter given by his Stoic guru Stertinius, it is these Stoics rather than ‘Horace’ himself who have taken over and who are in effect the authors of this monster satire. They produce Horace’s satire for him. It is therefore entirely appropriate that at the satire’s start, Damasippus should openly express his hostility to Horace’s oft-touted Callimachean virtues of slow, careful composition resulting in small-scale output with plenty of diligent editing. Horace’s

13 di te, Damasipppe, deaeque/verum ob consilium donent tonsore (Sat. 2.3.16-17). The term for ‘barber’ (tonisor) appears rather unexpectedly at the end of this sentence, adding to the comic effect. Muecke 1993:134 identifies this as one of the first confirmations (if we had not already suspected it from the nature of the advice he gives to Horace) that Damasippus has been converted to philosophy: philosophers typically grew long beards in an era when the fashion for most men was to be clean-shaven (cf. Hor. Sat. 1.3.133-34, where naughty boys are envisaged tweaking the philosopher’s beard).

14 At Sat. 1.4.8-13, Horace criticises his predecessor Lucilius for composing too much too quickly and for failing to edit his verses: ...

... horribilis componere versus:/nam fuit hoc vitiosus: in hora saepe ducentos,/ut magnum , versus dictabat stans pede in uno;/cum flueret lutulentus, erat quod tollere velles;/garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre labo rem,/scribendi recte:

... (‘He was rough in composing his verses. In this indeed lay his defect: he would often, as a bravura display, dictate two hundred lines in an hour on one leg; as he flowed muddily on, you’d have wanted to remove some of the content. He was a chatterbox, and reluctant to put up with the hard work of writing – writing properly, that is; his quantity doesn’t impress me one jot’; trans. Brown 1993:45). Horace refers back to this criticism of Lucilius’s ‘muddy’ discourse at 1.10.50-51:

... at dixi fluere hunc lutulentum, saepe ferentem/plura quidem tollenda relinquendis ...

(‘But I said that he flowed like a muddy stream, often carrying more that should be removed than left alone’; trans. Brown 1993:89). The image of the muddy, slow-flowing river (cum flueret lutulentus, 2.4.11; fluere hunc lutulentum, 1.10.50) for verbose composition with little editing is vintage Callimachean: cf. Callim. Hymn to Apollo 108-09. Eventually Horace concedes that it was the age in which Lucilius lived that encouraged his lax compositional habits, and claims that if the ‘father’ of Roman Satire lived in Horace’s day, he would edit his work religiously, as Horace himself does: ...

... sed ille,/si foret hoc nostrum fato dilatus in aevum,/detereret sibi multa, recideret omne what ultra/perfectum traheretur, et in versu facienda/saepe caput scaberet vivos et roderet unguis
inverse literary statement, therefore, placed in Damasippus’s mouth, is the Stoic convert’s own misguided programmatic statement. Appropriately, therefore, in the course of his related speech, Damasippus demonstrates how it is practically possible not to write Callimachean (and Horatian) satire. Inversions of some sort could almost be expected in the third satire of Horace’s second book, which, like its companion piece Sat. 2.7, is set at the time of the Saturnalia (ipsis/Saturnalibus, 2.3.4-5). This Roman proto-Carnivalesque festival in December occasioned temporary yet fundamental reversals in social hierarchy and decorum. The relevance of the Saturnalia is clearer in the case of that other would-be Stoic Davus, the slave who as speaker in Sat. 2.7 takes Horace to task for his personal failings and who ironically but appropriately lectures his master on the paradox ‘only the wise man is free and every fool is a slave.’ 15 What Damasippus is doing lecturing Horace on the occasion of this December festival in Sat. 2.3 is less obvious. 16 The name Damasippus appears in Cicero’s letters, indicating the likelihood of a real person. 17 At first glance the Greek origins of the name may suggest someone of servile origin, now a freedman, which would make the address on the occasion of the Saturnalia appropriate. However, research by Shackleton Bailey and others has shown that a family which bore the cognomen Damasippus was from the highest echelons of Roman society and that, if a

(\ldots still, if fate had postponed his life until our present age, he would file off a great deal from his work, he would prune everything that trailed beyond the ideal limit, and in fashioning his verse he would often scratch his head and gnaw his nails to the quick; trans. Brown 1993:87). At the start of Sat. 2.3, Damasippus likewise describes Horace exhibiting behaviour indicative of frustration during the trying process of editing: *culpantur frustra calami immeritusque laborat/iratis natus paries dis atque poetis* (*It’s no good putting the blame on your reed-pens and giving a hard time to the innocent wall which was born under the wrath of the gods – and poets*, 2.3.7-8; trans. Muecke 1993:35).

