HORACE IS (NOT) THERE:

A NARRATIVE APPROACH TO THE *SERMONES*

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULLFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF

THE DEGREE

OF MASTERS OF ARTS IN CLASSICS

IN THE UNIVERSTY OF CANTERBURY

BY DALE WANG

2016

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

My first debt is to my supervisor: Prof. Robin Bond. Where I have been *lutulentus,* he has been *tenuis.* Where my writing has been *rarus* he has been a *ridens* Damasippus. Robin's constant laughter, smile and help almost gave me the impression of being in the presence of Horace throughout my time in the thesis writing process. My second supervisor: Prof. Enrica Sciarrino, has at various points encouraged, edited, and graciously worked her way through my arguments. For her patience and insightful comments I will be eternally grateful. To my office colleague: Jordan Adams, few people can put up with my neurotic gestures and idiosyncratic habits as well as he has. To my two Latin students, Brother Martin and Brother Seelos: both were willing and enthusiastic students under the tutelage of this young and inexperienced *magister*. They were also wonderful listeners of an early presentation version of this thesis. For the other classicists I have had the fortune of rubbing shoulders with over the years I offer my thanks. Finally for my wife, Emma Wang, who has borne the thankless tasks of watching my grammar, watching my mind, and keeping me sane, I owe a debt larger than I could ever pay. To everybody else, the nameless *turba* who have spurred me on either with doubt or encouragement: cheers.

Introduction

"Familiar though his name may be to us, the storyteller in his living immediacy is by no means a present force. He is already becoming something remote from us and something that is getting even more distant."
        -Walter Benjamin: The Story Teller

"The originality of the Letterist International consists in understanding form not as literary form, in terms of genre, style, poetics and so forth, but as material form, as the book, the film, the canvas."
        -McKenzie Wark: The Beach Beneath the Street: The Everyday Life and Glorious Times of the Situationist International.

Horace's *Sermones* have attracted so much critical attention in their lives that another study of them seems superfluous.[1]So upfront I confess that as I have read Horace's S*ermones*, considered Horace's *Sermones*, and tried to write about Horace's *Sermones*, I have battled immensely between repeating what has already been said, and trying to write something new. As an approach I have attempted to write about the author of the text: The *Sermones*. While it has been written as two books, and while we are very aware of the author under whose name they have been organized: Horace, I think there is still space to say something about Horace as an author with a view towards gathering together the text under this title.[2]

We have arrived in the 21st century awash with authors and claims to authority. The newest laws being written and codified have to do with copyright, access and distribution rights of various art forms. The lucrative field of pop music has

---

[1] That is before considering the general superfluity to most scholarship produced in the world.

[2] Foucault (1998) discusses the author more as the material organizing principal for texts rather than the *fons* of them.

thrust the integrity, or lack thereof, of artists, labels and producers onto the front page. We are in a world with a serious crisis of authority. The term crisis however, betrays a characteristic, common -I think- to contemporary man, and that is to suppose that we live in a time of crisis. A crisis, as we know, is a time of picking and choosing, and even of the fabled 'hard choices'. We believe we are in a crisis because, we believe, maybe for the first time, that we are all in a position to change the world. This crisis, however, has been around for millennia now. In his first satire of his second book, Horace raises the possibility of censorship for the reader to consider. While he avoids the thrust of the problem by playing on the words '*lex'* and '*bonus, malus'* etc., (Horace, 2.1) he still manages to capture the heart of the problem of being an author. Ownership of texts, authority over texts, and responsibility for texts are not obvious ideas that can be solved by placing the name of a person at the start or the end of a text. Decisions, peoples, laws and even one's very self must be navigated in order to delineate clearly the relation of creator to creation.

In this thesis I will be analyzing Horace's satires one by one in the Books in which we have received them. I will first be delineating the various issues that prevent us from clearly knowing the author. I will also describe and engage with many of the authors who will be constant companions throughout my readings of each satire in Horace's satirical books. In particular I will be discussing the books as narratives. Not that each poem contains a narrative, as some do and some do not, but as each poem contributes to a larger picture of Horace which I describe as a narrative. I will also be paying particular attention to the voices, which, at various points, enter, interpolate, and interrupt the satirist. The voice of the satirist will then be subjected to both a dialogic and narrative-driven approach. My approach mirrors the shape of my own thesis which will be quite linear (one could even call it a narrative) and will introduce my methodology, and the various other voices I will be engaging with throughout my reading of Horace's poetry, followed by two chapters dealing with each Book of Horace's *Sermones* in turn, and then my conclusions.

I will not be analyzing Horace's *Epistulae* in my thesis, although there is good reason to include them in a discussion of Horace's satiric works.[3] This was mostly for time and space. I believe, however, that the *Epistulae* could benefit from the same style of reading to which I will subject the satires.

In my thesis I have followed the Tuebner text for Horace, edited by F. Klingner published in 1959.[4] I believe credit is due however to the Loeb, translated by H. R. Fairclough in 1926. His translation was my first exposure to Horace' *Sermones,* and while for the most part I have found occasion to disagree with his translation choices, and his introductions, they are probably still unconsciously formative for my feeling of Horace's writing style. Where I have found occasion to refer to Lucilius I have referred to E.H. Warmington's Loeb (1938) edition over F. Marx's, and in my research I am deeply thankful for the work Warmington did to provide a correspondence at the back of his edition.

All translations are my own, except where noted. Any errors also remain my own.

---

[3] See Whybrew (2006) for a discussion of *The Epistles* as satire.

[4] It should be noted though that I have followed Emily Gower's lead in changing some of the orthography. Gowers (2012) has a list of these changes on pp. 27-28.

Tota Nostra Est

What we have now called 'Roman Verse Satire' was in fact the beginning of a tradition that helped to define the literary culture of Rome. Through authors such as Lucilius, Horace, Perseus, and Juvenal, the city of Rome, the people of Rome and the history of Rome were scrutinized, analyzed and organized. What, however, makes satire truly satire is a question that scholars have troubled over for years. The idea of it as a genre, while not novel, still marks out a difficult moment in the literary culture of Rome. As far back as the teacher of rhetoric, Quintilian, was writing, the Romans were aware of it as their own unique contribution to literary history. '*Satura quidem tota nostra est'* (Book 10.1.93) is how Quintilian describes satire, an isle of purely Roman *ingenium* not having been pioneered by Greeks, and merely calqued or followed by later Roman authors.[5]

Satire is therefore significant for the Roman world. A genre that is entirely of their own means it is a genre that signifies something personal to them, something they can invest with meaning beyond just literary novelty. In particular, some have suggested, that this poetry gave the Roman elite their first and most powerful voice. Miller discusses the development from Ennius to Lucilius. He notes that Lucilius took a form from Ennius and then developed it into a public genre.[6] Others develop this idea such as Habinek who considers it a game (*ludus*) that enabled the participation of individuals within the community and a transformative process at the same time.[7] It is worth noting that Lucilius, who is proclaimed the *inventor* of Satire, himself was an *eques*.[8] This is markedly

---

[5] Debates on the exact meaning of this phrase have raged on, but I think it is safe to say that Quintilian is here referring to a uniquely Latin genre. See Van Rooy (1955 pp. 305-310) for a discussion of the options.

[6] Miller (2005 p. 5). His use of the term 'public' is nuanced by his reference to 'political invective' which suggests that by 'public' Millar means more that it pertained to political/public events, not necessarily that it was consumed publically.

[7] Habinek (2005a)

[8] Horace, *S.*, 1.10.48

different from previous acknowledged *inventores* of Roman genres. Slaves and immigrants began the traditions of poetry available for consumption in Ancient Rome, up until the Augustan era.[9] Satire, however, comes from much less contested figures, so that even though it may have been appropriated from various sources its beginnings are much less awkward or tricky for Latin poets to navigate. [10]

What makes satire "Satire" is a tricky question. The name itself is opaque. We do not know the exact etymology of it, although in a way the mixed up nature of the genre is a testament to its own self anyway. Ramage, in a review of the debates around its etymology, lands on the idea of it as a stuffing served at a meal, full of different flavours.[11] What we have then is a title that, unlike other genres, such as elegy, does not lend itself to any particular interpretation. While other poets may write love poetry in elegy, or martial poetry in epic, satiric poetry seems strangely bereft of any particular content to match form. This is what makes the definition of satire that much harder.

Lucilius, as the proclaimed inventor of the genre, is still less than useful in order to understand what exactly it is. First, his work is entirely fragmentary. Making sense out of it is notoriously difficult. Quintilian notes his importance in 10.1, and claims he is everybody's favourite 'satirist'. Therefore it is fair to say, whatever satire is, Lucilius defines it in some way. The consciousness with which Lucilius might do this is another question entirely. In one fragment he does have an unnamed interlocutor refer to his own writing as '*sermones'* (fr. 1038) although exactly what that is meant to mean is difficult to ascertain. Ramage notes that '*sermones'* is an element of elite discussion, something Lucilius himself links to (fr. 206-207). That this fragment ties eating to talking, and thus to the concept of *sermones* gives credence to the idea that Lucilius was aware that what he was doing was a particularly elite form of writing; something congruent with

---

[9] i.e. Plautus, Terence, Livius Andronicus, Ennius et. al.

[10] I.e. Old Comedy, Bion's Diatribes, Archilochus etc. See Jennifer Ferris-Hill (2015) for more.

[11] Ramage (1976 p. 24); Braund (1992 p. 7) also ends up here, with some doubt.

Paul Miller's point noted above. Even this, however, seems to me to be a little weak. We can't be sure what the nature of this 'interlocutor' is. Is he somebody annoyed by Lucilius' words, perhaps a named person who Lucilius lampooned, or a purely fictional character? Also, how Lucilius as a poet was experienced is an opaque issue. Was he a part of the *recitationes*? It seems likely that his poetry was a very public kind, considering the praise he is given for his '*libertas,'* it seems probable then that people were aware of his unique style. [12] But the self referential nature of the poetry, described as '*ludus'* may also point to the fact that Lucilius himself was not sure what exactly he was doing. It is possible he was using some Ennian elements, although next to impossible to prove given our extant fragments. It seems more likely to me that as a genre, 'Satire' is still being codified by the time we read Horace's *Sermones* so that in a way Lucilius' writings are the beginning of, but not a strict codification of, the genre.[13]

Genre?

Defining a genre is always a difficult thing. Many people have tried, and there are valuable tropes, themes, metrical considerations etc. that allow us to demarcate and delimit certain writings as belonging to certain classes, or genres. One such attempt is by S.J. Harrison who argues in his book *Generic Enrichment in Vergil & Horace* that a program of enrichment, started by Vergil, is continued and espoused by Horace in his *Sermones*. He goes into depth discussing genre and how to define it in Latin poetry, discussing the above ideas such as subject matter, meter, and other concepts for Augustan generic definition.[14] In particular, he argues that during the Augustan era we witness a poetic

---

[12] i.e. Quin. *Inst.* 10.1.93 Quintilian, a relatively late source, notes his freedom: *nam et eruditio in eo mira et libertas.* While this does not cover the issue of consumption, the understanding is that his association with the Scipiones protected him, so at least in principle, his poetry is considered public in its effect, if not in performance.

[13] These issues will arise in *S.* 2.1 where Horace is accused of being *ultra leges* with satire.

[14] Harrison (2007 pp. 22-27). Harrison leaves short consideration for 'narrativity' in terms of genre consideration, only flagging some possible avenues for considering narrative in pastoral poetry, I think more can be made of it then he claims.

movement of mixing genres in order to enrich already existing (predominantly Greek) models for the new age. He argues that Horace and Vergil have 'metageneric' signposts, ones that help a certain reader to construct links with other genres and use them to capture the cleverness of the poet and his poetry. It also allows the genre to 'expand its borders' so to speak, and include more topoi, etc. within its framework.[15]It is an attractive argument, and bears some truth in its analysis of Vergil's poetry; however, his analysis of Horace's *Sermones* leaves some questions unasked about the poetry. For a start, Satire as a form always existed in a cannibalistic relationship with other genres.[16]Lucilius himself gives his poetry the flavour of literary criticism upon other genres.[17]The idea of an enrichment is also one which assumes a stable generic lineage or ancestry. Lucilius' *saturae* are difficult to exactly pigeon hole as existing within a stable framework. Furthermore, Harrison notes standard intertextual sites only to skip over the more important (to my mind) question of the exact nature of these relations. Satire already plays with ironies, games and literary feints, so is a reference a commendation, a criticism, a development etc.? The exact nature of intertextuality within Horace's satiric poetry is, I think, one which needs consideration. It is not simply a way of signaling metageneric ambitions, although it could be partly that, but also part of the nature of satire itself. Stephen Hinds in his *Allusion and intertext* alerts us to the wa

ys in which we relate texts to each other in time. We create master-texts, privileging certain moments over others, so that we can create a stable tree leading back to whichever text we see as the master.[18] So, in order to understand how Horace uses a text, Harrison has to 'freeze' a possible interpretation of the *Eclogues* and read the intergeneric texts as examples of contact which enriches Horatian satire. Harrison's final summation is that satire is enriched from Lucilius' simple form to a completely new genre 'in touch' with higher forms of poetry.[19]The genre of satire surely has something to say about this though.

---

[15] Harrison (2007 p. 74)

[16] A similar point is also made by Breed in his Bryn Mawr review (2008) of the book.

[17] Lucilius, 401 Ff. (Warmington)

[18] Hinds (1998 pp. 99 ff.) especially remind us of these dynamics.

[19] Harrison. (2007 p. 103)

Horace is not the first poet to satirize higher forms of poetry, as even old comedy did this.[20]The question of the use of other genres is not indicative of an attempt at generic enrichment, so much as a standard satiric procedure.

Harrison's image of the author as co-creator of new genre's along with a tradition does bear some semblance to the idea that Horace is a social climber.[21]Here the image of a metageneric Horace on the one side and an ambitious Horace on the other, go hand in hand; he is climbing the ladder of a new state (the Roman Empire) with the help both of Maecenas and Vergil and other poets through the development of novel genres from the ruins of a previous age. This in turn could contribute to an understanding of the psychology of Horace, and perhaps even a sociology of authors under the imperial state; however the inference is unwarranted. What were Horace's political ambitions in writing the satires? They are -I think- inscrutable, at least from this perspective. Satire is not the mirror of political ambition, not in a strict one to one relationship. Of course, Satire is unable to actually convey political ambition. Freudenberg's book *Threatening Poses* contends that Horace's satires are unable to convey political ambition, even though that might be the ideal inherent within the form. For Freudenburg the history of satire is not just the history or literary convention and form, but the sound that traditional Roman *Libertas* makes as it dies through the change to the Principate.

Freudenburg considers Horace's satires within the context of Roman *Libertas*. The identity of the author therefore becomes the identity of a struggle, a gaping hole in the poetry. If, as noted above, satire was a unique mode of production for aristocratic elite identity, then how come Horace is agonizing over the lack of identity? At the heart of Freudenburg's thesis is then a question around identity,

---

[20] Presumably The *agon* in Aristophanes' 'Frogs' (1006-1481) between Euripides and Aeschylus is an elongated example of the fun that can be had of a more 'serious' form of poetry.

[21] Noted, also by Zetzel (1980 p. 69)

not just genre per se.[22] Genre, as a controlling form, is always at its own limit and the subjectivity of an author is always pushing at the boundaries, trying to see if it can squeeze out. The genre then holds freedom just out of reach of the author, and the law of genre meets the actual law of the land in *sermo 2.1*. The question of the author in his text is also displaced by the question of *libertas*. Horace is not important as an individual composing poetry, but as a chain in the agonizing question of how can one speak in the new conditions. Horace is the first satirist to notice the incongruence between himself and Lucilius. Horace does not have a unique voice and the text itself lies fraught. While, on the one hand, the author desires to speak the truth, on the other, he cannot for fear of any repercussions. So, the genre and the author are at odds with each other, as Horace attempts to utilize the voice created by Lucilius, but cannot quite express the full power harnessed by Lucilius, he diverts attention back onto himself. Freudenburg's stand out example would be *sermo* 1.5.[23] There Horace's description of a key political moment in the Roman civil war is obscured by the author's attempt to inject himself into the satire.

In Freudenburg's narrative, the dénouement of Horace's satire is the scene where the guests leave, (2.8) mirroring the response of the readers/hearers who are ready to leave a Horace who never quite delivers the generic expectations.[24]The author then has failed in living up to a genre's expectations. He has attempted to do something left behind by the writings of another, but has failed to completely uphold those expectations. So, in Freudenburg's work we see the needs of the subjective meet the expectations of the objective. As form and content clash, they create an author who never has quite as much control over his work as he would hope. Freudenburg analyzes Horace as a result of the clash between form and content, the author comes after the text rather than prior to it. I am sympathetic to this, as no doubt an author is not a solitary genius from which creativity emanates, but rather the result of social pressures, forces

---

[22] Freudenburg (2002 P. 81) notes that Horace meets the end of the genre satire in 2.1 where Trebatius advises the switch to Panegyric.

[23] Freudenburg (2002 p. 52)

[24] Freudenburg (2002 pp. 126-127)

and drives which at every point implicate themselves onto the text. The text is not exhausted by describing the state of the author at the time of composition. The author then for Freudenburg is complicated by questions of genre and content, but does not go beyond this into what kind of author is actually created. Horace is negative in his composition, but I think we can actually say something positive about him as well.

A more promising approach is - I think - represented by Oliensis in her work *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Here Oliensis uses the concept of a 'face' to discuss how Horace presents himself to the world. Her work is informed by sociolinguistics, and how people/texts relate to the world they find themselves in.[25]In particular she is interested in how Horace creates authority for himself by means of his *persona*, so that the gap between what is traditionally called an author, i.e. the biological being who put pen to paper, and the *persona*, i.e. the mask put on by the author in the text, can be bridged. The persona grants a face to the author, and thereby accumulates 'symbolic capital'.[26]This 'face' by the work it performs enables Horace to accumulate this capital, and spend it later on. In this way Oliensis creates a narrative for Horace to perform in his two books of satires. The creation of his 'face' and the ways in which he cashes in on his accumulated face in Book 2.[27]Her narrative for Horace is one in which the text constitutes Horace's reputation, and how he then handles that reputation in Book 2.[28] The pressures around him then constitute the author, and the satires are the creation of, on one hand, the biological author, and on the other the various pressures, freedoms, and impediments he encounters along the way. The author is an amalgam of the persona and the forces which the persona has to navigate.