16 As someone who has been labelled ‘mad’, Damasippus, it may be worth observing, has a great deal in common with the temporary insanity of the Saturnalia itself, which, with all its ‘topsy-turvy’ inversions of the usual social pecking order, created a subversive but ultimately short-lived type of craziness in the community (cf. our modern idea of ‘the silly season’).
17 Cic. *Ad Fam.* 7.23; *Ad Att.* 12.29. In the first instance the name Damasippus is mentioned in the context of an offer to buy statues, which is highly suggestive of the professional antique dealer that the Damasippus of Hor. Sat. 2.3 is supposed to have been. In the second example, Cicero is potentially interested, but only as a last resort, in buying gardens which Damasippus appears to have been selling. Could this have been our Damasippus auctioning off his property once his affairs had gone wrong?
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real person, our Damasippus could not have been a freedman. But whatever his origins, whether he was a real person, possibly dead by the time Horace was writing, or an imaginary figure given this name for literary purposes, the point about the Damasippus who appears in Horace, Sat. 2.3 is that he has sunk, through misfortune, to the bottom of society. It is at this point that Damasippus is saved by the proselytizing Stoic Stertinius.

In his first book of *Satires*, Horace was always cursing the *turba*, the common crowd, for being both the vehicle of the vice-ridden, as well as the refuge of his stylistic enemies (both groups comprising the targets of his satire). For the Callimachean Horace of the *liber sermonum*, as elsewhere, the common mob was an undesirable audience, whose approval need not, no must not, be cultivated. Horace’s satires were not going to be exposed to public circulation for the greasy hands of the common mob and Tigellius

---

18 Shackleton Bailey 1982:39 n. 14 identified Damasippus as probably L. Licinius Crassius Damasippus, the son of a senator who was killed fighting in Africa under Metellus Scipio; see also Treggiari 1973:260. Shackleton Bailey rejected the possibility (raised by scholiasts) that another historical Damasippus, one Junius Damasippus, was meant. Rawson 1985:88-89 reconsidered the latter possibility, given the ambiguous social position in which Horace’s Damasippus finds himself.

His social position may be interesting: rather than the son of the senator Licinius Damasippus, he may be the son of the Marian praetor Junius Damasippus, killed by Sulla, and himself therefore debarred from entering public life. If so, he was thus forced into a very dubious trade for a senator’s son, but one in which contacts with the aristocracy and a decent education ... were useful.

19 *quemvis media elige turba:/aut ob avaritia m aut misera ambitione laborat:/hic nuptarum insanit amoribus, hic puerorum;/hunc capit argenti splendor; stupet Albius aere;/hic mutat merces surgente a sole ad eum quo/vespertina tepet regio, quin per mala praeceps/fertur uti pulvis collectus/turbine, ne quid/summa deperdat metuens aut ampliet ut rem:/omnes hi metuunt versus, odere

20 *saepe stilum vertas, iterum quae digna legi sint/scripturus, neque te ut miretur turba

---

194 quae situm vertas, iterum quae digna legi sint scripturae, neque te ut miretur turba labores, /contentus paucis lectoribus ... *(You must often use your eraser, if you’re to write something worth a second reading, and you shouldn’t strive for the admiration of the crowd, but should be satisfied with a limited readership)*, Sat. 1.10:72-74; trans. Brown 1993:97).
Hermogenes to sweat over. In spite of his forays into the houses and gardens of the elite (24-25), and ironically in the face of his own (possibly) aristocratic origins, Damasippus has the common touch: until recently, we learn, he was the focus of attention at the crowded crossroads (frequitias ... compita, 25-26), where he was known by his nickname ‘Mercury’s man’ (Mercurialis) because of his former winning streak in business. After Fortune turned against him, Damasippus slid even lower down the slopes of society – even the method by which he was planning to commit suicide (jumping off a bridge) was one usually associated with the lower classes. Whatever his background, Damasippus’s associations make him thoroughly incompatible with the exclusivity, both social and literary, to which Horace had appealed repeatedly in his first book of *Satires*.

However, the Saturnalian satires of Horace’s second book, Sat. 2.3 and 2.7, see reversals and inversions not only in social hierarchy but also in the allocation of literary roles. The eavesdropping Davus in Sat. 2.7 is an erstwhile audience of Horace’s prior satires, albeit a surreptitious one (as he explains at the start of that satire, he’s been ‘listening’ a long while). In Horace’s penultimate satire, this domestic slave, tired of always being a listener, takes advantage of the December freedom (*libertate Decembri*, 2.7.4) to give his master, the satirist, a dose of his own medicine. As a former merchant, who, on his own confession, had devoted his energies to tracking down obscure antiques and unlikely pieces of Corinthian bronze, Damasippus would until recently have been among the chief targets of Horace’s moralising satire. Damasippus’s prior business interests were in fact comparable to those of the dissatisfied *mercatores* and others who, racing over every sea in frantic pursuit of wealth, were derided by the satirist in his first satire. Equally, Damasippus’s obsessions with bronze curiosities would...

---

21 nulla taberna meos habeat neque pila libellos,/quis manus insu det vulgi Hermogenisque Tigelli
(‘You wouldn’t find any shop or pillar displaying my little books, for the hands of the mob and of Tigellius Hermogenes to sweat over’, Sat. 1.4.71-72; trans. Brown 1993:49).

22 ‘Throwing oneself off heights either onto the earth or into water was to be expected of the lower classes or of slaves (Van Hooft 1990:70, 73; Grisé 1982:94). As a method of suicide that involved no technical preparation or financial outlay, it appealed to the poor or the desperate. The well-born were traditionally supposed to fall on their swords in an honourable *Romana mors* (Van Hooft 1990:73-77). Antiquity also viewed madness and bankruptcy as among the least noble causes of suicide (Van Hooft 1990:95, 115).

23 Iamdudum ausculto (Sat. 2.7.1). Appropriately, Davus uses the comic-flavoured term *ausculto* instead of the more usual *audio* to describe his eavesdropping.

24 Sat. 1.1.4-8, 28-32.
have made him very similar to a certain Albius who was said to have been ‘besotted with bronze’ (stupet Albius aere, 1.4.28) in Horace’s fourth satire. Thus whereas Davus, the speaker of Sat. 2.7’s Stoic tirade, is a former audience of Horace’s satire, Damasippus in Sat. 2.3 is a former target. The topsy-turvy nature of the Saturnalian context in Horace’s second book of Satires affords these former audiences and targets the opportunity to come out of the woodwork and have a go at being satirist for once. Appearing ominously on the occasion of the Saturnalia, Damasippus is in many ways the antithesis of Horace and of the Horatian moralist.25

There may, as with many of the names in Horace’s Satires, also be some kind of joke or pun associated with the use of the name Damasippus. It has been remarked, for example, that Damasippus’s conversion to Stoicism at extremis, as it were, parallels the conversion of the famous Stoic Chrysippus, who is said to have come to philosophy after the misfortune of having his property confiscated.26 While this sort of story concerning philosophers is not uncommon, nevertheless the similarity between the names Chrysippus and Damasippus is striking, sharing as they do the originally aristocratic second element -ippus, the Greek ἵππος, ‘horse’. Apparently, Chrysippus’s name (‘golden horse’) was also joked about and played around with by his contemporaries, with Carneades, for example, dubbing him ‘Cryptippus’, ‘hidden horse’ or ‘obscure horse’ – the proverbial ‘dark horse’ 27 Moreover, Chrysippus is brought to our attention when he is twice cited by name as an authority in Damasippus’s relaying of Stertinius’s speech (at 2.3.44 and 287).