---

[25] Oliensis (1998 p. 4)

[26] Oliensis (1998 p. 5) she refers here to Bordieu's work.

[27] Oliensis (1998 p. 3)

[28] Oliensis (1998 p. 14)

As Oliensis creates a narrative she implicitly acknowledges the work that a narrative can do to create the author. Oliensis finds the inter-poetic biography to be one that can be examined at the level of the text, and she does not move beyond the text in her analysis of the *Sermones* in order to uncover how the author exists within his own society.[29] The critic can then on her reading find the various moves that Horace makes in his texts on the very surface of them. The texts are the way he navigates the powers and authorities, and how he asserts his own authority in the midst of them. Her ultimate concern is how authority is constructed on to the poet. Horace's satires overlay the author so that the *auctor* is unknowable through the text. What is knowable is the author's persona, as the persona accretes authority throughout the text. What Oliensis does not seem to consider is the way in which the collection, as a poetic book, addresses the question of authority. While many poems may have been performed at the *recitationes* as Horace portrays in 1.4, the texts of these poems were published in a book form. This - I think - reshapes the way we think of a narrative, since it is now materially grounded in the production by the author. The narrative is contained within and grounded in the book as an object. Horace makes literal reference to this fact in the last lines of the text where he instructs his slave to go and add the final lines to the book (*libellus*) (1.10.92). The text is contained within the book by this performance. This occurs as the slave, an apparatus of the text, has the final word of the poem. The *puer* closes the text, and the narrative ends with the figure of the slave. In this sense I think Oliensis privileges the text of the *sermones* as a performed utterance without taking into account the materialization of the poems as a text.[30] While she does consider that the text will last for posterity, she sees that as part of the strategy of utterance. Conversely I would take the presence of the book as removing the text from the author so much that the material presence of the book has to be taken into account.

---

[29] Oliensis (1998 p. 47). Oliensis says it does not matter for her purposes whether Horace's trip to Brundisium occurred in time and space, so it's not that she does not take into account historical context, but she finds the authority of Horace is entirely summed up within the text itself.

[30] Oliensis (1998 pp. 5-6) discussion of speech acts and the rhetorical economy that she creates suggests this more.

Another scholar who has analyzed the first book of *Sermones* is Catherine Schlegel. Her work *Satire and the Threat of Speech* is a salutary reading of Book 1.[31] Her work is an attempt to understand Horace and his speech as the result of a master manipulator.[32]She notes the ability of the satirist to share in the power of speech, however she sees Horace's two books of *sermones* as attempts to mollify the power of speech and resolve the dichotomy of a speaker writing *sermo* at people, rather than *with* people.[33] Her underlying assumption then is that the manipulation of the self in satire is the manipulation of the genre.[34] So as she traces the various attempts by Horace to utilize the genre of satire in a friendly way, she is also tracing the attempt of the author to shape himself as well. The genre and the poet are then related genetically for Schlegel, so she sees the development of Book 2 of Horace's *Sermones* as his own development to include the reader within the form of *sermo*.[35]I agree with her insofar as she sees the author manipulating the genre, and thereby himself, although I disagree with her proposed *telos* of Horace's goals. To say that he is predominantly mollifying his own voice would be to grant the author near unlimited control in his own reception; however I think we can see how Horace struggles to maintain that.

What could a poet look like?

In this I follow the discussion around texts, transmission and authority that has been occurring in the context of 'Latin Literature' for the last decade. Lowrie, in her discussion of the world and art considers the way the text performs in the world, not as a purely aesthetic artifact but as an intervention in the material world.[36] In particular she considers the way in which the poet comments on his

---

[31] Schlegel (2005)

[32] Schlegel (2005 p. 16)

[33] Schlegel (2005 p. 17)

[34] Schlegel (2005 p. 18)

[35] Schlegel (2005 p. 18)

[36] Lowrie (2009 pp. 65-66)

own medium as a way to define his role as a lyricist.[37] Lowrie notes that part of this self-referentiality is related to the bookish nature of Augustan Latin Literature, as the author is aware of the future audience, as the text is saved for posterity, not exhausted at the moment of utterance.[38]She traces throughout her text the engagement between Horace's texts and the incongruence of 'song' and 'text' and the variegated ways his poetry, namely his *Odes* and *Epodes,* navigate these.[39]The discussion ends with the ways in which the poets create through their poems a lasting monument, and the ideological formations embedded within these texts. The monument form makes sense within a reading public, and therefore within the continuing realm of the Roman Empire, as the empire creates the horizons (literally and figuratively) within which the poetry survives.[40]This results in the view that 'prosopographical detail about the addressees or poetry's material transmission will elucidate his poetry's position in society only so much'.[41]

Important in Lowrie's discussion is the fact that we are talking about elite subjects, and therefore elite production, hence the privileging of genres that address the elite audiences and contexts. Horace's *Odes* and *Epodes* are generically well-defined collections, relying on well-attested models, and discuss serious political events (i.e Actium etc.). She stresses that her own text analyses elite cultural production, and not mass culture.[42] The division is - I think - instructive for the way Lowrie imagines the creative moment as a moment of individual creation. Mass culture would presumably involve nameless individuals and less well defined productions. These would sit outside genre, tone, and other markers of production that define the literary landscape of

---

[37] Lowrie (2009 p. 66) A 'lyricist' emphasises the song element of Horatian lyric, as it relies on a performative model, even if we might construe it as a primarily written document.

[38] Lowrie, (2009 p. 74) Although she caveats this is a mere heuristic, not a perfect description of the results of publication upon a text.

[39] Lowrie (2009 pp. 63-122)

[40] Lowrie (2009 p. 122)

[41] Lowrie (2009 p. 122)

[42] Lowrie (2009 p. ix)

Augustan Rome. A landscape in which the elite culture authorizes itself by virtue of its connection to name, genre, and the various anxieties associated with those labels.[43]

Lowrie's discussion of texts and the way they ascribe authority to their authors highlights an important element of the production of authors in the Augustan period. The authors were interested in the power their texts afforded them. As subjects of poetry, they existed prior to the texts, but the texts themselves afforded them the privilege of being 'poetic subjects', so that in reception they became intertwined with the persona they projected, a persona that existed in the way freedoms and constraints were being navigated in the texts. Lowrie's discussion of '*sermo*' as a genre is not detailed. She references the fact that Horace does not rigorously delineate *what* his poetry is.[44]The authority she ascribes to the poet in satire is minimal, making gestures towards *libertas* but more with reference to the dulling of his voice. Horace could write satire, but he is content to reference the power of satire without using it.[45]

Habinek in contradistinction discusses satire as having power in an incubatory manner. In his discussion of the ludic qualities of song, he discusses the need for song to have a corporeal nature. Habinek's category of 'song' is expansive. Habinek sees it as encompassing not just the performative moment of a singer, but also constituting genres as diverse as satire and epic, oratory and even

---

[43] Lowrie (2009 p. 60) discusses briefly the multiple ways in which 'literature' exists in contexts and transcends them. The anxieties I mentioned are the ways in which authors try to account for the various chronological spaces their texts are plausibly believed to inhabit.

[44] Lowrie (2009 p. 24) she notes that Horace's satires are characterised as '*sermo*' although are written, so the conversational tone is not a perfect fit for her.

[45] Lowrie (2009 p. 348) Her conclusion, though arrived at quite differently from Freudenburg, is confluent, as satire exists as a formally limited genre, and the author cannot escape those barriers, as Lowrie also notes here that the constraints are 'conventional' rather than legal on p. 347.

philosophy.[46] For 'play' then to partake in the category of 'song' is to understand that 'song' is not simply a unifying category. Rather it is a category that defines songs to the degree they participate in 'song', either serious or non-serious, as Habinek notes that 'play' defines a less serious participation in song culture.[47] For Habinek then, the 'less-serious' kind of song that is satire connotes an embodied phenomena, one which by its nature as a physical expression of itself, allows the 'serious' forms of song to generate in maturation from these forms. [48] So play becomes an important constitutive element in song. How satire would fit into this is part of Habinek's argument as he argues that satire allows an extension of play into adulthood.[49]In particular it allows for elite masculinity to be negotiated in a playful medium. Satire as a genre exists to allow other genres such as oratory, epic etc. to generate themselves. So satire is incubatory in the sense that it is meant to grow out into something else, it is essentially transitory for Habinek.[50]In another essay in the *Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*, Habinek has an expanded discussion of satire as aristocratic play by further stressing its ludic nature in the way he discusses how it plays with other genres, forms and practices.[51] By playing with other genres and forms, Satire would reshape things in its own way, as a child might imitate friends or even parents, so satire makes a farce out of it. The representation involved though is fraught, as ultimately Habinek notes that it is not able to do away with what it imitates: while the power of satire is to make fun of its object, it can never do away with its object as it exists in both chronological and spatial relation to its object.

---

[46] Habinek (2005b pp. 94-95) Although he notes this is not a simple elision of categories, rather the writers themselves struggle to redirect their efforts away from their opposing categories, but Habinek argues that the fact that they do this belies the truth that they are in fact related.

[47] Habinek (2005b p. 110) so he is able to say: 'Play can be used to describe a type of song that is construed as less serious than the other, non-playful types – for instance, lyric poetry or satire, in contrast to epic.'

[48] Habinek (2005b p. 112) eschews various attempts to categorise 'play' *as* genre, or *as* practice, rather seeing it as existing in distinction to serious categories, so that satire opposes epic, and literary criticism opposes moral philosophy.

[49] Habinek (2005b p. 115)

[50] Habinek, (2005b pp. 115-116)

[51] Habinek (2005a) pp. 191-192

Without the object satire too would cease to exist.[52] So the power of satire is both allowed and limited by its object.[53]

Where does Habinek leave the author in all this? As a satiric author, Horace is hyper-aware of his medium, and the references to his own body and to his work suggest the attempts at longevity inherent with all writing. The relationship between writing and death is well attested.[54]For Habinek, in a way similar to Lowrie, there is an attempt to grant longevity, but it comes at the expense of the author. Song is the attempt to overcome the limits placed by our mortality, and the bodies of our poets are the attempted sacrifices. The history of the author is then lost to us as an authentic whole, but as an imprint, and as a reminder of the gap that exists between subject and object, history and biography, and the text and us.[55]The author names the imprint of a long gone character. The satiric author then is almost further removed, as it plays with, and toys with, the expansive weightiness of the adulthood which characterizes epic, oratory and the weighty affairs of real life. [56] The satiric author is the image created by the inverse of these activities, more akin to a photo negative than a photo. The author exists entirely subsumed by the satire. Created by the interplay between song and play, the author never escapes his/her own material conditions, and is transplanted (translated?) into the poetry, but never out of it.

---

[52] Habinek (2005a) pp. 182 ff. discusses the *scurra* and how satire can make fun of, but never do away with this character.

[53] One can think of the recent attempts in our contemporary age, where satire has taken on a truly dominant mode in contemporary political discourse, and yet while it seeks to make fun of politicians and policies, it can never do away with them. Head lines (and I do not jest) such as "John Oliver Destroys Donald Trump On 'Last Week Tonight'" (Huffington Post) while funny, do very little to actually 'destroy' Donald Trump, they perform a satire and while they are funny, they are ultimately stymied by the very conditions that make them possible

[54] Foucault (1998 p. 206)

[55] Habinek (2005b p. 259)

[56] Horace's question to Fundanius is instructive: 'Tell me if it is not too weighty (*gravis*)' Horace, *S.* 2.8.4-5

Habinek's discussion of the corporeal nature of 'Song' is particularly apt as it is applied to satire. Barchiesi and Cucchiarelli regard the body as an important 'self-referential' symbol for Satire. They ask: 'What happens when the poet describes, and thereby reflects on, himself, and his body, in satire?'[57] Through a discussion that traces the significance/signifying possibilities of a body in ancient literature, they arrive at the conclusion: The text is embodied, as the body serves as an intertextual device, to compare with other poets, and thereby the shifting, narrative-driven social situation the poet happens to be in.[58] They discuss in particular the medical differences which highlight Horace as a person in a status inferior to his satiric predecessor: Lucilius. The distinction is in the way in which Horace's body excludes himself from full participation in Roman society. When Maecenas is playing ball (*Sermo,* 1.5) Horace has to withdraw, or when Maecenas comes with the important members of society he has to withdraw and rub ointment on his eyes.[59] Unlike Lucilius who is a full participant, Horace's body, and thereby his societal status, prevents him from such participation. The important step here is the idea that as interpreters we can conflate his body with his social status.

The identification of body with social status is an interesting theoretical move that requires us to consider the ways in which bodies function in society. Bodies are materially affected by their status in society. Today we can witness bodies on television that signify poverty, injustice and a call for charity.[60]When we talk about Horace's bleary-eyes then we are witnessing Horace's almost secret signifier. And it has to remain as this, it is not overt, and it is not even perhaps intentional. It is instead something that reminds *us* of his body's frailty, and, intertextually, reminds us of Lucilius' healthy body, that of an *eques* and not a mere son of a freed-man like Horace. This move, therefore, reminds us of the

---

[57] Barchiesi & Cucchiarelli, (2005 p. 207)

[58] Barchiesi & Cucchiarelli, (2005 p. 210)

[59] Barchiesi and Cucchiarelli, (2005 p. 214)

[60] All this can be gleaned easily by a picture of a small African child, belly distended and eyes downcast. These images make speech almost unneeded, except to allay middle-class guilt, and assure them of the power of their pocket-book.

textualization of Horace's body. His body is a code, rewritten for us in the text, allowing us to interpret it as it reaches us from the page.

He has created this image with his words, creating a body to map social significance and identifiers onto; however, that this text is embodied is our interpretation. It is the reader's vision which projects the body from here on to the Lucilian body, or any other body in which it can see an intertext. In this act of super-positioning bodies, a more immanent logic is revealed which shows the way in which bodies function in texts, as interpretive devices that are always entirely the devices of an interpreter. Thus as an author Horace exists on the page, as his body is part of what survives the death of the author. The body is not the literal 'biographical' body, but the textualized narrative body. The body is entrapped, and creates the narrative at the moment of comprehension from the page by the reader. What Barchiesi and Cucchiarelli do not consider is the way in which the book also becomes an analogue for the poetry of Horace, as the text itself is commented upon in the text. The body of the poet is then comingled with the body of the text, as the author comments upon himself, not as a way of distinguishing himself from his poetry, but as a way of sublimating himself into the nature of the poetry, and into the very text itself.

Sciarrino's *Cato the Censor and the Beginnings of Latin Prose* develops some ideas around how authors relate to their texts that can help us further uncover these issues. In her conclusions she discusses the concept of subjectivity as the ability of Roman persons to extend their own bodies in relation to the socio-cosmic reality they inhabit.[61] In this sense the authority of Roman persons was developed in their ability to '*discover* and *adhere[nce]* to a socio-cosmological order materially perceived'.[62] She goes on to note that the degree of *auctoritas* enjoyed by authors *prior* to the moment of writing is able to determine the sort of writing that will obtain in that authors' oeuvre. She notes, however, that the opposite is also true, as various writings, their themes, genres and relation to the

---

[61] Sciarrino (2011 p. 204)

[62] Sciarrino (2011 p. 204) italics hers.

socio-cosmic order, will 'make manifest' the authors' position in the world and affect the reception of his texts. Our position then, vis-à-vis our actual understanding of the 'consciousness' of Latin poets is, according to Sciarrino, difficult in an analogous way that the contemporary 'subaltern' is unknowable.[63] But as we examine the gaps and rifts we find in our sources, the moments where self-reference suggests the possibility of (re-)placing our authors into their context, we can uncover the author's attempts at mastering the world around them.[64]Mastering the world around them is a key attribute of those either in power, or with ambition to see their own selves exerted in the world.[65]Therefore I see here a potential link between the body of a poet and the body of their text. The mastery must make itself known, even if self-depreciatingly as in the case of Horatian satire. In this sense, the capture of the text within the text itself displays awareness of the impacts of publication upon both the poet and the text.

In a later article *Hyperreality, Intertextuality, and the Study of Latin Poetry*, Sciarrino discusses the ways in which texts create and describe realities within themselves by magnifying them through a process of compression.[66]As objects are portrayed through a text, they come to obtain a new level of clarity, filling up the vision of the reader, and becoming almost viscerally present to us. Horace's satirical text participates in this through the way it magnifies the very book in our hands by compression into the text itself.[67]The text then is part of the poet, and we can read the actual text not just as words upon a page, but also as ways in

---

[63] Sciarrino (2011 pp. 204-205) she notes the essay by Spivak as an example of the troubles classicists have faced in our discipline since it's dubiously dated inception.

[64] Sciarrino (2011 p. 205)

[65] This is key for Sciarrino's discussion of Cato's development of Latin prose. See especially p. 206 for her summation.

[66] Sciarrino (2015) pp. 379 ff.

[67] Instructively, Sciarrino also uses Horace's *Ars Poetica* as an example of this pp. 380 ff. While the *Ars* is not 'satire' in itself, it participates in one of the elements of satire, that is literary criticism, and even censure as it discusses what a poet is and is not. In her PhD thesis published in Canterbury, Linda Whybrew (2006) considers these elements and discusses how Horace's *Epistles* are a part of Horace's satiric oeuvre.

which the page is made real to us by the text's more 'aesthetic'qualities. [68] Whether these are overt as in references to the action of writing, the material elements involved in composition, the various bodies which the text are written on/by/with or even the more subtle elements which inhabit poetic texts such as meter, tone, theme, inflection etc.[69]The materiality of poetry, and its references to its own materiality are then important sites of authorial revelation. This is not to say that they are moments of biographical honesty or windows from our world into theirs, rather they are the imprints of the authors' attempts at navigating the complicated currents which writing thrusts them into. The authority available by writing texts, and the mastery afforded through them, in part depends upon them on the one hand making themselves present through the text, but on the other hand disappearing into the text, as the text will outlast them.[70]Sciarrino's comments upon texts and the authority they afford to authors helps me to comprehend the uses of the poet's body within the poetry and the materiality of the poetic artifice itself. In an earlier work Habinek also explicitly comments upon this. He discusses how Augustan poets bridge the gap between paper and stone in their poetry. In this he discusses how the poets authorize themselves into a monument-form giving themselves lasting significance beyond death.[71] In this sense then the references to the material of the poetry are attempts to transcend the materiality of their own voices. Through this the authors seek to communicate their achievements to unheard horizons.[72]The material references are then also indicators of an authors attempted mode of

---

[68] I use the term hesitatingly, not to say that a text is wholly aesthetic, but to emphasize its material quality.

[69] Sciarrino (2015 p. 380) references metrical structures and onomatopoeic elements

[70] Horace's well-annotated *Epistle 1.20* dramatizes the moment for all to see. See also Oliensis (1998)

[71] Habinek (1998 p. 109-110) in particular noting the example of Horace's *monumentum aere perennius* (*Odes* 3.30.1-2)

[72] Habinek (1998 pp. 110 ff.) He goes on throughout his text to note that this is not a politically neutral survival, but an imperialistically coloured survival, a community of *Roman* readers. Horace fears the potential readers who cannot properly comprehend his texts in Epistle 1.20.

survival.[73]With these in mind we can see how authors attempt through both their body, and the extended bodies of their works, to externalize their subjectivities in mastering not just of the art of poetry, but the art of survival, not in a biological sense, but rather as they see their own textualized bodies surviving in the future consumption of readers.

Some have criticized these models of understanding the ancient world, especially on account of them involving constructions of the ancient world based upon categories that the ancients themselves came up with[74] whereas we might prefer to discuss 'literature' even acknowledging the heuristic nature of the model. Stephen Hinds likewise discusses authors as 'helpful to think with'.[75]In this sense an ideal of 'realism' is applied to the ancient world, which sees the Roman world as at least to some degree conforming to models of development and interrogation by modern scholars.[76] The Roman world then is susceptible to our minds, and capable of being grasped by us by interrogating them and sifting their claims by modern standards of scientific investigation.[77] The difference is not as great as it may seem, as the conclusions are not necessarily contested and I feel free to utilize these models in a similar way that they are dismissed by opposing

---

[73] An interesting counter-point here is discussed by Luke Johnson (2001) where he discusses uses of the book in Martial to actually emphasize his current situation, and therefore his material reward he expects now. This is a difference in the tradition of what we call 'Silver Latin poetry' whereas Horace's material references gesture towards possible futures of recompense, not current.

[74] So Feeney (2006) in his review of Habinek's *The World of Roman Song* criticizes it on account of it relying on traditional/mythic accounts of the origins of Latin song. See also as his discussion of Archaic Latin Literature in his review of the Handbuch der Altertumwissenshaft vol. VIII (2005).

[75] Hinds (1998 p. 119). For an alternative view, whereby securing meaning in a certain figure behind the text seems doubtful, see Edmunds (2001).

[76] Feeney's (2006) term at the end of his review of *The World of Roman Song*.

[77] I use the word loosely more in the sense of 'wissenshaft' than the more narrowly defined natural sciences usually denoted by the word 'science' in todays paralance.

traditions of scholarship.[78] In this sense I am not committed to every claim made by individual scholars, but rather I have found them useful to think with.[79]As I analyze and discuss Horace's satiric authorship, I will be utilizing their concepts and ideas on the broader swath of Roman history and writing to inform my own conclusions about what and how Horace was as a satiric poet.

There is another tradition of scholarship upon the author that is Horace. This tradition, which might be construed (uncharitably) as naïve, tends to take the texts as windows into Horace's soul. While they are not in actual fact single-minded in mining the text for social-historical clues, and biographical details, they do tend to use the satires of Horace and the rest as simple textual clues to the world they inhabited.[80] Critics like Rudd and Fraenkel approach Horace's poetry primarily in terms either biographical or aesthetic, at various points discussing what this means for the man Horace, and what this means for our interpretation of the poetry. I do not find this tradition to be useless in my own endeavor. At various points I have found their comments insightful, as my analysis of Horaces' *Sermones* will show; however, they do tend to assume a relatively linear moment between writing and author and reception, so in terms of understanding what authorship actually is, I find their core insights relatively dispensable. A more recent analysis that I see as fitting within this tradition, although at some distance, is Jennifer Ferris-Hill's discussion of the debt that satire has to Old-Comedy.[81] This is not to say that she is not sensitive to the (by now) traditional distinction between persona and author, but rather that she is interested in how the authors marshal and create their poetry in a way that suggests a similar model of poetic creation. [82] She notes that the genre itself is

---

[78] Feeney (2005) p. 230 n. 18 though does contest some of Habinek's claims about the chronology of Roman Song.

[79] Hinds (1998 p.119) makes the same point about authors: that they are useful to think with, even if their theoretical presence is relatively opaque.

[80] Braund (1989 p. 1) has a brief description of the 'biographical fallacy'.

[81] Ferris-Hill (2015)

[82] Ferris-Hill (2015 p. 243) See also, p. 36 where she discusses the incongruity between author and persona.

responsible for some of the anxiety expressed by the poets.[83] So in this she notes that the genre has some control over the poet. This is similar to Freudenburg, where the poet and the influences of generic power influence him, so that the author might exist somewhere in-between genre and the text. Ferris-Hill, is a little more interested in the way that pre-satiric material is deployed in and creates a new genre. Her discussions of the poet as abject, especially Horace, are then relevant to my thesis, but are on a different trajectory, as for her the body of the poet, and the body of the text, are inheritances from Old Comedy.[84] The *artifex* of the text is part of the authors attempt at self-realisation only in so far as it partakes in the older tradition of Old Comedy, Ferris-Hill replaces the body of the poet with an ancient tradition, delineating paths of influence and control through historical moments.

Where can we find a poet?

The final element of Horatian satire that needs discussing is its social location in ancient Rome, as it did not arrive out of nowhere, but was embedded within a society that allowed its existence at a time when perhaps we would not expect to see such a political genre breathe.[85] In this sense then we need to understand how satire could exist within the social structures of its day. I take as representative two key understandings of the relation between poet and patron. The first is Peter White's *Promised Verse* while the second is Phoebe Lowell Bowditch's *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage*.

Peter White discusses patronage, sensitive to concepts of exchange and also as an important element in how the poets were able to acquire fame and status in

---

[83] Ferris-Hill (2015 p. 244)

[84] Ferris-Hill (2015 p. 45) Her use of the word 'abject' is how the poet creates a sub-strata persona: one who exists as an image of the self-confident poet that satire requires. Take for example the figure of a Priapus statue in Horace *sermo* 1.8, where there is a powerful persona created only to be undercut by an only accidentally powerful figure.

[85] The civil war period, in which whole elite families were destroyed surely would not give rise naturally to a genre so traditionally acidic.

society.[86] White considers the poets of Rome to be at a handicap relative to Greek poets in that there were less educative elements pushing for a society of 'song' in Rome.[87]In here I detect an unexamined analysis of 'public' and 'private' societal structures, where the Roman system of patronage fulfilled the job of a 'private' sphere as the communal elements of song and performance were not as established in Rome. This leads White to say: "it is in this sense that the great friend's expectations of his protégé must be recognized as a benefit of the *same order* as material support and publicity," (p. 19, italics mine). In this sense the expectations of the patron are part of what makes possible the poetry of the Augustan poets; the author is then, for White, inspired by the patrons and in fact gravitates towards the patrons. This is - I think - summed up in his conclusion: 'Augustus dominated poetry by dominating public opinion, not by cultivating a literary policy. Poets, like the rest of society, responded to him as a phenomenon without parallel, and the image they created of him was very much a response to him personally.' [88] This conclusion is astounding in the way it relates the poems as almost spontaneous reactions to the man Augustus. The system of patronage can then be boiled down to almost a cult of personality. The influence of this on poetry is enormous, if we follow White's conclusions, and he has an impressive amount of evidence behind him. I am not persuaded totally by his analysis of the reciprocity between poet and patron. Part of his argument is that the poets are themselves part of the *eques* and so by and large financially independent.[89] The fact that satiric poetry largely attempts to deny such luxury should count against it- not because Horace was actually poor, but because representations of poverty make sense as a way of emphasizing the debt to the patron, so that there is something left over after the reciprocity of poem and payment.[90]

---

[86] White, (1993 p. 14 ff.)

[87] White, (1993 p. 19)

[88] White (1993 p. 208)

[89] White (1993 p. 12)

[90] By payment I do not necessarily mean payment of money per poem, or even necessarily fiscal compensation, but status, visibility, fame etc. all come to play a part here.

In his section specifically on satire, White considers how this impacts the writing of satire, as *amicitia* is obviously threatened by too virulent a satiric persona.[91] White notes that the diatribe form gives way to narrative form, and describes the material as defying the author Horace.[92]This is strikingly similar to discussions of satire above where the genre as a form influences the author's (Horace's) content as he struggles to deal with generic expectations. The result is that White sees book two of Horace's satires as essentially toothless satires. He emphasizes the final satire as a satire of essentially manners.[93] Satire is then modified by the magnetic allure of friendship with the patrons, and ultimately Augustus.

On the other side of this is Phoebe Lowell Bowditch's *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage.* Part of Bowditch's overall argument is the conviction, inherited from her more Marxist and ultimately materialist analysis of the patronage relationship, that the system of patronage is an obfuscation of social relations. She views the relationship as not entirely reciprocal, criticizing White in this regard.[94] In actual fact the theory of gift exchange obscures and in turn reveals the lop-sidedness of the relationship, as exchange between two members of different social class are always lopsided and sites of oppression.[95]Bowditch recognizes this when she asks the question "if the gifts of patronage symbolically expropriate the poet's self, obligating him to make the return gift of poetry as the embodied or 'reified' form of his labour, then in what ways and to what degree does the figurative language concerned with this exchange permit resistance to

---

[91] This is similar to Schlegel (2005) as she also considers Horace tries to mollify the bite of satire, Peter White's analysis would add a sharp materialist edge to such a literary judgment as he locates the impetus within the material conditions Horace finds himself in.

[92] White (1993 p. 85)

[93] White (1993 p. 87)

[94] Bowditch (2001 pp. 12-13)

[95] This oppression is not uncovered by hearing the secret talks of Maecenas and Augustus, but structural and determined by class structure and antagonisms rather than personal and calculated. The bibliography on these issues is vast, and I do not wish to engage with it at length. Bowditch very briefly raises this point in p. 13 An almost prosopographical account of these pressures was recently discussed by Adams (2015) in an Honours thesis completed at Canterbury University.

that same patronal discourse?"[96] The lopsidedness, which Bowditch sees in this relationship, is directly related to the kind of 'agency' we can detect in the poetry of Horace.[97] Whereas White sees the poets as almost overcome by the aura of Augustus, Bowditch wishes to see how Horace can be seen in many ways personally responsive to the system he is caught up in. She, however, runs into the problem of subjectivity.[98] The poet is subjectively authorized into existence as an effect of poetry, so that the poetic subject is essentially objectified. The patronage system enforces this system so that the poet is not responsible for his poetry, and later scholars cannot inscribe a direct line from author to poem.[99] The patronage system redefines the gifts of patronage as requiring reciprocity on the part of the poet, not as material compensation for gifts rendered but as a *courtesy* since the discourse of *amicitia* obscures the material nature of the exchange.[100] It is essentially ideology.[101]

My own sympathies then lie with Bowditch, whose analysis of the patron relationship emphasises the use of poetry as attempts at sublimating the self into the gift. The gift is linguistically performed in Horace's poetry through his references to the material nature of his poetry, so that we can see how Horace's poetry functions in society, not just as disembodied censure, blame and critique, but as actual gifts performing the required elements of *amicitia* and providing a *munus* for the material and non-material benefits which Horace received. Bowditch sees this as a movement of reification, analogous to the reification we

---

[96] Bowditch (2001 pp. 3-4) This question is no doubt in part raised by modern scholars as we find ourselves increasingly hemmed in by hostile discourses of 'use' and 'value' whereby academic labour not immediately related to the ostensibly useful and valuable modes of production are questioned, and are our own academic labours in anyway emancipatory? My own opinion is pessimistic on this issue – for now.

[97] Bowditch (2001 p. 11)

[98] Bowditch (2001 p. 16) where she discusses this.

[99] Bowditch (2001 p. 26)

[100] Bowditch (2001 p. 13)

[101] Bowditch (2001 p. 22) where she discusses the difference between 'structure' and 'ideology'.

encounter in a capitalist society of commodity exchange.[102]I am not sure I would see reification on display here, as capitalism as a unique historical moment has more developed class pressures and antagonisms able to give rise to reification. Regardless I take the basic point of Bowditch, and can see this as a useful heuristic.

In a way, White and Bowditch can be represented as an attempt at scholarship from above, as they analyze social structures and how individual authors are caught up into those structures. The other side, represented by Freudenburg, Oliensis et alii come from below, beginning with the text. Although neither is able to exist in isolation, I have favoured, as a methodological approach, a text based approach.

Constructing a Poet

Suzanne Sharland in her work *Horace in Dialogue Bakhtinian Readings in the* Satires considers the 'faces' shown in Horace's *Sermones* to be duplicitous, interestingly adding the idea of 'author' as one of them.[103] She argues the 'author' is a unifying trope, not one that splinters out in contradistinction to the client or the questioner, or any other persona Horace seems to put on. I agree to a point. The idea that the author is a unifying force in 1.1 is in a way self-evident, in the way we always organize works under names and collate them, organize and differentiate them through titles, genres and ultimately persons as the material force underpinning them. It is however my contention that 'Horace' is destabilized by the poetry, not as an historical figure, but as a persona, or face, or 'type' present in the production of poetry through the various voices he includes, excludes and engages with. To this end I have found Sharland's work on dialogue to be useful, as she engages with the various voices that inhabit Horace's *Sermones*. I in fact have found dialogue to be an important element in Horace's

---

[102] Bowditch (2001 p. 16) She is aware of the difference, but does allow the language gift exchange to slip into the language of The Commodity.

[103] Sharland (2009 p. 65)

Sermones, which makes sense given their title as a *sermo*. The primary distinction often noted between Horace's two books is that the second book includes more dialogue, and less direct discourse from Horace.[104]For this reason then, an analysis of the way in which Horace's poetry participates in dialogue is important.

Analyzing dialogue for Sharland involves understanding the dialogic nature of speech. In particular she is interested in the diatribe satires of Book 1 and Book 2. She relies explicitly, but not entirely, on Bakhtin's ideas on dialogism.[105] I do not feel beholden to her theoretical underpinnings in particular, but have found her emphasis on dialogue formative for my own approach. Horace's dialogues help us to consider the idea of an author active throughout Horace's poetry. Horace's poetry dialogues with itself, as the poetry creates a narrative within which the poet can step into and speak out of. The dialogic nature of Horace's poems creates the possibility of a narrative as the poems divulge voices in which we can find the developing body of Horace.

Narrative as a unifying factor in poetry is usually considered to be more useful with poetry in the tradition of epic, tragedy, old comedy, and other more generally 'grand' poetic traditions. In the Augustan age, most poets through a Callimachean aesthetic eschewed longer poems in favour of smaller poems such as Virgil's *Georgics*, the elegiac tradition and, for example, Horace's *Sermones*. These poems have caused some trouble for traditional modes of narrative analysis that have sought to find unity in these poems. Traditionally narrative was thought of as an undergirding biographical narrative through the chronological space which the poet inhabited.[106] So, a narrative of historical setting was grafted in and read through the poetic text. Thus various attempts at

---

[104] Fraenkel (1957 p. 137-138) wonders if Horace had run out of ideas, and perhaps gives tacit approval to the idea that Horace's second book is encroached upon by other voices because the author has exhausted his own resources.

[105] Sharland (2009 p. 51)

[106] So for example Zetzel's (1980) argument around narrative discusses narrative in a relatively passive mode: the narrative is there to discover.

cohering Horace's life story with incidents mentioned in his satires. Scholarship's attention has since changed and the book of satires is considered a more artful artifice than at first supposed.[107] The unity of the text is now considered standard, and the two books have a structure and unity that brings them together; however, it is not the narrative that is supposed to make this unity, it is the arrangement of themes, allusion, and character. So, we can understand in Book two for example that 2.1 is related to 2.5, 2.2 to 2.6 and so on.[108] The idea of a coherent narrative is essentially dead.

Another challenge to the idea of a coherent narrative is in the fact that the texts are compiled with no respect for the time when they were actually composed. The poetic book is not available to us as an autograph of the writer's hand. Our text is only given to us after years of copying, emendation and so on. Zetzel has already discussed the problems that arise when we try to analyze too closely the kind of structures that could exist in Horace's *Sermones*.[109] Zetzel does note that Horace's *Sermones* are read as the scroll is unfolded, and that this constitutes the chronological space that the poems inhabit.[110]Catherine Keane in her investigation of the generic status of satire also notes the power of narrative to establish a generic theory.[111]For Keane the narrative of the text as it is displayed to us, in poem after poem, allows us to understand how the genre is developed and theorized. While my intentions are much more limited to the authorial subjectivity of Horace, I take her point that the poems, as they are portrayed and as they are read, allow a narrative to be constructed in which we might catch the intersecting moments of authorial creation by Horace. The fact that the poems were written at different times then is of no consequence. The chronological time

---

[107] Anderson's stand out essay (2005=1982a) discusses the various developments he witnessed in studying satire at the time, issuing a call to return to studying satirical poetry as *poetry* not simply as one dimensional reflections of what Horace, Lucilius et al. saw around them.

[108] This is an old understanding going back to F. Boll (1913)

[109] Zetzel (1980 pp. 59-58)

[110] Zetzel (1980 p. 63)

[111] Keane (2006 p. 8)

of reading provides the experience in which we can locate the narrative movement of the text.