While the literal translation of the name ‘Damasippus’ is ‘horse-taming’28 (an epithet used of the goddess Athena), an entirely unorthodox interpretation suggests itself from the fact that the first element of the name, Dama, itself

---

25 If we believe Horace’s continual protestations that his father was a freedman, and if we accept the historical evidence that Damasippus came from an aristocratic family, then the two are indeed diametric opposites of each other, since Horace has risen in society and in the circle of Maecenas, while Damasippus has sunk to the bottom of the social hierarchy.

26 Bond 1987:7 suggested that the description of Damasippus’s conversion to Stoicism in Sat. 2.3 may be a parody of Chrysippus’s own conversion (Diog. Laert. 7.181).

27 D.L. 7.182.

28 ‘Damasippus’ may be interpreted as a would-be aristocratic ‘horse-tamer’ if we consider that Horace is the ‘horse’ that he is apparently trying to ‘tame’, i.e. convert to Stoicism, in Sat 2.3. Amusingly, Horace sometimes likens himself to a donkey, as at Sat. 2.1.18-20, where, punning on his cognomen Flaccus, he describes himself as ‘floppy-eared’ donkey, in contrast to Caesar who is compared to a skittish, thoroughbred horse with pricked-up ears and a tendency to kick.
occurs independently several times in Horace’s *Satires*, where it is generally synonymous with the servile and the low. Coupled together, therefore, the *Dama* element plus the suffix *-ippus* would seem to suggest an oxymoronic ‘low-class/high-class’ individual. In other words, the name ‘Damasippus’ seems to suggest ‘a poor man’s Chrysippus’, which aptly describes the Saturnalian speaker of Sat. 2.3.

Many of the prolix writers and the loquacious stylistic enemies attacked by the Horatian satirist in his first book of *Satires* happen to have been Stoics. To whatever degree this was based on truth or not, the fact remains that, within the world of the *Satires*, Stoics are portrayed as being among Horace’s most loathed and ridiculed stylistic *bêtes noires*. Fabius and Crispinus, for example, inhabited a number of satires of the *liber sermonum*, where they were the bane of the Callimachean-inspired satirist’s life. Chrysippus himself was credited with having been an exceptionally prolific or prolix writer, depending on one’s perspective. As a Stoic therefore, albeit a new one,
Damasippus – the poor man’s Chrysippus – is fittingly longwinded and appropriately aligned with the loquacious windbags of the liber sermonum. It is also not surprising that Sat. 2.3, Horace’s longest satire, should owe its bulk to a lengthy Stoic lecture. The Stoic’s concerns are evidently not composition but conversion, and consequently, like the paradox on which he preaches, he strives to be as inclusive as possible. Put simply, Damasippus misunderstands and misrepresents Horace’s stylistic ideals both because, until very recently, he belonged to the common mob (the turba) and because now he is also a Stoic.

As a freshly-converted and loyal disciple of Stoicism, Damasippus hastens to surrender the floor to his saviour, the Stoic teacher Stertinius, whose teachings he now claims to relay to Horace. Between lines 38 and 295, therefore, it is the commanding voice of Stertinius, even further removed from the reader than is Damasippus, which dominates the satire as the voice with authority. What is interesting is that, although it is presented within the framework of a dialogue, and although it also contains some petty dialogic aspects (sounding much like a catechism), Stertinius’s speech as quoted by Damasippus on the whole comes across very much as a monologue. Damasippus presents himself as having never, in his awe, interrupted or questioned Stertinius’s evangelism, or at least he does not relay any of this to his new audience.

Likewise Horace is either not granted or else he does not claim the opportunity to interrupt Damasippus’s repetition of Stertinius’s sermon. Indeed, while engaging in dialogue with Damasippus both at the satire’s beginning and at its end, Horace is curiously silent between lines 31 and 300. Ironically, when compared to this Stoic lecture in Sat. 2.3, Horace’s moralising discourses in the first book of Satires, while formally couched as ‘monologues’, are in effect far more ‘dialogic’ in their relative openness to the objections of other voices and in their constant awareness of and orientation towards their audiences – this despite the fact that Horace’s physical presence is undoubtedly to be imagined throughout Damasippus’s

Chrysippus wrote 500 lines a day. Diogenes’s later representation, whether one believes it or not, reflects an amusing tradition that Horace, tongue firmly in cheek, saw fit to use against the Stoics, just as he mocked their paradoxes and dogma.

Stertinius intercepted Damasippus when he was about to hurl himself into the Tiber from the Fabrician bridge, and his intervention and subsequent speech are usually identified as quoted by Damasippus from lines 38b to lines 295, with the framing device of having Damasippus refer to Stertinius himself at lines 33 and lines 296 respectively. Within Stertinius’s speech there is the further framing device of two references to Chrysippus, as noted, more or less opening and closing off his speech, at lines 44 and 287 respectively.
presentation. Thus, in Sat. 2.3 not only has Horace permitted the reversals of the Saturnalia to deprive him of his voice as main if not the sole speaker of his Satires, but indeed he has gone further, denying himself the right even to take the floor as adversary. Instead, Horace has joined us, the audience, as a passive recipient of the sermo.

One of the main problems with Damasippus’s relaying of Stertinius’s speech to Horace is, I think, the fact that it is not really addressed to Horace. Perhaps partly because of the universal compass of the paradox that it treats, the central Stoic sermon lacks a sustained, effective consciousness of its immediate audience. Rather, Damasippus appears to have quoted Stertinius’s speech verbatim, since he explained that he faithfully ‘made notes’ during the former’s talk to him. Although generally more successful at addressing Damasippus than Damasippus is at addressing Horace, Stertinius himself was perhaps not always that good at editing his speech, as the relaying of Damasippus’s apomnemoneumata includes the call, made perhaps from the crossroads or the street corners in the manner of some Stoics, to large groups of potential listeners to approach and hear the lecture. What is entirely lacking in Damasippus’s address of Horace is what Bakhtin and his circle termed ‘addressivity’, the orientation of ‘dialogic discourse’ towards its listeners. This is because, unlike Davus’s speech in that other Saturnalian

---

33 descripsi dehis praecepta hanc (‘From him I myself, being eager to learn, took down these marvellous precepts ...’, Sat. 2.3.34; trans. Muecke 1993:37).
34 Audire atque togam iubere componere, quiques/ambitio malo et argentii pallit amore, quiques haece titivile superstitione aut also mentis morbo calit; hoc pretendit me/dum docte invita venite vos ordine, audite. (‘I invite to listen and arrange his toga, whoever is pale with nasty ambition or with love of silver, whoever is feverish with lust for pleasure or gloomy superstition or any other sickness of the mind. Come here, nearer to me, while I teach in due order that you are all mad.’ Sat. 2.3.77-81; trans. Muecke 1993:39). We are given the impression that Stertinius has included, somewhat misguidedly, in his personal address to Damasippus, the usual attention-grabbing devices that he would use at the crossroads to attract crowds of listeners.
35 Instead of viewing communication (following the Saussure-Jakobson model) as something formulated by the speaker, encoded, sent and decoded by the receiver, Bakhtin and his circle regarded the listener as being present in every utterance as it is
satire of Book II, *Sat. 2.7*, Damasippus's derived lecture in the central portions of *Sat. 2.3* has not been tailored to Horace's measurements. True to the title of *doctor ineptus*, as he is often labelled by modern scholars, the convert fails to realise that it is unnecessary to treat almost every conceivable variety of human insanity in order to get his point across. As he berates the madness of all mankind at length, it becomes apparent that Damasippus, too, has proven quite incapable of editing the speech that he has inherited from Stertinius so as to be particularly relevant to his present addressee:36 hence being made, and not as an afterthought. As Medvedev, one of Bakhtin's circle, comments, there is no ready-made message that is simply sent from A to be decoded by B in the manner of a telegraph. Rather, '... it takes form in the process of communication between A and B. Nor is it transmitted from the first to the second, but is constructed between them, like an ideological bridge; it is constructed in the process of their interaction' (Medvedev 1985:152). Likewise, Voloshinov, another of Bakhtin's circle in the 1920s, notes that 'word is a two-sided act. It is determined equally by whose word it is and for whom it is meant. As word, it is precisely the product of the reciprocal relationship between speaker and listener, addressee and addressee ... A word is a bridge thrown between myself and another' (1973:86). In other words, in natural living discourse as well as in literary discourse that imitates the dialogic qualities of natural living discourse, the speaker is conscious of his audience throughout: the addressee is not a passive recipient but shapes the utterance as much as the speaker does. The listener or audience is therefore an entity present in the utterance from the outset. Every utterance is constructed with the audience in mind. Bakhtin terms this naturally addressive quality of discourse its 'addressivity'; see Bakhtin 1986:95-100. Moreover, as we shall see shortly, 'internally persuasive discourse' is 'addressive' (i.e. orientated toward its addressees), according to Bakhtin, whereas 'authoritative discourse' is not.