In a collection of essays published in 2008, a group of scholars discussed the impact the field of narratology can have upon the notoriously fragmentary texts of the elegiac poets.[112] In it the contributors attempted to develop lines of enquiry that could take the illusory genre of elegy at its fragmentary best, and still forge narratives that bound them together. To do this they discussed how narrators, narratees, etc. can hold together texts in the absence of clear ideas around plot, continuity and so on.[113] In one of these essays, Peter Green tied the variegated subjectivities of Ovid together through the various poetic works he wrote, not just in the *Amores*, but through Ovid's entire oeuvre, and how there was a unity in this disunity.[114]While in this thesis I will not be using the formal instruments of narratological enquiry, I will be investigating narrative as the Satires both narrate the poet, and in doing so create the poet himself.[115] This relates to answering the question of an author in Horace's satires. The satires do not reveal an author; they create an author.[116] This author is not a hidden

---

[112] Liveley & Salzman-Mitchell (2008) Fragmentary not in that they are all in literal fragments (although some are, i.e. Gallus, but fragmentary in the way that they portray narrative.)

[113] See especially the introductory essay 'narrating in couplets' Liveley & Salzman-Mitchell (2008 pp. 1-13)

[114]Green (2008 pp. 180-195)

[115] That is going into detail of how texts are focalized, narrated, from what point of view, and so on. I am not engaging with the vast bibliography that includes, as well as the standard concerns of literary criticism, philosophies, politics, and other, diminishingly related, topics for consideration, but will find occasion to make mention of some standard narratological points of concern and/or interest in Horace's *Satires*.

[116] Foucault's comments about his own writing and reception are relevant here: "What, do you imagine that I would take so much trouble and so much pleasure in writing, do you think that I would keep so persistently to my task, if I were not preparing – with a rather shaky hand – a labyrinth into which I can venture, into which I can move my discourse... in which I can lose myself and appear at last to eyes that I will never have to meet again. I am no doubt not the only one who writes in order to have no face. Do not ask who I am and do not ask me to remain the same: leave it to our bureaucrats and our police to see that our papers are in order. At least spare us their morality when we write." (1972 p. 17)

element of the text, waiting to be revealed around the next corner, He is developed and enfleshed by the text itself.

I hope to show how narrative can help us comprehend and grasp the author of Horace's *Satires*, in particular the trace of an author that is left to us, a satiric author. Through this picture of the author I hope to weave we can see how Horace's poetry, through its complex system of censure and praise, hints at audiences and listeners, and even over-readers, creating an embodied figure, that gestures towards an author. The final line of Horace's first book of satires is almost as good as any to start as he orders his slave to go and write (*subscribere*) the final line of his book of poems (*Libellus*). The open-endedness of this command, the way in which the subjectivity of Horace, meant to stop here, continues in the body of the slave, encourages us, I think, to continue to think with the author of Horace, to gather the variegated elements of his body in the poem.[117]In this sense narrative no longer fills a passive role in analysis, as an element of a poem to be discovered, but is actually a part of the apparatus deployed to uncover the subjectivities of the poet, as they lie, disparate throughout the text. Thus the proclaimed 'death of the author' is true, but not entirely. [118] His body has been hidden in the graveyard of his own texts, and if I may repurpose Horace's own words of Ennius:

> *Invenias etiam disiecti membra poetae* (*Sermo* 1.4. 62)

> You would discover still, having been dissected, the limbs of a poet.

Horace may have passed on from this world, but every text and *nugae* left by our garrulous satirist is like a gravestone waiting to give up the parts of Horace which delineate for us the body of an author.

---

[117] Gowers (2003) acknowledges these elements of Horace's poetry, although does not specifically utilize narrative as a tool to tie these two things together. On p. 87 she also notes this aspect of Horace's poetry in the final verses of *sermo* 10.

[118]Barthes (1967)

Sermones Book 1: Finding a Voice

In the *Oxford Handbook of Roman Studies* Kathleen McCarthy deals with Roman Satire under the title of 'First Person Poetry', explaining that it is a form that privileges the transgressive speech of an 'ego' or persona.[119] In contrast to McCarthy I suggest that there are traces of dialogue in Horace's first book of satires. Although it is a complete book in itself, and has no obviously dialogic element, interlocutors abound in small sections. This can be compared to Book 2, which I will deal with in the next chapter. The first book starts itself referencing the fact that there is an audience. This fact has been well explored, as the audience is interrogated to understand how Horace fitted his idea of speech in with the prevailing moods and manners of his time.[120] I think that the audience could be fruitfully considered as participants in the construction of Horace's first book. They could then perhaps be considered welcome, or unwelcome, co-creators of the first book of the *Sermones*. Here I will develop my argument from the beginning of the book, and argue that Horace's text is slowly but surely interpolated by other voices, voices that contribute to the whole picture of Horace's poetic text. The interpolation is part of the narrative as it helps co-create the poet, Horace.

Sermo 1.1

Horace begins by an invocation of one of his recurring characters, Maecenas. Maecenas is asked why people try to go beyond their own stations. The question, which is rhetorical and places Horace as a philosophical inquisitor, is a way of introducing the dialogic nature of Horace's *Sermones.* The question also suggests the epistolary nature of satire, and allows the possibility of dialogue. Horace has framed his diatribe as existing in a chain of reciprocity. The hint of dialogue then betrays an important relation between Horace's writing and the text. The text

---

[119] McCarthy (2010. p.438) Although she nuances this description, it remains a marker, and I think she is right to use it.

[120] McNeill (2001) who uses a model of concentric circles to discuss audiences.

exists it seems at the behest of Horace; however, the question at the beginning of the text represents the client-patron relationship, as the answer to the question is probed, but not answered by Horace. Maecenas, presumably, knows the answer. Maecenas is, however, silent for the rest of the poem and remains an ambiguous *tu* which Emily Gowers lays out in her commentary, discussing the nature of Maecenas as a listener.[121] Horace here portrays the excessiveness of his relationship with Maecenas: there is something left over after the exchange of book and gift, as Bowditch discussed.[122] Horace is still in the debt of Maecenas and the poem portrays that in Maecenas' silence. Horace then has to end the poem. Horace even discusses this as the limits of roles in society end up being the limits of his poetry.[123] Structurally, by verse 108 we are reminded of the beginning. The verb *redeo* exploits the idea of a *sermo* as a journey, but also reminds us that Maecenas is the audience.[124] As the author revisits his own introduction, this time without Maecenas' authorizing voice, he performs the limits of his own monologic voice. Maecenas' generosity is of Horace's *finis,* his natural end and limit in life. He cannot go beyond the name, and the name limits the poet's, and thereby the poem's, ability to go on. And very quickly Horace finishes the poem with a swift "*verbum non amplius addam"* (121) he will not add another word. On the one hand, it's a fine example of adherence to Hellenistic, and thereby Callimachean, aesthetics. Delimiting the poem, keeping it thin is of course essential.

At the same time, however, it is also allowing Horace the opportunity to comment on the various pressures upon his own writing. First is the moral

---

[121] Gowers (2012. p. 59-63)

[122] Bowditch (2001 pp. 3 ff.)

[123] *finis*, while a stoic element of Horace's poetry, as it teaches the student to know his lot in life, also is how Horace ends the first half of his first book of satires, that is in *S.* 1.5.108 where the final line is the end (*finis)* of a poem and a journey.

[124] Bond (2009 p. 133) discusses Horace's politics under the title of 'journey'. We are all implicitly aware that our own thought, feelings, prejudices etc. are not static moments quantifiable or meaningful as excised moments to analyze: but are only comprehensible as chronologically contextualized events.

writing of various philosophers, of whom the scholiasts considered Crispinus among. The fact that Crispinus is called *lippus* contributes to the idea of the materiality of writing (1.120). Scribes leaning over their scrolls would develop bleary eyes. Horace mentions his fear of seeming like a moralist in the most material terms possible. Crispinus' physical disability, later to be applied to Horace in his *Sermones* is a feared outcome for Horace, himself a writer. Presumably the fear of being seen as a moralist is then conflated with the fear of having a deformed body. Horace is also concerned with originality in this section, Horace needs to seem as though he is saying something new. In this way, stopping writing is better than continuing writing. Horace's Callimachean aesthetics conflate with his own attempt to create authority through his text in a satirical, but not strictly moral manner. Horace cannot seem too moral also because Maecenas is the addressee of this poem. Maecenas is then a shared authority in the poem. It is Maecenas' name that contributes to Horace's compositional ability, both allowing it and limiting it. Maecenas' presence then serves as a figure of dialogue Horace has to navigate before he can consider himself as having authority over his own text.

Sermo 1.2

The second satire is a little different. Other points of view are criticized and dissected by Horace, as he enjoys relative freedom in criticizing the sexual appetites of his contemporaries. This poem is about conflict. The larger conflict between chastity and fidelity, a more idealistic conflict, but ultimately it is about what is a good affair. The other teachings he is opposing are predictably extreme: *nil medium est*, (2.28) either leading to extreme prudishness or license. The various figures we encounter in this satire are all, it seems, perfectly under the thumb of the author. A certain moral air of indignation is held over named individuals. This is strikingly different from the first *Sermo*, where general titles are preferred. A sailor is satisfyingly non-descriptive so as to avoid general outrage. In this poem, however, Horace lets his teeth out only to insert himself in

the poem. His own example serves as the butt at the end of a long joke. Commentators have wondered what the moral point of this diatribe poem is, if it has any. The point seems to me to be more towards laughter, as the satire ends with a story about Horace's own sexual exploits. The ending is heavily laden with innuendo, as well intertextual references to Catullus and Callimachus. Harrison considers the Callimachean reference to be an enriching quality, rather than a parodic quality.[125] I myself do not find this persuasive, as the parody works especially well here. The erotic imagery of poetry is subsumed within another genre not so much to enrich the genre (how exactly is satire enriched by making fun of another genre?) but rather to give the satire another voice. This is part of the dialogic nature of the *Sermo* in question. The *Sermo* incorporates other genres, however they remain there in an un-conformed manner as the poetry does not completely subsume another genre, but rather develops another voice in polyphony to what is expected. The question of 'form' then is challenged by the inclusion of other voices as the text itself challenges that traditional confluence of form and content. While above I discussed how for Freudenburg the author is always pushing at the edges of form, I think here we can see how Horace uses form to obscure content. The extra form of epigrammatic elegy that is brought in devolves the poem into laughter, in order to defer questions of moral offensiveness, as *Sermo* 1 avoided it by citing Crispinus and moral philosophy, so here he avoids it by citing and thereby obscuring the poetry. *Sermo* 2 is then building upon the *sermo* as it brings satire *as a genre* into dialogue with other genres.[126]

The poem comes to a final crescendo as it places the qualities of erotic poetry in the mouth of an inept lover, as opposed to the simple lover of Horace himself. The ineffectiveness of the genre of epigrammatic love poetry, considered in Catullus is exposed as ineffective against the moralizing, but humorous *Sermo*.

---

[125] Harrison (2007 p. 95-96)

[126] Conte (1994 pp. 54 ff.) describes the ways in which Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* relates to his earlier oeuvre and challenges and reshapes the genre of Elegy. Horace is not doing the same thing, but he is bringing the genres into conversation, into dialogue, and so I see Conte's approach as instructive.

The author here enters into dialogue with peripheral teachings, only to find a simpler persona in himself. While different from *Sermo* 1, I think it still represents the modus we can expect from Horace so far. He is a simple man, conditioned by the tides of philosophies around him, a true *farrago*; however, he finds some stability in the middle of his poem, as he centers it around his own body. The dialogue of his poem is between the body of himself, the simple girl, and the bodies of these other more complex girls. Perhaps there is a subtle dig at other genres as the easy girl is described as being all feet, and is to be measured by the eyes, all erotic staples of love poetry in the Roman world, as the feet of a poem and the eyes which draw them together are elements of the elegiac oeuvre. The author is a master of them, but has to go through them to get to the simple love he desires. This satire light-heartedly makes fun of the author himself.[127] At the same time though, the other genres in which Horace composes almost co-write his satires allowing him to interrupt his *Sermo's* form with other forms. Generic enrichment should rather be cast as generic confusion, as the poetry displaces traditional expectations through a dialogue of forms.

Sermo 1.3

The Third satire is the final diatribe satire in the set and perhaps the one with the strongest 'ego' within it. The ego delineates the possibility of friendship throughout this poem, engaging with multiple personalities around him. Various other speakers introduce their voices, challenging and questioning Horace's precept that in order to be fair, one must note the faults of others around in a kind manner, in a way that considers them in a manner relative to their severity. Here there is a polemic against Stoic severity, a dialogue hardly to be considered 'trace' as the title suggests. But still there are other voices on the margins, suggesting that Horace is engaged in various other struggles as he writes this poem.

---

[127] Sharland (2010 pp. 129-130)

While discussing the possibility of self-censure Horace says that self-censure involves an ointment, something remarkable physical (v. 25). An eye daubed with ointment is applied to one's self, while an eye as sharp as an eagle is applied to the other (*amicus*). The suggestion is that satire, for Horace, is mostly an exercise in learning to clean the eyes of your own self when applied to yourself, but to apply ointment when looking at others. Cucchiarelli claims that satire exists between the contested grounds of poetry and experience.[128] In this sense then the experience of satire becomes the experience that Horace is forced to draw upon. His polemics with the Stoics, who are overly harsh, viewing *amicitia* as insufficient grounds for indulgence, represent the ability of the satirist himself. After all, in an ideal world of satirical possibilities, the satirist is free to lampoon even the closest friend. But in the 'real world', the patron is in charge, and *amicitia* is as much a disabling as enabling factor. Bowditch's work here is relevant. She notes that there is no complete reciprocity. The patron-client relationship, while codified as *amicitia* always leaves something left over.[129] In this case Horace owes something to Maecenas. We can see this satire as fulfilling the dialogues that were started in the first two satires, as the possibility of speech is countered initially by the fear of appearing too moralizing, then avoided by generic conflict, and now limited by the relationship between patron and client. In this way the persona of Horace is challenged and shaped as he navigates the freedom grasped by a satirist, and at the same time stymies the freedom he supposedly has.

Suzanne Sharland has asked the question whether this satire represents an anti-diatribe. As if to bookmark the diatribe satires, Horace has almost undercut his evolving creation.[130] The question Sharland asks is a good one, and perhaps can help to push it even further. If diatribe is the usual mode of satire, and if the *amicus* Horace is addressing is the Patron, Maecenas, then the satire itself represents an attempt to navigate the rocky seas between genre and experience,

---

[128] Cucchiarelli. (2001 p. 9)

[129] Bowditch (2001 p.160) details some of the lop-sidedness of the relationship.

[130] Sharland (2010 p. 157 ff.)

and indeed poetry and experience. This is because the external conditions of poetry writing can be seen, within the poetry itself, to be impacting, distorting and twisting the poetry into new forms. The *amicitia* Horace enjoys with Maecenas becomes the condition for real satire. He is indirectly asking Maecenas to be lenient towards him, setting the grounds possible for real satire, while in doing so creating the new satire that will eventually characterize the rest of book one.

The diatribe against the Stoics is important as they are wheeled out as the indirect target of Horace's diatribe, an extreme example one can safely criticize, and thereby plead for the space possible to create satire safely. Horace needs this in a way because satire, as Kathleen McCarthy noted, involves transgressive speech, but in a Stoic universe of innate morals and inborn senses, satire would only ever be rebellion and the realm of fools (*stultorum).* Instead Horace provides us with a realm of convention or custom, in which satire is able to flourish. Satire is then possible within a space of contention: Horace as an author develops it in dialogue with other philosophical schools, as he pits Epicurean thought and Stoic thought against one another.[131]

Dialogue in this poem then represents the possibility of satire, and the author is really in an attempt to control the possibility of dialogue within his poetry, and in doing so to assert himself fully within his poetry. The author is then in conflict with the other voices, even as he ingratiates himself with Maecenas, he is also trying to use flattery to divert attention away from the core of any particular satirical point. The author's voice is directed from the beginning of 1.1 towards Maecenas. The questions asked of Maecenas, and answered by Horace, work as a way of highlighting a particular form of satire. That form in these three poems is the form of diatribe. Sharland's point about these being 'anti-diatribe' is -I think-better utilized as a way of understanding how Horace manipulates form in order to take attention away from content. If we, as readers, strip away the flattery, and the way in which Maecenas enters the poems from the margins, we get three poems that very directly critique and attack society. Horace's speech is curtailed

---

[131] Sharland (2010. p. 85)

by digressions that discuss the *kind* of satire he is writing, and also emphasize that Horace is not the only one writing.[132] Where Oliensis discusses the possibility of an over-reader, I see an over-writer.[133]

In a way, satire up until here in the *Sermones* is a way of discovering the possibility of censure in new ways beyond just invective. Horace has attempted to do something that goes beyond writing the poetry of blame, but is trying to mould the poetry through a strategy of deception. Speech, or even better, song, as it is told, performed and repeated, builds on the strength of association with a mythic past.[134]Here, however, we see how Horace moves the strength of satire from beyond its invective form.[135]The form of invective is supplanted by other voices, as invective does not work in dialogue, invective works in one strong monologue where interlocutors are targets. Horace, however, is unable to extend himself into his poetry in this way. The material forces around him, which engulf him, have at various points overwritten his subjectivity. So these three poems have flagged the possible authorial elements at play. Horace has engaged with his most obvious external pressure, that of his patron. He next turns to another pressure that arises from the form of his genre itself, that of Lucilius.

<u>Sermo 1.4</u>

---

[132] N.B. for me this is not a philological claim, but literary. Horace is the only writer (or his amanuensis is), but my claim is that Horace is not the imprint of a direct authorial decision, but the navigation of possible decisions and worlds.

[133] Oliensis (1998 pp. 6-7)

[134] Habinek (2005b p. 4) Habinek's discussion of the ritualization of speech into song is relevant, as invective involves a rich history of blame, non-generic, but here codified to become something more.

[135] Elliott (1966) discusses satire as the development out of invective forms of poetry, and the power of speech. I am not beholden to all of his ideas, but the basic idea is I think correct: Horace's speech gains its power from this association, and if there is not a genetic/familial connection, there could be at least a polemical one.

The fourth satire begins a novel section in the narrative of the *Sermones*. The mild invective is replaced mostly with self-reflection and a poem revealing the *modus* Horace will follow. It takes the form of a confession, as well as setting up an *agon* with Crispinus. The elements of dialogue in this *sermo* are clear. An external standard and generic history is imposed upon Horace. It is important to note the way in which Horace slides from Lucilius' poetic genealogy into the contemporary challenges he faces. The disavowal of poetic prowess by Horace is understood in the paucity of his verbiage. It is not just that the poetic author cannot write much, but it is also that he is not clever. Notably, in this context the gifts are of the gods. Horace attributes his meager abilities as far-sighted gifts from the deities.[136] The verb '*facere*' is used to represent the ability of the poet to fashion himself.[137] At the same time it speaks to the limitations of Horace's *persona*. While this limitation is ascribed to the gods, it is almost as if Horace's speech is ascribed to the limits set by his patron.[138]This would be confluent with the way in which Horace is limited by his friendship with Maecenas in the earlier *Sermones.* Horace, however, attempts to work it to his advantage. His rare and infrequent speech is pressed out of the text to take the edge off of the very real attack that is to follow. In this then, the fashioning implied by *facere* is also about the way in which Horace fashions his own reception, and considers the possibilities of control over his own poetry. Horace's mastery is impinged by external factors, and in *Sermones* 1 through 3 he never quite moves beyond the impact of his patron. But here he is able to utilize the limits of his speech to create a space for himself to create a new satiric *persona*.

---

[136] I take it that Horace's admission in 1.4.17-18, is meant to be a 'thank you', as his patron and the new order of Augustus have made him able to avoid such competitions with Crispinus and others.

[137] Gowers (2012. P.158) also notes this quality and relates it to the persona fashioned in 1.8, the Priapus statue.

[138] It reminds one also of the anecdote preserved in Suetonius' *Vita Horati* that Horace called him a *purissimum penem*. While chronologically distant, it does reflect the idea that Horace's poetry is in the pocket of the elites.

This, however, is all to point out that there is difference between him and Lucilius, the other pressure upon Horace's authorial voice. He notes that Lucilius is wholly dependent on a genealogy leading back to old comedy (1.4.1-7). Horace instead draws a line from his poetry, on the one hand, to the gods/patrons on the other. Is it secretly then a one-upmanship? Lucilius may have been a great writer, and Crispinus as well claims to such a heritage of verbosity, but Horace, while unwitty and slow, can say with confidence that he has the gifts of the gods/patrons. Therefore we see how Horace draws a line from his standard mode of living to his poetry. The gods/patron did not fashion a poet out of Horace. A simpler man was fashioned, slow to speak. He is the kind of character framed in the previous satires, knowing his *finis*, and his poetry claims to follow such a life: simple, unadorned poetic stuttering.[139] The idea of *libertas* so prominent in Freudenburg's understanding of Horace's satire, is seen here as well. It is also recast not as a struggle, but rather that the generic and political pressures are not just pressures upon Horace, but they are utilized by Horace to co-create his poetry.

The poem then has a change of tone as it discusses finer points of poetry and satire's place within what can be considered 'poetry'. The discussion is not unprecedented in Roman satire, as there are fragments of Lucilius which likewise discuss the nature of poetry. What is interesting, however, is the very material nature of the discussion here, whereas Lucilius sticks with Greek words such as *poema* and *poesis*.[140] Horace instead discusses the process of writing on *tabula* and on *charta*. The material nature of his own writing is emphasized at the expense of the actual skill, or technical terms given to it. The idea of etching words on a tabula creates the idea of a new written satire, one which emphasizes

---

[139] These are also reflective of Callimachean aesthetics, and the accusation by Horace of Lucilius' muddy river (v. 11). To reduce these to aesthetic proclamations would be to submit to the idea that these satires have given up the realm of actual bite, and are not able to engage in the world critically.

[140] Schlegel (2010) Discusses these relations in this article. On p. 259 in particular she hints at the possibilities of these fragments relating, although she counsels caution based on the fragmentary evidence of Lucilius.

the reflective properties of Horace's poetry. Horace is not a poet like Lucilius, he is cast off their list by his own admission, and begins his discussions of technical poetic terms on the basis of material production, rather than their definition in the literary world. In this sense Horace is a new poet of a new age. His creations are distinct from Lucilius' not just in quantity, but also in quality.

The poem then continues as Horace discusses what is and is not poetry, but in his standard manner, never settles upon an answer. As he continues he defends himself against the charge of being too savage in his satire. His defense is one of silence; he never pushes satire too forcibly out into the world, preferring to recite it only to friends, and only when pressured. He jostles his papers only during leisure (*otium)* and in this way his poetry is not a job but a way of pleasantly passing the time. It is something he enjoys, and nothing like what this poem started as, as a defense against those who would attack a satirist. If anything, Horace's writing practice is here cast as quite different from the way people imagine it. He is not somebody in a contest, (although emphatically he is) and his writing is on paper. Nothing as permanent and judge-worthy as the *tabula* he is challenged to write on by Crispinus. The sense in this poem is that Horace removes the works he is creating from the collective works of the Hellenic and Latin traditions he is ostensibly participating in. Throughout the whole poem there is a process of marginalization. That is to say Horace is of meager talent, he is not a poet, and he only recites for close friends. Horace only writes as a game, not as a discipline. He is not composing, merely dabbling. In fact, in the city of Rome he is normal, he is a part of the crowd that will attack those who stand out, who go beyond the *finis* prescribed to them.[141] The point seems ultimately to be that Horace is a quiet, unambitious diary writer. The dialogue in this poem is then hinted at in various movements: between him and the aggressive interlocutors whom Horace then amusingly places on their own heads. The accusers charge Horace with being too aggressive, but Horace in turn considers himself just a standard Roman man, who writes life lessons in his diary, small morality tales, and nothing serious so as to avoid any vice. This then

---

[141] I.e. his first poem in 1.1

correlates with his accusers who are cast as overly aggressive and ironically, as the ones going beyond the norm, not part of the great throng that make up Rome.

The dialogue in this poem is a dialogue of conversion. At the end of the satire, Horace has positioned the production of his own poetry as a quintessentially private event, made public by an angry mob, which then is only the crowd by virtue of a loud voice not reality. The reality is everybody who is a truly Roman citizen does satire, it is what is taught by your father and is passed on to you as a moral code. The dialogue is punctuated by references to Horace's own work as a material reality, scribblings on pages (*chartae*), censuring others (*illeverit chartae*) and also that his *anima* and *charta* are identical is expounded in vv. 101-102. The consistency of heart and language is obviously Stoic in effect, but also has poetic and authorial implications. Horace's material poetry is the result of a practice of 'orthography' the aligning of one's soul with one's poetry. In this sense the material nature of the poetry is rightly emphasized at the expense of its ethereal consumption within a poetic tradition. The idea of this poetry as 'song' is then challenged by its removal from the traditions that make poetry powerful. Horace has resituated his poetry by utilizing the shape of his own body and material conditions. Horace's body is correctly aligned with the principals of the world, and so his poetry is as well. In this sense the poetry is meant to be the result of a direct line between Horace and the page. We, however, also know that Horace's *persona* is the body that we are discussing. Horace's poetry has created for us, through this development of his narrative, an elision between his body and the form of satire. Horace's body becomes an analogue for his poetry, but more specifically for the form of satire.

Interlude

So far the structure of Book 1 is more than triadic. Traditionally 1.4 is seen as a programmatic poem, placed after a trio of 'diatribe' satires. This satire, though, does not shrink from diatribe, and the dialogic elements are as strong here as they are in the previous satires, if not stronger. They are, however, more subtle. In 1.4 Horace relies on the power of satire to change names. In 1.1 he warned the

audience that if they change the name of Tantalus to themselves, then the satire still applies (1.1.68). In 1.4 he actually utilizes this power on the *turba.* That is to say: the *turba* who are afraid and have accused him, have had the tables turned, are in fact the very ones doing the accusing, and criticizing of Horace. His *persona* is simply behaving as an educated Roman, one of many, so that the crowd, by the end of the satire is divested of its majority status and instead the poem is about crowd, not about his own poetry. The crowd are the 'poets'. Poets who are not formally part of any poetic tradition, discounted by the fact they are simple private men, but now they are in the majority. They have the power to change the names in songs to be about those who accuse them.[142] The ability to change names, and to create a new majority is part of what Horace gives himself in this poem. Schlegel considers it a strictly illogical syllogism, however, the narrative force seems to me to lead us to consider Horace's argument not on an axis of the logical or the illogical, but on the ability to use poetry in a certain way. [143] Horace's poetic narrative then allows him to become part of the dialogue himself, as his pages are written not just by himself, but by the crowd of poets around him, that is the society that make poetry possible. The triflings on his page (*illudo chartis* 139) are part of a larger dialogue, and now there is an ambiguous other, referred to only as somebody who will not tolerate his poetry (*cui si concedere nolis* 140) who is singled out from the crowd in the way that Horace was singled out at the beginning of the *sermo*. Horace is now a part of the crowd, the *multa poetarum manus* (1.4.141). The final usage of the author is to create a poem which utilizes the crowd, and uses their own education, and expectations, to become a larger body for Horace, corporeally related to them by their description as *manus*: the hands representing the possibility of externalizing and exerting one's own authority in the world.[144]

---

[142] Schlegel (2005 p. 48)

[143] Schlegel (2005 p. 43) considers it a 'cheerfully illogical argument' which she sees Horace abandoning by v. 63-64

[144] Schlegel (2005 pp. 47-48) also considers this conversion of the crowd of mockers to a crowd of poets, all trained by their fathers to be real roman men, who cast out iniquity from amongst themselves. She, however, does not go as far to suggest that the poets/turba take a corporeal form as I have done here.

<u>Sermo 1.5</u>

This satire is the culmination of the previous four satires. Told in an entirely biographical and first person point of view, it seems to admit no dialogue within it. A closer examination will, I think, reveal elements of dialogue. The satire has, first and foremost, a strong narrative. A clear beginning middle and end are delineated, and there is even a trajectory. In this poem, various scholars have discovered the programmatic edge in which Horace encodes his satiric poetry. For an apparently innocuous satire, this may seem surprising. What looks like in many ways to be a light-hearted tale of adventure and misfortune, sharply ending upon some navel-gazing, has, we are to believe, a serious satiric punch. I think the case for this can be strengthened if we consider the poem as the first one to use an oblique dialogue form, which relates Horace into his poetry and then back to his own persona. Up until this poem the dialogue has engaged with external interlocutors and previous literary experiments, but here Horace begins the more serious dialogue of self-censure. This dialogue occurs through the restructuring of satiric poetics as the poetry of Horace's body, rather than the poetry of politics. This picks up on the narrative that was left off at the end of *sermo* 1.4.

The poem itself is simply expressed through a ring structure, beginning with Rome, and ending at Brundisium. While the cities punctuate the text, suggesting travel, time and distance, the text itself is filled with intimations of Horace's own persona. The narrative follows a mostly solitary Horace until his meeting with Maecenas and company (30). The section of solitary travel, apart from his companion Heliodorous, contains the only other speech. Interestingly, Horace records the sayings of boatmen and slaves. Neither is significant; however, the conflict between the two parties delays Horace's arrival. What is interesting is the speech he preserves. The speech, while not in dialogue with Horace, represents Horace's engagement with the world around him. The recorded shouts give an air of realism within Horace's poem, suggesting an interest in material events around him. This expectation is, however, a farce. The material events that occur around Horace are not building up towards anything

significant, rather they are beginning of the poetics of censure, as Horace attends to menial details rather than the serious ones occurring around him.

As the poem progresses Horace pays less and less attention to his external surroundings. The trip to Brundisium, ostensibly about Maecenas and Augustus' dealings with Marc Antony, and the treaty at Brundisium, is obscured behind self-deprecating comments. Horace becomes the bumbling fool, obscuring every image of political importance. While Oliensis considers this a fulfillment of ethical promises in earlier satires, I consider it more as an aesthetic consideration, revealing not deliberate self-censureship per se, but rather the inability of Horace's new form/body to completely encompass an activity as important as the treaty of Brundisium. [145]Instead of the weighty political gathering, the poem begins to focus on Horace's activities. These mundane and mostly boring activities are almost reminiscent of a child's recollection of an important event in a parent's life. The main details are obscured in favour of details regarding trifles and mere fancies. Horace discusses putting on make up on his eyes, his incontinent stomach, his failed romances and the mock epic put on by Sarmentius and Messius. Horace is not of course an innocent child, but rather is a hyper self-aware adult, having fought in the civil wars, even against Augustus. Horace deliberately obscures facts behind his body. His body then continues to be an analogue for the poetic form Horace has been unfolding.

The key text here is in the self-blinding by Horace. At the point where Maecenas and his entourage appear, Horace covers his eyes with black ointment. The application of this is encoded within his poetry as a fundamentally satiric application. The verb is *illinere* and is the same verb as applying satiric attacks

---

[145] Oliensis, (1998 pp. 27-28) The question of the fictional nature of this satire has some bearing on the discussion. Oliensis considers the level of detail to be indicative of a real event, whereas I consider the level of detail to be primarily poetic, and aesthetic. This does not of course make the story necessarily fictional, but I think does make us consider the poetic effect of such details. They are not disinterested re-tellings, Horace is not bound to an historian's code of conduct (if even such a thing could be imagined to exist). Rather they are discursively activated as signifiers, not revealers, of historical reality.

on the page (*charta*) in 1.4.36. In this way the body of Horace, the very thing obscuring our view of the political events happening around him, becomes the page upon which Horace writes his satiric scribblings. The page is then impacted upon, and so the journey becomes the journey of satire more than the journey of Horace. As Horace applies the ointment to his bleary eyes, he is actually self-satirizing. This gesture reminds us that we are still in the realm of satire, but the question becomes, who is the target? The answer is Horace himself.

For this reason, I think, Oliensis' argument that this satire shows a Horace who follows his own aesthetic precepts, is not quite right. The satire is not one which champions Horace but makes light of his own poetry, the form of which seems unsuitable for containing the full weight of the political actions contained therein. The irony is of course the epic form that the satire sustains. The hexameter of the poetry beats to the war drums, which Horace was no stranger to, and yet the only conflict contained is a farce. The mock epic, the invocation of the muses, and the brawl are all elements of epic being made fun of. While Horace deliberately opposes his poetry to Ennius' national epic in 1.4, here he makes fun of it. In doing so Horace is pushing his poetry ironically to its limits. He can contain this fight, but no others. Schlegel in her reading of this satire also considers it to be a farce, but hints at the larger context.[146] The context of real epic, of the making and shaping of new worlds, is present in the satire, but is shunted out in favour of this trifle, this jocular fight.

The Final sentence of this poem brings home the Horatian poetics:

> *Brundisium longae finis chartaeque viaeque est*

> Brundisium is the end of a long page and a long journey. (1.5.104)

---

[146] Schlegel (2005. p. 69)

Horace identifies the trip and the page as one thing. While this does not make the poem necessarily ahistorical, it does suggest that Horace sees it primarily as something *written*. The poem literally hit the bottom of the page (*charta)* and thus ended. As the page ends the artificial nature of the poem ends, the materiality of the poem then in turn coincides with the body of Horace. Horace as a figure, transposed between the reader/listener and the main events, is then further emphasized by the material nature of the page itself. There are then two pages, the body of Horace and the sheets of paper upon which it is written. The sheet is the page upon which the satiric scribbles are smeared (*illinere)* and the body of Horace upon which black ointment for a bleary eyed poet are also smeared (*illinere* v. 31). The eyes of the poet, Horace, are then also the eyes of the reader, as satire always engages with the audience as is pointed out in 1.4. The readers eyes are obscured to what is happening in the poem by the super-positioning of the body over the text. Horace *becomes* the form of satire in this instance. We are blinded also by the blinding of the eyes of Horace, blinded to the reality that goes on behind his body, a body unable to be pierced by our eyes. The author stands in between the reader and the content of the text via the materiality of his poetry, mediating our vision of reality by the corporeality of his poetry.

The dialogue, which Horace uses within this poem, is then the dialogue between Horace and the blank page. We actually get an insight into Horace's writing process, not in an over-the-shoulder way, but in how he views his poetry's impact. As Horace writes this poem, whether he is recording history or not, he is attempting to write himself into the corridors and back-alleys of history. History itself as a genre is never encoded into Horace's literary genre, but it is, as it were, a back door. If, as Cucciarelli says, satire exists in the contested area between poetry and experience, and if we extend those terms to mean creation and event, then Horace's satiric program has created a moment where Horace controls the readers' eyes, exerting his authorial *persona* in a way to look beyond their natural expectations of epic events and history making moments to Horace's

body.[147] The eyes of Horace have become the eyes of the reader. Horace has warned his audience already in his satires, with a bleary eyed Crispinus (1.1.120) as somebody unable to read, and then as a morally blind observer of feminine beauty (1.2.91) and then as somebody who is unable to see their own sins because their eyes are rheumy (*lippus*) (1.3.25). In this *sermo* (1.5) the eyes become the way in which Horace redirects our vision towards himself. The material concerns of the poem then can be seen as attempts at grounding the dialogue of Horace's poetic output in his own body. This is an attempt to assert mastery over a tradition that always threatens to transcend human bodies.[148]

I have deliberately avoided thus far discussing the fact that Lucilius is the hidden poetic inspiration behind this poem. The *Iter Siculum* written by Lucilius but sadly lost to history, was supposedly a model according to Porphyrio. The tradition which Horace asserts mastery over, passed on by that scion of free speech, Lucilius, is a difficult one, and the last comment about the long *charta* suggests some of Horace's challenges. It is almost undoubtedly shorter than Lucilius' muddy river, and yet confesses its own length, as a self-deprecating form of *aemulatio*. Horace, in his attempt to create a poem to rival Lucilius' but with his own Horatian flair, has instead come to the end and noted the difficulty of the venture. The *longa charta* reflects the *longa via,* not in that it is exceedingly long, but in the same way that it was, in our vision anyway, an arduous road, that for Horace took too long and was filled with pain, interruption and failure, rather than sublime poetic experience. In this way then, the contest with Lucilius reveals the poet as somebody striving with tradition, and reflecting upon that struggle in the process. At the same time, the *charta* upon which Horace is writing is then equated with the physical journey the poem offers to reveal. The page and Horace's body are elided in the last sentence, and so in this sense this

---

[147] Cucciarelli (2001 p.9)

[148] Plautus' *Pseudolos* portrays the clever slave as being 'scribbled all over' *stilis me totum usque ulmeis conscribito* (Plautus, *Pseud.* 546) The body of the slave represents the possibility of punishment of a poet (especially these early, non-roman poets), see Sciarrino (2011 p. 66) The entrapment of writing within the text also functions, to my mind, as a way of containing the text within the poem, not allowing it's generic history/translation to overcome the work of an author.

poem is a properly programmatic poem. Without exposition this poem delivers a class in Horatian aesthetics while also explaining the context, history and direction of his poetry. The reason for this is that there is a conscious attempt to elide the poetry with Horace's own personality within the form of his body. Horace's page and body are the same so that one can say that the poem is Horace and Horace is the poem.