36 A certain section of Damasippus's lecture (lines 64-76) clearly derives from Stertinius's own prior attempts to adapt his Stoic 'diatribe' to Damasippus as an individual. In this section, we distinctly hear Stertinius addressing Damasippus in the latter's own situation, and even using humour to appeal to his potential convert (e.g. the example of Perellius's senseless calculations of what Damasippus is unable to pay back, 75-76). Moreover, here Stertinius twice refers to Damasippus by name, in lines 64 and 65, and at line 68 (cf. 25); he also mentions Damasippus's former 'patron god' Mercury, who presided over material fortunes (*merx*). Damasippus, however, stupidly relates the whole of this section to Horace, without thinking to change it or adapt it to his new addressee's own situation. To what degree Stertinius himself had made any further effort to adapt his lecture to Damasippus we cannot be sure; from line 77 we are back with the formulaic approach and the lecture now applies to all humanity. But presumably Stertinius did achieve more than the mere transmission of his gospel, because he successfully converted Damasippus by convincing him that virtually the whole of humankind is mad and not solely he, Damasippus. That Damasippus does not seem able to convince Horace of the same is partly due to his
the richly-deserved question, once his talk is completed, as to how, exactly, all that precedes applies to Horace (Sat. 2.3.300-01).

It is Damasippus’s own attitude to his master Stertinius’s authoritative discourse that, I think, is at the heart of this problem. He appears to want to preserve the guru’s speech as nearly as possible, without changing it at all, respectfully transmitting it as the ‘gospel truth’. Bakhtin proves useful here, as he distinguished between two types of ‘discourse with authority’: namely ‘authoritative discourse’ and ‘internally persuasive discourse’. The difference between these two varieties of discourse depends largely, as far as I can tell, on the individual’s response and attitude to them, and the extent to which a response is invited or encouraged. The first type of discourse with authority Bakhtin called ‘authoritative discourse’, which he explained as a ‘prior discourse’, ‘located in a distanced zone’, which ‘demands our unconditional allegiance’, and which one must either accept lock, stock and barrel, or alternately, reject entirely.37 It is important to realise that one cannot engage with ‘authoritative discourse’, only transmit it: in Bakhtin’s terms, any creative or dialogic response to it is rendered impossible.38

On the other hand, Bakhtin also argued for the existence of a second type of ‘discourse with authority’ which he termed ‘internally persuasive discourse’, describing it as ‘tightly interwoven with one’s own word’, ‘contemporary or reclaimable as contemporary’, and ‘primarily audience-related’, with a ‘special conception of listeners, readers, perceivers …’.39 Thus ‘internally persuasive discourse’ tends to be highly ‘addressive’ – patently conscious of its intended addressees and possible audiences (in other words, good in Bakhtinian terms) – while ‘authoritative discourse’ is not. If someone is passing on ‘internally persuasive discourse’, one could expect that this person would have engaged with, questioned, considered and evaluated the discourse before being to some degree personally convinced by this ‘discourse with authority’ and then not only transmitting it but also representing it in a

38 The best way to imagine this type of discourse is to think of some people’s attitudes to Biblical texts or other religious texts viewed as canonical or ‘holy’. Zealots will sometimes insist that such a text be either accepted or rejected entirely, without the individual being allowed to engage with this personally in any way.
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creative manner for the benefit of his new addressee(s). 'Internally persuasive discourse' means, in other words, that someone has made the discourse his own.

But because Damasippus allies himself so completely and uncritically with his source, because he is such a true believer in Stertinius's message, this inviolate and unquestionable 'prior authoritative discourse' has ironically in effect become, for Damasippus, 'internally persuasive discourse'. This is, after all, what blind belief effectively comprises: a prior authoritative discourse that is internalised by the believer. As a result, the believer 'dialogises' or engages with the authoritative discourse only to a very limited extent, and the fundamentals of the dogma never come into question. Damasippus's faith in the Stoic message has made Stertinius's authoritative discourse seem personally persuasive to him: in other words, he has swallowed it hook, line and sinker. Damasippus's complete belief in and thus total identification with his master Stertinius means that he ensures that they present a united front. Whether or not Damasippus is to be understood as repeating Stertinius's teachings verbatim, religiously replaying his master's voice, the fact remains that it is hard for us to separate convert from teacher: where, really, does Damasippus start and Stertinius end? Within the Stoic sermon itself the two speak mostly in one, combined authoritative voice, which may explain why scholars have complained about 'blurring' between these speakers in the central portions of the satire. Stertinius's discourse has become Damasippus's own discourse, and heteroglossia is now the register of the brainwashed.

Damasippus's motivation in reciting Stertinius's speech is perhaps best revealed by what he says once his direct quotation is over: in retrospect, he describes the speech as arma ("weapons", 297) given him by the Stoic guru so that he is in a position to defend himself from further attacks by those who call him mad. If they call him insane again in future, Damasippus assures us, they will hear the same in reply, courtesy of the speech on the Stoic paradox of all but the sage being mad. The defensive nature of this conclusion, reflected in the imagery of weaponry, hints at what Damasippus himself perceives to be the purpose of his recitation, and this may in turn explain his curious failure, throughout most of the talk, to suggest his awareness of, or

---

40 Rudd 1966:174-75 complains of 'blurring' at a number of points in this satire. Bond 1987:15, however, suggests that if there is 'blurring' in this satire, it is not accidental, but is deliberately fostered by Horace.

41 Haec mihi Stertinius, sapientum octavus, amico arma dedit, posthac ne compellarer inultus. dixerit insanum qui me, totidem audiet ... ("These weapons Stertinius, the Eighth Sage, gave me as his friend, so that in future I should not be called names without taking my revenge. If anyone calls me mad, he will hear as much said about him ...", Sat. 2.3.296-98; trans. Muecke 1993:55).
to adapt his speech in any way to his new audience. Damasippus does not address Horace, I would maintain, because he is simply not reciting the speech for Horace’s benefit; rather, like someone fingering worry-beads, Damasippus recites Stertinius’s speech at length to himself and for his own reassurance. Equally telling, perhaps, is that two lines after calling Stertinius’s teachings ‘weapons’ (arma), the images of warfare are suddenly exchanged, with some bathos, for those of playground battles, with the reference, for the second time in this satire, to a childhood game which seems to have involved pinning a tail on an unsuspecting individual, who could then be subjected to ridicule.42 Stertinius’s speech is Damasippus’s security blanket against Rome’s bullies and the puerile Damasippus seems to think that he must recite it as fully and as accurately as possible for its magic to take effect, to point to the tails on the backs of those who mock him. The accompanying lack of ‘addressivity’ in the central sections of Sat. 2.3 recited by Damasippus may explain why many readers of this satire have felt that the Stoic convert fails to ‘connect’ with Horace, as it were. It may also explain why Horace appears to find this satire so boring that he makes no comment on it and is effectively ‘silent’ between lines 31 and 300. A clue, I maintain, lies in Stertinius’s name, which like Damasippus’s, may have some significance for the satire. The first element is so similar to the Latin verb *stertere*, to snore,43 that it is hard to believe that no pun is intended, especially

42 Porphyrio identified this as a reference to a child’s game, and there were apparently also proverbs to this effect (Ott 1971:79). Damasippus assures us that anyone who mocks him will ‘learn to look round at what hangs, unawares, behind his own back’ (respicere ignoto discet pendentia tergo, Sat. 2.3.299; trans. Muecke 1993:55). This echoes the earlier reference to this game at Sat. 2.3.52-53: *crede modo insanum, nihil ut captivator ille/qui te deridet, caudam trahat* (‘To this extent believe yourself mad, that he who mocks you, no wiser, drags along a tail behind him’; trans. Muecke 1993:37).