The genre of satire is entered into by means of a discussion of its past, present and future in a narrative driven mode, as Horace negotiates its previous pitfalls and advantages. These negotiations are then redirected into the new Horatian poetic narrative and expressed with only an oblique reference to the material it is written on: the *charta* of both the book it is on, and the body it is scrawled over.

Sermo 1.6

This Satire at first glance seems to be an odd fit. The book got off the ground with 1.5 and seemed to be going on a more poetic and exploratory (both aesthetically, and physically) trajectory. This satire slows that down. The poem does this with its opening line "*Non quia, Maecenas*…" (1.6.1). This is clearly reminiscent of the opening line of 1.1, and even the point about Maecenas' land is encapsulated using the word '*finis*' reminiscent of the injunction to remain within nature's limits in 1.1.50, and also recapitulating the ending of the previous satire (1.5) as it ends at the end of the page. Apparently, the scroll continues to unfold. The restart though seems to require a new understanding of Horace's *persona*, and so we get an autobiographical poem, ostensibly addressed to Maecenas. This poem paints a man at ease, slow and plodding.[149]

 As the poem picks up, it directs the reader towards Horace's own childhood, the reason he has acquired the position he has today. Here the traditional concern with operating according to one's lot (the *finis*) is raised as Horace defends the

---

[149] Freudenburg (2001 p. 58)

place he has attained within Maecenas' circle. Oliensis argues for a face-saving motif, as Horace defends his position in a traditional mode, as self-effacing.[150]I agree to a point, however, I would also push that the poem is converting a poetic defense into an ethical one.[151] This seems to be the position of Emily Gowers in her commentary.[152] It performs a similar operation we are already familiar with from 1.4. There the criticism of the person was turned into an exercise in aesthetics. In this satire, however, the opposite operation is performed, and an exercise in aesthetics becomes a defense of Horace's person. The reason is perhaps that the criticism comes from the crowd, and he is trying to balance their perceived response with his argument in 1.4, that argument being more about poetry. Here though, he is attempting to defend the man, but in that attempt, where criticism of poetry became criticism of ethics, criticism of ethics in 1.6 becomes criticism of poetry.

His own body, already discussed in the earlier *sermones* as an analogue for Horace's own poetry, becomes here again, the page upon which Horace can express his own writing. In vv. 45 ff. where Horace discusses the reasons for his favour with Maecenas, he ends up claiming his character to be the critical factor. Of course, the poetic connection is the obvious one to draw, as one expects Horace to have been chosen for artistic merit, rather than certain character traits. Initially his argument goes in that direction as Vergil is invoked as the originator of his success with Maecenas - presumably a poet's reference for a poet's work; however, instead we get a shining character study of himself. Although, as Gowers has noted, this section is only available as the work on earlier satires is expressed upon his body so that Horace is the product of earlier satirical polishing. [153] Horace's self-censorship is the cause of his own near-pristine body. The contrast with the sickly and frail body in 1.5 is stark, there is

---

[150] Oliensis (1998 pp. 30-37)

[151] Muecke (1979 p. 58) notes the performance of this slippage in 1.4 in the opposite direction, as Horace relates literary principles towards ethical ones. That Horace does both suggests to me that the author is aware of the way in which his form is shaping the reception of the content.

[152] Gowers, (2012 pp. 217-218)

[153] Gowers, (2012 p.217- 218)

perhaps a suggestion that this is why this poem is placed after 1.5. It presents a change in tack for Horace, as he expresses himself before his identity as an author was known. The narrative of this is unclear though, as 1.5 definitely takes place after his patronage with Maecenas, and this section is a memory of pre-patronage Horace. He is not an author at this stage, he is just a man, a simple banking clerk, and so the idea that his body now presents the idealized version of somebody who is impacted by the diatribic nature of his satire is somewhat problematic. The other possibility, though, is to render his entire satiric work as truly that fatherly care which Horace depicts it as in 1.4.[154] Therefore his whole satiric body of work and the impact it has upon people can be characterized as the care with which his father gave him as he grew up. The poem then presents a well brought up characteralready with the elements of satire (Horatian Satire that is) written onto himself. [155] While I think Gowers is correct to see this representation of his body as the impact of satire on one's person, I think we can go further and see that Horace in that same moment that he characterizes satire in his own body, also characterizes satire *by* his own body. In this way we can see how he casts his writing as yet again, not the works of an *ingenium* but as the result of a certain upbringing, and a certain class. His works are not then transcendent, hanging over world in generic suspension, but arise from the world, and stay within that world. They do not participate in the code of satire, as Horace has defined his poetry not as the result of the *inventor*, Lucilius, but as the education brought on by his father.[156]

This idea is supported, to my mind, by the closing of the satire. As Horace winds down his evening he does what he pleases, expressing the liberty of a man, not in the same way as Lucilius, but somebody unencumbered by the responsibilities of

---

[154] Obviously this is a poetic fiction, but it makes the narrative of the text flow, as we see the author impacted by the education of a roman son, and then see the diatribe satires as the result of that education, not a description of them.

[155] This is obvious from the poem, but the point I am making is stronger, rather that as well as the obvious argument Horace makes, there is a subtle undertone which subverts all his own poetry into something 'less-than-poetry'

[156] Schlegel (2005 pp. 51 ff.) discusses the relationship between on the one hand the education of Horace by his father, and on the other hand, his 'education' by his generic father, Lucilius.

the elite or the worries of the crowd. Of course, he emphasizes the freedom of his lack of ambition, not the freedom he experiences from the patronage provided by Maecenas, but in this small portrayal, his writings are regarded as the things he pleases himself with at the end of the day. These are not the writings of somebody trying to achieve something in the same way as an Epic or Elegiac poet, but of somebody simply recording their quotidian trifles. Horace's authorship is a product of his *modus vitae* and not the other way around. His father is invoked at the end as a nice bookmark. He is happy with what his father gave him in life, as he does not have to while away his life in the senate, or on the *cursus honorum*, but instead can spend his life in private leisure. The future poetry however will begin to complicate such leisure.[157]

This poem represents an etiology for Horace, an explanation of all hitherto writing practices. The poem, while not programmatic in the same way as 1.5, does try to cross the bridge between experience and poetic genius. The dialogue between the two poles of poetic creation as expressed by Horace is a way to navigate the poles of poetic authorship available to him. While there is the possibility of creating poetry from the inborn talent of a wondrous mind (1.4.43), there is the possibility of creating poetry tempered by the experience of a man, not a poet. In this sense though, Horace bridges them by making the point that his poetic lifestyle is the result of an inborn proclivity to relaxation rather than struggle. His ancestors were not *quastors.* (1.6.130-131). So he has inherited his lot in life, his *finis.* This has allowed a poetic output like satire. He also relates it to his own 'experience' as he describes his writing as trifles (*quod me tacitum iuvet* 1.6.123) so that here we can see how Horace's poetry is the result of both inborn social location, but also his temperament and lifestyle. Horace's poetic output is always explained between these two elements, as interruptions and tangents, and also as the result of the education of Horace. Keane argues that the idea of the education of the author is part of the construction of the satiric

---

[157] Oliensis (1998 pp.35-37). Her connection of this poem to 1.9 is apt, but perhaps rushes past the concrete organization of the book in favour of thematic unity; a valid goal, but perhaps not in line with the same satiric plodding which Horace develops.

genre.[158]I agree with her assessment that the descriptions are generic, and not autobiographical in an historical sense; however, I also see it as building up more than a generic picture. The autobiography is not exhausted within the form of satire. The educational vignettes contribute to the construction of Horace's body. Horace's educational history, while it may or may not reflect any reality, pushes Horace's body out of the text, placing it in front of us, to avert our eyes from the text. Through the development of Horace's body, his body has obscured the content of the poetry. I think it is no coincidence that this has happened as we move away from the original diatribe satires. The dialogic elements of Horace's satires have become more insular, and external interlocutors are ignored in favour of Horace's private compositional impulses.

Sermo 1.7

Oftentimes 1.7 is placed as a chronologically earlier composition of Horace. The events in the poem are definitely 'earlier' than any other events in his satires, and it may well be that it was composed at that time, although, once again, the events recalled are signifiers of historical reality, not revealers. To get bogged down in figuring out its meaning based upon its supposed composition time (almost like a time of death) is to me wrong-headed, and ignores the material relation of the poem, so well explained by Zetzel.[159]

In this sense the fact that a properly dialogic poem enters here, having previously been eschewed in favour of one voice, and only hints and whispers of other voices previously, is a little surprising. The narrative is introduced through the eyes of a blind poet, introduced as a narrator, but not the only narrator as the sole surviving witness might claim to be, but as one amongst many: in this way Horace becomes a common man, one of the *vulgus*.[160]A curious position for a poet, but then Horace has already struck off his own name from such an illustrious role. The poet is then one of the many. The poem introduces the two

---

[158] Keane (2002)

[159] Zetzel (1980)

[160] lippus, not blind but visually impaired, as Crispinus is described in 1.1

litigants, and here many have seen an analogy with Lucilius.[161] Lucilius' speech is then counter imposed upon two characters full of invective and form, rather than the measured *persona* we have encountered in Horace. I think there are elements of this in the poem. Lucilius is definitely present here in a controlled manner. As I mentioned above, the poem is introduced via an explicit narrator, identified with the satirist who wrote 1.5 as *lippus*, as well as the one who considers his own sins in 1.3. The *lippus* is ultimately unreliable, and so there is a hint perhaps at a lie, at an artificial nature to this poem. For this reason in particular, I would be hesitant to consider its conception as in the camp of Brutus.

A true dialogue in form is introduced. It remains, however, in form only. The characters are introduced, even though, in classic Horatian style, a small interjection becomes a prolonged comparison, and a gesture towards Homer is made. By the time the characters are properly introduced, the opportunity for a proper discussion is over, and all that is left is a quick overview as the poem rushes towards its pun and closure. The speed at which it is over is Lucilian, not Horatian, as the poem instead of ambling across, makes a short stab at invective and is quickly over. The end of the satire is of course the joke at the end, and perhaps here there is a hint at the failures of invective. Politically of course, one could see Brutus as ending the possibility of the satire, and even of dialogue, as his person is a gesture at tyrannicide, and punishment.[162] Schlegel considers the lack of editing (a pun on *securus)* as a function of the poem, as the two men argue but instead of acting Brutus listens. But here I think Brutus' past actions and the action he represents already are evident to the listeners. They know their argument lives on borrowed time, as the possibility of death is real, and Perseus just happens to be the first character to use it.[163] But the dialogue does have a short-lived experience, and in that moment Horace's opportunities to impart himself are evident.

---

[161] Schlegel (2005 p.83).

[162] The end of the Tarquinii and the assassination of Caesar are lurking in the background as context for this poem. See Gowers (2012 p.)

[163] Schlegel (2005 pp. 86-88)

The hexameter of Satire is the first and foremost element in this poem, one I have not seen too much comment upon.[164]It is actually an apt meter as the whole poem is epic in mock-form. The mention of Achilles and Hector, as well as the possibility of an *impar pugna,* the effect is similar in 1.5 where the battle of two clowns is mocked with an invocation to the Muses. Here, however, the material nature of the invocation is played out: Horace mentions that it is heard not by those with a line to the gods, but by the crowd, by those in the traditional gossip mills of Rome. The comparison with the epic does more than just make fun of it, it also unveils the nature of Horace's poetic writing. It makes his poetry, in a way, the poetry of poverty. Poverty here not necessarily of one in poor material circumstance, but of one shut out from the power halls of Roman living. Those who are not on the *cursus honorum*, but are rather the ones who overhear the tales of the powerful through bawdy tales in taverns. Horace's scribbles are then encoded within a novel attempt at poetry as the experience of 'everyman.' Horace's satires here begin to take full form. Up until now there has been a clearing away of the traditional tropes of poetry: the Muses, the tradition, and the fame of reception. These are replaced with in turn: the *chartae*, the private readings amongst friends, and now the hints and whispers of others, and his own bleary-eye-witness testimony. The hexameter then, as I have said, is the first and foremost element of this poem, because it is the first time in Horace's satire that the full possibilities of a mock epic are realized. The characters' speech is admitted into the hallowed realms of epic speech, only to be torn back down by the fact that they barely talk, and are only reported, and then ultimately have to refer to Brutus, entirely silent, for arbitration. The loftiness of Achilles' speech in book 9 of *The Iliad*, or Aeneas' retelling of the horrors of war in book 2 of *The Aeneid* are nearly imitated, but not quite. [165] Of course, if a barber were to start

---

[164] One (possible) exception: Henderson's (1994, p. 146) mentions of 'Hexameter scribble' a reference I am tempted to treat as a throw-away comment on the one hand, and on the other as a potentially gnomic utterance, worthy of further mining.

[165] Interestingly Horace actually doesn't mention Aeneas' epic-in writing, whether Vergil has yet to embark on the project, or he is keeping mum about it is impossible to say, but I like to think it

quoting Odysseus to his clients, the feeling of incongruity would no doubt crowd out the room, and so in the end the content fits the *satirization* of the form.[166]

Freudenburg eschews dealing with this satire at length in his *'Satires of Rome'* and perhaps that is ultimately the fate that the critics have left to this small poem.[167] Rudd wonders if it even deserves a seat at the table[168]while Fraenkel admires its neatness, but also struggles with it as a poem.[169] It has been 'reduced' to a literary critical comment, and a poem on method for Horace, but I feel that is a little unnecessary, for I see it instead as an implication of literary critical concerns already expressed. [170] This *sermo* is not something reducible to mere mechanics, but exists as an epiphenomenon of them. The poem then fulfills a very important function, as a bridge between the concerns of the previous poems, and the ones to come. This seems to be in spite of the various puzzlements of other scholars, puzzlements I do not share. The poem clearly fits within a 10 poem schema, and most of the concerns arise because of its setting: it is set in a time before which we feel comfortable talking about Horace, in the days he was in the Republican army. I think we can dispense with that concern by realizing that Horace's inspiration is a little less immediate than this. Horace is capable of reflecting upon events, as all humans are, and turning them into poems months later. He is also capable of inventing them wholesale if he needs to. To assume that Horace wrote this immediately, or to equivocate upon the setting of the poem is to not realize that the power of poets is greater than our autobiographical concerns, even more, the power of the *form* a poetic book can take.[171]

is the result of *amicitia* that Vergil remains a pure and near angelic figure throughout Horace's satire.

[166] Petronius' *Cena* likewise participates in this, as the mistelling of the *Odyssey* (get reference) represents the incongruity between certain types of poetry in certain social locations.

[167] Freudenburg (2001) it is lumped in at p. 24 with 1.8 and 1.9, both which receive longer treatments latter in the book, but is barely considered alongside them: indicative of his method?

[168] Rudd (1982 p. 68)

[169] Fraenkel (1957 p. 118)

[170] Van Rooy (1971)

[171] See for example Horace's own comments on the power of poets in *Ars Poetica* v. 10.

To come to a conclusion on the meaning of such a poem is difficult, because as I discussed above, this poem does much to set the agenda and to reveal a lowly Horace writing poetry sanctioned, even created by, the *vulgus*. The poem also undercuts the very possibility of it in the end with the gesture towards the abilities of Brutus. All poetry has a Brutus, somebody with the power to cut it off, and to make all dialogue meaningless. The mistake here is to elide those concerns with political censure in the age of Augustus.[172] Horace is not going for a satiric attack on the conditions he is living in, or if he is, he is equally likely to be doing the opposite simultaneously. Horace's poetic output is not the result of a *persona against* the power of the principate, after all Horace is as pessimistic of the abilities of the Republican assassination of Caesar. Violence still ensued.[173]

Sermo 1.8

Sermo 1.8 is an interesting dialogue. In the same way as 1.7 it has an introduction which points towards Horace, and away at the same time. I have discussed the various ways in which Horace's voice is filtered through his engagement with his social structure and also through his engagement with the writing process, but here we understand a different *persona*.[174] This poem shows Horace conversant still with other models of Poetic creation. He creates a poem in the tradition of *Priapic* invective, but takes the position of a *faber* within that poem. A *faber*, a lowly craftsman writes this poem, and in fact materially constructs it (*facio*) as a way to express his wishes in the field.[175] Here the statue takes over and begins with a description of his job: chasing away birds and thieves. Then we get a description of the place, interestingly a plot of land given to Maecenas, which is

---

[172] See Kennedy (1997 p. 26 ff). His mediations on poetry, propaganda and the frames within which we imagine them are I think relevant to any easy pro-or anti-Augustan reading.

[173] Schlegel (2005 p.89)

[174] i.e. his *amcitia* the *vulgus* etc.