43 Snoring could be symbolic of moral delusion and folly, as it is used by Lucretius in impugning the imaginary adversary of his ‘diatribe’ against the fear of death (DRN 3.1046). In this Lucretian passage, snoring while awake (i.e. being in a state of delusion) is compared to being drunk: mortua cui vita est prope iam riu riu alius studebit/qui somnum partem maiorem contetus an si et vigilans steret, ne venia et error caudam trahet (‘You, whose life is next-door to death although you still live and look on the light. You, who waste the major part of your time in sleep and, when you are awake, are snoring still and dreaming. You, who bear a mind hag-ridden by baseless fear and cannot find the commonest cause of your distress, hounded as you are, pathetic creature, by a pack of troubles and drifting in a drunken stupor upon a wavering tide of fantasy’, DRN 1046-52; trans. Latham & Godwin 2005:93).
since Stertinius’s (Prof. Snore’s) lecture is long enough to have had a soporific effect on an audience sufficiently sophisticated to find the commonplace and examples somewhat wearisome. The particular joke about Stertinius, I am suggesting, is not necessarily that he himself is snoring, but rather that his long-windedness has the effect of making his listeners resort to snoring. If the audience is already primed with drink and exhaustion and is used to sleeping a lot, as Damasippus alleges Horace was, then snoring is an obvious outcome of sitting through a boring lecture. Therefore I would suggest that Horace says nothing between lines 31 and 300 because he has become the most passive of possible (living) audiences: he has fallen asleep. When Horace wakes up, somewhere prior to line 300, the satire has grown beyond all proportion. If Horace has not only been nodding, but even snoring while Damasippus does his thing, it is really not at all surprising that our poet has been unable to apply his usual Callimachean file to the resultant satire’s bulk until it is far too late. Prof. Snore and his disciple Damasippus

---

44 Horace mentions Stertinius again at Epist. 1.12.20. Ps-Acro tells us in relation to this passage that Stertinius wrote 220 books on Stoicism in Latin verse, which would suggest that it is his reputation for tortuous long-windedness that is being satirised in Sat. 2.3.

45 At Sat. 2.3.3, Damasippus describes Horace as vini somnique benignus (‘lavish with wine and sleep’; trans. Brown 1993:35). Damasippus maintains that these habits are what prevent Horace from composing enough. The impression of Horace having indulged in too much wine and sleep, however, suggests that he may already have been somewhat drowsy when accosted by Damasippus. The soporific effects of overindulgence in wine are kept in our minds by the exemplum, at lines 57-62, of the drunken actor Fufius who, playing the part of Iliona, fell asleep and could not be woken up in time for his part – Fufius ebrius ... / cum Ilionam edormit (‘drunken Fufius, when he was sleeping through the part of Iliona’, Sat. 2.3.60-61; trans. Muecke 1993:39).

46 In Persius, Sat. 3, a satire often recognised as owing much to Horace, Sat. 2.3 (see Smith 1969:305), the narrator has difficulty staying awake through a Stoic lecture that he is given in his bedroom, it appears, because he overindulged in alcohol the previous night. Smith 1969:305 notes: ‘Like Horace, Persius is satirizing himself with the self-portrait of a man whose literary and philosophical interests fall far short of those of his overly zealous Stoic companion’. The narrator (Persius?) confesses this at the start of the satire: stertimus, indomitum quod dispumare Falernum/sufficiat, quinta dum linea tangitur umbra (‘My snores continue, allowing the fierce Falernian to simmer down as the shadow nudges the fifth line on the sundial’, Sat. 3.3.3-4; trans. Rudd 1979:216). Later, the older Stoic who has come to lecture him, chides him for having gone back to sleep: stertis adhuc laxumque caput conpagae solute/oscitat hesternum dissutis undique malis (‘Still snoring! Your head’s lolling, neck-joints undone and jaws unfastened on both sides, yawning off yesterday’, Sat. 3.3.8-9; trans. Rudd 1979:218).
have run away with *Sat. 2.3*. Through them Horace shows us that true madness does not consist of a plethora of competing voices or even of the chatter of numerous personalities, but of one endless, monologic, undialogised and unchallenged single voice.
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