[175] C.F. Horace's characterisation of a *faber* in the *Ars* vv. 32 ff: described as *imus* and incapable of being a true poet.

about to be turned into a park.[176]Where previously a grave stood, now part of Augustus' renewal project has begun to reclaim it.[177]The side-glance at the forming empire is a recurring theme from 1.5, and mildly from 1.6 and seems to suggest an attempt by Horace at focalizing his own point of view on the whole civil war and the period of peace afterwards from a squinted eye.[178]

This Priapus statue is another chance at dialogue for Horace, as he puts on the mask of at first the *faber*, and then the statue himself. The Statue initially seems to represent a Lucilian model. Priapus statues represent sexual virility and potency, and most importantly free speech. They are a model of male expression.[179]They do, however, present a problem for satirists, writing an admittedly lower form of poetry, and Richlin details the way in which Lucilius' poetry deals with the possible attacks on his own poetry as effeminate, or not properly masculine in the way that his patrons, the Scipiones, were.[180] Horace likewise has to deal with the same issue. In attempting to put on a Priapic *persona*, Horace is engaging with a history of negotiating the power of the genre he is writing in. Lucilius' modus was classically satiric, and full of invective, as he used the voice to assume a stance powerful enough to exert himself in the world.

Horace, however, flips the priapic potential on its head. The statue threatens with his oversized phallus, and mentions his own prowess only to completely undermine his own authority. The appearance of witches who he is unable to frighten off by his presence, show the apparent weakness of Horatian satire. The witches, named Canidia, an important name for later on in Book 2, and the elder Sagana, are claimed to represent, by Schlegel, an invective form of satire, and an

---

[176] Schlegel (2005 p. 93)

[177] I.e. Augustus' reported last words by Cassius Dio that he found Rome a city of clay, and left it to the Roman people a city of marble (*Hist. Rom.* 56.30.3).

[178] While the statue's reliability is less in question than the *lippus* of 1.7, a priapic statue's reliability is related to its meta-generic resonances, rather than its place within the *sermo* itself.

[179] See Richlin (1983)

[180] Richlin (1983 pp. 164-174)

old-women-form.[181]There is much to commend about this reading, and I think it is right. She is not the only one to have noticed it, and Henderson as well takes this satire as a staging of masculinity verses femininity.[182] Anderson considers this poem programmatic for the soft voice of Horace's new satiric program. [183] The witches -I think- complicate the poem in a different direction, as they represent the possibility of Horace's dialogue with the past. They have entered into the park, not to enjoy the fruits of a new world created by Augustus and safe guarded by his poets, but in order to extract the previous world from under it. Reading bones, and practicing witchcraft, both un-Horatian, are practiced right before him, and seem to hark back to a previous life, a life before the stability that the Augustan Principate claimed to have ushered in.[184] The dialogue then that occurs is between the new Horace, the client of Maecenas, fulfilling his role as protector of the new order. Once again, political realism, and the difficulties to account for the valences of Horace's speech should prevent us from rushing into this piece as an apologia for the Empire, or the alternative. Still, the political image is raised up for us. Like Horace, the Priapic statue, frets about how he is to deal with these intruders from the past, who now represent both the civil war, and possibly a generic history of Lucilian invective. Horace reveals his own impotency in the face of the shifting nature of the world around him, and creates a poem of classic Horatian suddenness. The poem is not ended by any of the mechanisms the poem supplies it with. The invective of priapic literature is mute, the *faber* is absent from the poem, and the words of the poet are silent. Instead an unexpected sound issues from the anal cavity of Priapus/Horace, and frightens off the old world in a gale of laughter.

Is this then a poem of success? It would seem that way, as the satiric program of Horace succeeds where the program of Lucilius failed, and yet at the same time there is a touch of failure, as the cost of the success is great. Horace/Priapus stands with a gaping hole in his arse. Pathic tendencies are decidedly not

---

[181] Schlegel (2005 p.98 ff.)

[182] Henderson (1989 p. 185-186)

[183] Anderson (1982 pp. 81-82)

[184] The famous *Ode* (1.11) contains its own form of warning against Babylonian numerology.

masculine, and are not the tendencies of a proper author. He exhibits control over his form, and leads one end to another, not pulling surprises out of his arse, so to speak.[185] The dialogue of Horace is muted yet again through the sound of something unexpected, and creates a dialogue of flatulence. *Ridentem dicere verum* has been replaced with *Ridentem displodere verum*.

To conclude that Horace has either expressed discontent with the future, or vehement opposition to the past would be too much. Horace has told the truth, but seems keenly aware of the nature of that truth and refuses to say it. He instead farts, and in a way the future then was ushered in, not with fine words and a poetic homage, but through the most basic of sounds a human can make. The author is then once again the bleary-eyed (*Lippus*) man, standing on the edge of events, influencing them by accident rather than on purpose. It is in a way, a more powerful statement than 1.5, where the poet stands completely sidelined from the action, but at the same time it still shows a certain impotency. Horace scared off two old women who are revealed to be nothing more than that, as their hair falls off as they run away. The Priapic statue is victorious in a minor skirmish, by accident. None of these events bear any importance. The author is standing to the sideline, the possibility of power represented by the figure of Priapus is nullified by the presence of Horatian aesthetics. The possibility of a new *persona* is then not the promise of more invective, but the criticism of it.[186]

<u>Sermo 1.9</u>

This popular satire is the last in a trio traditionally tied together by their narrative drive and their thematic unity; however, this is the first of the three to reintroduce the author as a character himself. Horace sets the scene: he wanders along the *Sacra Via*, and describes an ideal day in the life of Horace. We have already heard about this in 1.6.122 ff. In this way it is a good sequel to 1.6 as

---

[185] Poetic guidelines in the *Ars Poetica* can be used as an interesting foil in this regard.

[186] Schlegel (2005 pp. 90-107) makes the same point in her chapter on this poem.

Fairclough suggests in his introduction. [187]It begins a simple stroll for Horace as he muses over some *nugae*. The word *nugae* appears here in the satires for the first time. It strikes me as exactly the word Horace wants to use for his own literary output. While it has been described as something of an afterthought (i.e. 1.4 and 1.6), and also as just scribbling on a page (1.5), so *nugae* could quite comfortably characterize Horace's production. What we have then is an interruption not just in Horace's day, but an interruption in Horace's writing process. The mystification of literary production as the result of an inborn genius is here unveiled and revealed to be little more than the result of a wandering figure, as a custom, not a gift. [188]What is interesting is that the interruption, often cast as something that interrupted Horace on his usual daily constitutional, is actually more: it interrupts his poetry. Consequently I categorize 1.9 not as a poem in continuity with the previous two poems, but actually as in intrusion into the space of the work. As we read it, we anticipate another complete narrative, just like 1.7 and 1.8, but instead we encounter Horace meandering through the streets. The introduction of the interrupting person, identified by some as Lucilius, is then an interpolation into the book of satires by a new figure who represents a foreign body to the satires.[189] The possibility of dialogue is enormous, and the poem is set to perhaps stage an agonistic contest, one which Horace has turned down repeatedly already, as in 1.4 with Crispinus, but instead Horace keeps silent.[190]The reader is left to endure an interruption in their expected programming to come to terms with somebody who has interrupted the possibility of another humorous trifle resulting from Horace's *otium*. The dialogue is muted, and Horace engages variously with different deflationary techniques to avoid having to deal with this pest.

His dialogue is one of avoidance, and the author is implicated within this avoidance. Many have considered Horace to be a paragon of virtue in his

---

[187] Fairclough (1926)

[188] i.e. Horace's description of a proper poet in 1.4.43-44, A definite result of *mos* not *dos.*

[189] See Ferriss-Hill (2011)

[190] Gowers (2012 p. 283) cites this as a sort of triumph for Horace.

patience, and yet this is hardly the case.[191]Horace is interrupted and he comes off as elite, utilizing all the tricks of an elite personage in this passage. His poetry, the material poetry of satire, one of empathy, is absent. The interruption of a sane figure, Fuscus, reminds him of what he wrote in 1.3 about the value of generosity and patience.[192] So, while the poem creates a model for dialogue, the intrusion of another voice into the monologue of book one, it also functions as a censure of dialogue. When read this way one can see it as an example of Horatian satire at its fullest. It is an example of what Horace was taught from his father as a note-taking exercise. I mean this in the fully Horatian sense of *notare.* His usual writing routine is interrupted, and Horace himself becomes the satiric example. He is the one who is unable to act cordially and generously to the outsider, and to extend the hand of *amicitia* given to him by Maecenas.[193]The author then becomes somebody we are not meant to emulate but rather to employ as a cautionary example. Within a poem (*charta*) Horace is meant to write about those whose behavior is worthy of censure, and yet here his only possible form of censure is against himself.[194] The dialogue form is then not an opportunity to put forward an even more satiric *persona*, or develop his genre into new areas, but is actually almost a regression for Horace. This is -I think- a more productive way of reading the satire than Oliensis, who considers the poem to be something that nudges Horace out of silence and into satiric speech.[195] My view is that satiric consideration is better encapsulated, for Horace, by *nugae* rather than the *clamor* with which this satire ends. When the intruder says he is learned (*sumus docti* v.7) the implication Horace expects is that the intruder will be silent and circumspect. Instead the intruder is about loudness and the rudeness of city

---

[191]I.e. Fraenkel (1957) As Gowers (2012 p. 281) has pointed out in her commentary

[192] Gowers (2012 pp. 281-282)

[193] Gowers (2012) makes a similar point, as the poem is a great example of 'change the name and the poem is about you'

[194] Not that Horace uses the word in this poem, but rather as poetry is considered in the satiric vocabulary favoured by the satiric Horace.

[195] Oliensis (1998 pp. 36-37)

living. The properly Horatian satiric author should spend his time *meditans*.[196] His friends know this full well, and the arrival of Fuscus proves this as he politely avoids the encounter through religious observance, knowing that Horace cannot join him due to his own lack of extreme religious observance.

The poem ends on a well worn note, as Horace compares his relief to that of a man from an epic poem surviving the onslaught of an inspired enemy, i.e. the escape of Hector from Patroklos and the eventual rescue of Hector's body from Achilles. The salvation of Horace from Apollo is apt, as the god is also the friend of poets. However the rescue reveals something about Horatian *sermo* that has not yet been made obvious. Dialogue is difficult for Horace's poetry as it impinges upon his ability to write. The poet's voice has been effectively filtered through external pressures, the pressures that the pest represents, and even the pressures that his friend represents who reminds him of his own ethical imperatives. The invocation of Apollo at the end is a reminder more of the poet's helplessness in this situation than an expression of divine providence.

Interlude 2

These three satires form up as mirror opposites of the first three diatribe *sermones*.[197] Structurally though, they seem like an odd fit. Whereas earlier I discussed how the dialogic form of the three diatribe satires are supplemented and taken over by the more introspective Horace of 1.4 through to 1.6, we might expect then perhaps an intensification of this brooding Horace, a self-involved Horace. How then do these three satires fit into the narrative of Horace's body? As Horace's body has obscured content through its magnification into a hypertextual element, the narrative has centered on the author's *persona*, easily

---

[196] Undertones of Epicurus are hidden here, although Freudenburg (2001 p. 64) takes it too far in my opinion when he considers this as some sort of absent-minded poet wandering into unknown realms. This is classic Horace, the place of the poet is ultimately within the city, and Horace knows this full well.

[197] Zetzel (1980 p. 67)

determinable from the various voices present in each satire.[198] In these three satires (1.7-1.9) the voice of the satirist is only obliquely hidden from site until we reach 1.9. I think this anomaly can showcase the usefulness of the narrative driven analysis I am using. As Horace's body extends itself beyond the text and into the reader's view, at the expense of the satirical content, the author needs to work out how to extend himself further. These satires then perform the hiddenness of the author, as the author deliberately now obscures himself from the view of the reader, but slowly reveals himself through his poetry towards 1.9 when the body of Horace is again in view. To account for this I read the narrative of hiddenness as a response to the fact that Horace avoids either enthusiastically endorsing his current regime, or criticizing it. Horace's body is then conspicuous by its absence. This is the power of the poet. Horace's authorizing voice is absent, and yet is still as loud as ever as he utilizes his own silence to make us guess about the relation between himself and the views in the poem. Once again the form of the poems contributes more than the content as the voices are obscured. The final poem in the set, 1.9, brings Horace into the poetry again only to criticize himself.[199]The body of the poet cannot tell us the political leanings. It is a properly *lippus* body. While maybe scrubbed clean in 1.6, it is still obscuring as much as it reveals, and the narrative arc of these three poems highlights these developments.

Sermo 1.10

This final *sermo* is an important one. As the reader unwinds the book, he or she reads the final response by Horace to his critics. The response seems to tackle the main contention Horace has had throughout his satires, that of his competition with Lucilius. In a way it reveals the whole book as a staged contest *cum* dialogue with Lucilius' satires. Unsurprisingly then, standard Horatian poetic terms are used, with *charta* coming back in the first verse to stand in for

---

[198] See Sciarrino (2015) for a discussion of hypertextuality.

[199] Schlegel (2005 p.126) also notes the way in which Horace is vulnerable to his own criticisms of the interlocutor.

his poetry, and also applied to Lucilius, as well as the question of laughter and what makes a poem *poetry.* Interestingly the idea of *poemata* is brought up, and here there seems to be some indication of Lucilian aesthetics coming in, as Lucilius also discussed what makes certain creations poetry, or a part of poetry.[200] Horace is quick to delineate proper conditions for poetry, considering mimes to be something else. The adjective *pulcher* is a little strange here as until now no poetry has been described by Horace as *pulcher*. Good poetry is described in more generic terms, and usually uses a Callimachean register. Indeed, Horace does this by the end of the poem. Here, however, Horace's discussion pushes against *mimus* as a genre worth considering. He has already discussed himself as not worthy of being considered a poet, and here more technical terms are discussed in order for a creation to be considered 'poetry'. In here I detect a criticism of 'reader-response' theory *avant le lettre* as the response of laughter is not enough to make something worth considering within a generic framework. There needs to be, as it were, *objective* conditions for Horace to fulfill in his framework of poetry. There needs to be *brevitas* and a style both *tristis et iocosus*. The dialogue of Horace's satire contains conversations around generic requirements within satire. Horace's own production is then examined via the foil of Lucilius' completed poetry. The various accusations from 1.4 are reexamined and detailed in 1.10. Once again the crowd appears, this time as a *turba*, and are here preferred for the few (*paucus)*. Readership is a huge deal for Horace, and it is in a way the manner in which Horace controls the dialogue throughout the *Sermones* as he attempts to navigate the various pressures exerted when an author starts writing. In this way the rest of the poem follows through to delimit the possibilities of dialogue. He himself engages in poetic discussion, criticizing both his poetic forerunner Lucilius, and other contemporaries, only to then shut out those who are criticizing him in vv. 78 ff. He only allows the inner circle, named as a kind of appeal to power, to criticize his poetry.

---

[200] Lucilius Fragment 401 ff. (Warmington)

Finally at this point the beginning of a self-assessment of his poetry materializes. Whereas before Horace did not consider his own works to be poetry, he here considers them to be verses worthy of being criticized by the likes of Virgil, Varius, Maecenas, and even Octavian. Horace names an inner circle striking in the way it places Horace in a position of power, and also in the way it cuts off those who would try to claim some authority over Horace's poetic output. In 1.4 and earlier, Horace had tried to avoid the satire of the world by striking his name from the list of poets worthy of the name, but here he includes himself within a select circle.[201] The author is then considered within a communal paradigm, as someone who creates within a highly reified context of fellow poets and learned men. Poetic creation is then considered something done not within an empire wide, or even citywide scope, but rather within a circle of intimate fellows. The dialogue of Horace's poetry is then curtailed and sharpened to include only the select readers and listeners, hinted at in 1.4. The named interlocutors function then as co-authors, not in the sense of literally writing the poetry, but being the ones worthy of convincing Horace to turn the pencil to erase verses. (1.10.72-75)

The poem leads us even further and reminds us that even this seemingly grounded model of poetic creation for friends is a lie. The final verse mentions the other listener, an even more important author, than Virgil *et alii*:

> *I, puer, atque meo citus haec subscribe libello.*

> Go, boy, and quickly write this in my little book. (1.10.92)

The interruption of the poem, as an order, undercuts and underwrites all the previous appeals to authority in 1.10, and indeed in the whole book. To unroll a scroll, be impressed by the bumbling figure Horace produces in the poetry, only to finish with a reference to a slave, is startling, as startling as the end of 1.5. Where in 1.5 we might have expected the treaty to have finished it, we instead

---

[201] Kilpatrick (1986) discusses the theme of friendship in Horace's First book of Epistles. *Amicitia,* is never far from Horace's mind.

had a reference to the page on which an unexciting journey was written on. In the final page of invective which Horace uses to defend himself and criticize his poetic rivals, the material substance of the book is brought in, but this time also the material mechanism by which the poem is written: a slave.

This suggests a material aesthetic I have already mentioned above which Horace uses again and again to ground his poetry. His poetry, as a creation, is not actually just the result of an echo chamber under Maecenas' patronage; it is in fact the result of a one on one moment between Horace and his slaves, and the material he is writing upon. The tradition that Virgil, Varius and others represent, of utilizing Greek and Hellenistic models is shifted aside to a material poetry, dealing in concrete materials. There also is a sense of poverty. The slave boy is the man to put the last touches on a poem. He is the smoothing pumice and the final pencil to touch the page, and the book, and so the lowest member of society is the one to finish Horace's poetry.

The final point seems to be a conflation of literary and social criticism. Oliensis and Freudenburg both find the final lines to be ironic undercutting of Horace's non-presumptuous *persona*.[202] I have already noted this element to Horace's listing of important names, and I think this element is definitely there. For Oliensis this is an attempt to mask Horace's own face behind a larger face, a social face, one that does not rely on the vicissitudes of poetic taste, but on the stability of social capital and protection. There is more. I do not think the final line quoted above (v 92) is an afterthought, or cheeky wink at the author, but instead an inclusive element that incorporates production of poetry within the social structure Horace seeks to both create and inhabit. The final line then can be read as a moment of self-creation for Horace, as it both reflects the creation of the book, and creates it. It is a powerful speech act, in a way quite different from Virgil's "*arma virumque cano…*"[203](Virgil, *Aeneid,* 1.1). Horace says at the end of

---

[202] Oliensis (1998 pp 40-41) and Freudenburg, (2001 pp.39-41).

[203] Lowrie (2009 pp.1-2) Her discussion of the generic and poetic power presented here is similar to how I understand Horace's material poetic creations.

the poem: I am embedded deeply within a social structure I helped create, but also one which is written on a literal page, written in a book, created by a slave. A slave is as important a tool for his own self-promotion. The *puer* rounds of the book, and in fact is revealed to be the author of the book *in toto.* Horace then distances his book from previous poetic creations, it is not just a novel Roman genre, it is something more than that. It defies genre in the way it reaches down from the heights of epic, elegy, or lyric and pulls itself up by way of a freed-man's son and a slave's stylus. The material book is a creation Horace inspired through a slave, and in doing so created himself through the means available to him, afforded by the social circle he invoked earlier and the boy who now listens to every word he says. The dialogue of Horace's first Book of satires is a new production for the imperial age, reflecting a poetic poverty typified by the material grounds it is built on, and the poet who inscribes them.[204]

The End of Book 1

Book 1 ends the same way in which it began: with a gesture away from the author. While *Sermo* 1 begins by asking Maecenas a question, locating authority outside the poet, *Sermo* 10 ends with the slave. The dialogic voice that I have argued is present, even in what is usually considered a primarily monologic book. The poem is not limited by Horace's voice, but incorporates and is even incorporated by, other peoples' views. The narrative, from Maecenas to the slave, closes the book in a place of doubt. While 1.10 lists a number of important names (1.10.81-90), it does not end with their expressed approval, even if it is assumed. Rather, a slave who then announces his own existence by including the most recent command to him appends this list to Horace's poetry. Horace's poetry is only as powerful as his voice is able to command the obedience of a slave.

---

[204] The *Puer* is described as engaged in *subscribere.* This verb definitely means Horace's *persona* has overridden the slave, but still at the end of the day Horace is trusting a slave, not himself.

Oliensis argues this book closes with an acquired 'face'.[205] Horace builds up his reputation, and so the narrative is of the *persona* of Horace being selected by his circle of friends. There is an element of this; however, I would argue that this final disavowal of poetic authority in the figure of the slave should soften this conclusion somewhat. Horace's satires do not just create a voice for a monologic voice, but point out that poetry exists dialogically, and Horace's voice is filtered and directed through the various parts of society that he is embedded within.

In a slightly different direction, Schlegel considers book one to be the attempt to dampen the threatening speech of satire, as Horace is uncomfortable with it.[206]So the final part of Book 1 is apt as the slave finishes off the book. There is nothing threatening in a cheeky slave writing the command of his master. Schlegel does not account for narrative development in Horace's body, and so while she sees the manipulation of form in Horace's work, she does not see this as an attempt to develop his own poetic voice or body, but as the attempt to disavow one.[207]

I see Horace's body here as being expressed through the slave in 1.10.92. With this attempt though, Horace's narrative concludes with a competing body entering into the field of view of the reader. So, the narrative of Horace's poetry at the end of Book 1 is not the failure of his poetry to avoid threat, contra Schlegel, nor is it the development of a 'face' to which he can show the world, contra Oliensis. Rather it is the development of the form manipulating Horace, as he uses his body to hold the poetry together. The inclusion of the slave's body helps to signify this narrative arc as it suggests the possibility of dialogue, and leaves open the possibility of more dialogue. This is -I think- the suitable end of Book 1, as it creates an author who has been in every way impinged by other voices, but in its last moment manages to utilize one other voice to finish his book.[208]

---

[205] Oliensis (1998 p. 41)

[206] Schlegel (2005 p. 18)

[207] Schlegel (2005 p. 18)

[208] The use of a slave is not unproblematic for Horace, however, in contemporary reception for Horace, people would see it as a sign of control.

Sermones Book 2: Displacement and replacement in Horace's Voice.

Book 2 of Horace's satires is remarkably dialogic. The poems contain seemingly genuine dialogues in which multiple voices share center stage in a way unprecedented in book one. Nearly all of the satires have other voices pushing in on them, suggesting a model of authorship only nascent within the first book. I will analyze the dialogue, now no longer merely a trace, but the dominant feature of Horace's text. Meanwhile I will also be considering why this change has occurred. As far as I can see people have not answered this from a generic angle. The closest would be Oliensis who considers the novel 'face', which a now published Horace is at liberty to portray within his own works.[209] Her account relies on some elements of Horace's biography. In her reading, Horace's second book of satires reflects the new material dimension of Horace's life: the Sabine Villa, the stable empire, and the security of his relationship with Maecenas. These are the result of the 'face' Horace has presented in Book 1, and then develops through Book 2. [210] A part of the process she passes over though is the question of dialogue and identity. In this way I will be considering the similar dynamics that she discusses, but also take into account the reconfiguring of the genre that Horace extensively engages in within Book 2, starting from the very first poem.

The question of the relationship between the two is complex. I have already noted in my previous chapter that Oliensis does not see this as a sequel to Book 1, but rather as a self-effacing replacement of Book 1.[211] Sharland also disagrees with Oliensis and sees continuity between the two books.[212] She argues that Horace steps down and into the audience, creating a sympathetic Horace for us to agree with, and even spectate the dialogues alongside.[213] While I agree with Sharland and do not see this book as over-writing Book 2, I would go further and

---

[209] Oliensis (1998 p. 41 ff.)

[210] Oliensis' term for Horace's poetic *persona*, and the main framework under which she constructs Horace's identity.

[211] Oliensis (1998 p. 57)

[212] Sharland (2009 p. 172)

[213] Sharland (2009 p. 171)

say that there is within this a development of Horace's subjectivity. As an author, he is now seeking to utilize the elements of co-creation that he seemed to try and avoid in Book 1. So in this sense then there is a narrative of completion, as Horace brings to fruition the narrative drive of Book 1. I therefore see Book 2 as the author willingly giving up control of the satires, allowing the tendencies and traces of dialogue in Book 1, to become the dominant feature of Book 2. The result though is not a sprawling mess but a refined sense of control present from the very first poem.

Sermo 2.1

The first satire begins with the first positive identification of book one with the genre 'satire'.

> *Sunt quibus in satura videar nimis acer et ultra legem tendere opus;…*
> There are those to whom I seem, in satire, either too harsh or to stretch
> the work beyond the law. (2.1.1-2)

So, the speaker of Book 2 then immediately steps outside himself, and indeed outside the patron-client relationship developed in the opening poem of Book 1. Here there is an unnamed number who challenge Horace's writing.[214] The point is worth stating though that Horace has a wider audience in view now than when he was writing his first book. His response is not one of irritation at people hearing his satires as it was in 1.4, but is rather one of consternation at their response. In this sense, Book 2 becomes Horace's first ostensibly public work, but in a way retroactively activates his previous works as 'satire.' It is as if they were not properly authorized until book two was published. I think this can go some way towards helping us understand the shift from the dialogue-as-monologue form towards the more ostensibly dialogic form on display in Book

---

[214] Fairclough supplies 'critics' in his Loeb translation (1926), although I think that is over-reading the passage. Perhaps they are 'critics' in one sense Horace is not responding to a professionalized class of critics.

two. The voices present in Book 2 I think can represent a reception history of Horace. Horace shapes and controls his own reception, by authorizing certain responses towards himself. We will meet multiple other voices, voices we will respond to in various ways, and this develops Horace's own *persona*, not as a way to hide his own face (*pace* Oliensis) but as a way to control it.

The next question then is for Trebatius, who counsels Horace to stop writing. (2.1.4) Although Trebatius just uses the verb *quiescere,* which as Muecke notes can mean a variety of things; from as simple as stop, but also to take no legal action in response, or to have a rest. Horace interprets Trebatius' words to mean write no more satire, which immediately places Horace's *Satires* then in the legal realm.[215] This is because now to simply stop writing is not just to put down a pen, but also to cease speaking in the face of public criticism. Censure of Horace's work in this context is then a public matter, not a case of silence enforced from the top by the Pricipate, but rather of his listeners being afraid of his satires. Censure is a public good against Horace, because his satires do properly fulfill their proscribed role, they are transgressive either as they are too easy to repeat, or stretch the idea of satire beyond what is lawful. Horace sees the wisdom of Trebatius' advice, but claims to be unable to sleep (*dormire)*. The fact that he uses a different verb perhaps indicates his interpretation of *quiescere.* Horace sees it as a matter simply of rest, but here Horace now ties writing to labour, and thus to the opposite of rest. Writing is work. Whereas Trebatius is advising a retirement from public life, Horace cannot separate his writing from the very possibility of a comfortable private life. In the beginning of this exchange Horace and his writing is brought up for examination and the dialogue begins to take shape as a way for Horace to discuss what he is doing when he is writing satire.

Immediately Trebatius replies to Horace's lack of sleep with a physical regimen. Interestingly he encourages swimming and prior to the swim, lathering oneself

---

[215] Muecke (1993 p. 102.) places Horace's poetry in the legal realm, as Horace misinterprets (willfully) a technical term as a personal term, acknowledging the issues of legality at work in satire.

in oil. Now, this is no doubt a cleaning regimen for the Romans and not surprising in itself, but here again writing is related to the body.[216] In particular Trebatius recommends the usage of an *unctum*, what Horace previously has referred to as the satirized body in *Sermo* 1.3.25. So Horace's body, having suffered from public backlash is to be cleansed instead of writing. So the possibility of not-writing is in a way allowing Horace to be a victim of satire. Interestingly Horace never picks up on this again, but picks up on Trebatius' next comment that he should write some epic poetry instead, safe and unrelated to the general populace. However, Horace rejects this and instead defends his writing of Satire on the grounds that it is innate within him, like an *ingenium* but not a talent, as he himself is not a 'poet' (1.3) with an innate talent, as this is what happens to one who is born near Venusia. So the defense of satire becomes the defense of his own personality. This is a similar move I noted in *Sermones* Book 1 where in *Sermo* 4 the criticism of literature became the criticism of the *person(a).* It is related to the discussion of dialogue and satire. Horace's voice, while there is a clear voice and a clear dialogue, is obscured behind this move that at once makes the poetry seem autobiographical, but also formalistic and generic simultaneously.

This strategy is explained and demonstrated more fully as Horace defends his choice to write satire with a comparison to Lucilius. As he defends his right to write satire, based on the idea of it as a kind of peccadillo, he compares himself to Lucilius. Lucilius, according to Horace as a satirist used his books as a mode of confession. Obviously the move is ironic and cynical, as a book is read and consumed by the public and the whole dialogue is based on the simple idea that public consumption of one's book is a time for self-reflection. However, the description of Lucilius' books as a kind of 'votive tablet' (2.1.33) reveals more about writing for Horace than just the confessional mode he is attributing to Lucilius. A large part of this is because of the generic discussion, barely disguised as a defense of Horatian invective. Horace's reply to Trebatius' suggestion to write epic or panegyric is answered with an appeal to Lucilius' mode. So we

---

[216] Trebatius was a keen swimmer according to Cicero (*Ad Fam.* 7.10).

know that this is a defense of Horace's generic choice, not just against the attacks made against him in the public sphere. Horace has not in any sense changed the content of satire to be panegyric, but rather, when he defends himself by reference to Lucilius, he roots himself in a fundamentally republican tradition. Therefore, Horace has established a link with the past that authorizes himself to write satire in that tradition. He has done this through a defense of Lucilius' autobiographical approach to writing, something we are not in a position to assess, but the portrayal is interesting as it defines satire by content, more than form.

As it comes also at the onset of his second collection of satires, and the first to actually formally identify his literary works as satires, it is interesting to ask why he defends them on an autobiographical level. Harrison argues in his article that this is actually a description of writing going well or badly, focusing on an earlier interpretation by Bentley whereby *neque si male cesserat, usquam decurrens alio* (v. 31-32) does not refer to events in Lucilius' life, but actually the process of writing itself.[217] This is confluent with Horace's earlier description of Lucilius' poetry as a muddy river; however, I think he goes too far in erasing any mention of autobiography. The analogy Horace uses to set up the revelation of Lucilius' writing style is to compare his writing to a discussion with faithful friends (*fidis sodalibus*), that is to say: friends who will not tell others what you tell them. The analogy with speech only works if it is about the content not the kind of speech. Horace represents speech not because it can be good or bad but because of the content of said speech.[218]So to reduce Horace's argument entirely to aesthetics goes too far in my opinion. What this *Sermo* does do though is to recreate satire for Horace. As he uses this description of Lucilius' hardy nature and perseverance in the face of opposition, he is creating a foil for his own writing, which is defended as a reflection of his own upbringing.[219]In this way then

---

[217] Harrison (1987) *passim*

[218] While speaking well is important (i.e. Phoenix's admonition to Achilles to be a speaker of words, and doer of deeds) presumably one is a allowed to be a feeble speaker in private with little consequence.

[219] Another reason to doubt Harrison's argument.

Horace grants himself freedom in what he writes. This way, I think we can see some truth in Harrison's idea of the aesthetic nature of Horace's description of Lucilius. Freedom is granted between the poet and his books. The books exist for Horace as a private confessional, however not where private *peccadillos* are recorded, but rather where Horace can record his own experimentations with verse. Horace is allowed to write bad verses, and should get away with it, so long as they are true, but even better, if they are good, he should be able to avoid any recourse to law, as Horace argues at the end, and Trebatius grants.

The final discussion is whether Horace has left himself vulnerable to lawsuits by his writing. Here again I think the central question is around the impact of Horace's writing, and its reception by Horace's audience is key. Trebatius gives a final warning. Exhausted by Horace's refusal to take his council to avoid writing satire, or a politically neutered form of writing - panegyric, Trebatius reminds him that there is recourse to law available to those whom Horace writes ill (*mala)* of. Horace's response is basically to use language to take the sting of the threat out. Reworking *mala* as a reference to the quality of verses, rather than the content, Horace crafts all his poetry as quality verses, targeting people who actually deserve it. This turns the poem's subject matter from the harshness of Horace's poetry to the quality of them. So, now we can read his earlier discussion of Lucilius confessional poetry in the way Harrison would have us, but only if we read it first as about the response of those readers to him. In this way Horace is plotting a course towards aesthetic appreciation as a better way to read poetry, rather than simply looking at who is made fun of: we ask *how* they are made fun of. In this way Horace manages to go above the law, circumventing its requirements, and Trebatius agrees, but at the same time it takes away the immediate sting of satire as well. Horace's poetry has no impact on the world by its own admission.[220] Horace's satires however still maintain that basic aggressive and transgressive speech which the republican tradition he relies on demands. However by focusing on form, his satires make the impact *seem* inconsequential.

---

[220] Lowrie (2009 pp. 347-348) arrives at a similar conclusion.

<u>Sermo 2.2</u>

From *Sermo* 2 onward we begin to hear less of the voice of Horace, and more of the voice of other characters. They are all models of dialogic discourse, in various ways interacting with the author's voice and the voice of another. In 2.2, Ofellus never speaks directly, but it is his voice that Horace is reporting. In sections of the satire Horace's voice surfaces to reinforce and reassert Ofellus' voice.

In the focalization of the text, the voice becomes a kind of reported speech and Horace is merely the medium through which we encounter Ofellus' wisdom. While on the one hand reported speech grants a veneer of deniability to Horace, perhaps a shrewd political choice, on the other hand Horace actually throws his weight behind this satire. In v. 112 he adds his personal testimony of Ofellus' character to guarantee the trustworthiness of his council on frugal living. I think then we can begin to see an establishment of a trustworthy *persona*. Horace points to his own testimony as a way to secure the validity of a life lived in line with the precepts of the speaker. This is quite unlike the Horace of Book 1, an unreliable narrator keener on his own body then on paying any attention to the people around him.[221]The author in this way both distances himself from the message, by creating a mask to wear, but also by undergirding the poem with the idea that he knows Ofellus and can therefore vouch for the trustworthiness of his words.

Freudenburg argues that that this satire shows a character of ambiguity, relying on platonic dialogues as a precedent.[222] This could be there, but I think the sharp contrast with how Horace and the historical past are presented in previous satires ought to dampen that conclusion and consider the more immediate concerns of the Horatian *persona*. While Plato depicts himself as absent in nearly all of his Socratic dialogues, he does not position himself as a reliable

---

[221] i.e. 1.5 and 1.8

[222] Freudenburg (2001 pp. 109 ff.) This is also the view of Fraenkel (1957 p. 136)

narrator.[223]Plato always has other voices as an intermediary. For example in *The Symposium,* Plato always has other voices as an intermediately. Plato relies on Apollodorus, and an unnamed friend, there is no attempt to ground the reliability of the speech in the life of the speaker. Horace's carefully maneuvers himself to be behind the poetic voice in such a way that he is both not the author, but the authority upon which the whole poem stands. The authority of Horace is then positioned as a guarantee of truth, but not a conveyer. The dialogic nature of the satires allows Horace to highlight and conflate the various dichotomies present in his text. The voice of the author and the voice of the speaker are presented only to be melded together as the author *authorizes* the text, speaking/writing it into existence, at the same time as he authorizes Ofellus' authoritative voice, so that the disavowal of authority happens at the same moment of the writing process. The form of the poem, and the content, are also conflated. The dialogue-as-form grants freedom within the text to slide between discussions of form and content, as Horace relates both what Ofellus is saying, and also depicts the separation between the lesson and Horace himself.

As for the narrative of the satire, Oliensis notes that Ofellus shares in common with two other characters a reversal of fortune.[224]Ofellus has lost land in the confiscations following the civil war. His stoical attitude towards loss, as he is now a worker of the land only, is held up as an example to follow. The parallel loss by Horace of his own land in 41 BCE surely bears some comment. Why did Horace feel the need to put the words in Ofellus' mouth that he himself could have said? On the one hand he now had his Sabine Villa, so maybe felt it came better from the mouth of somebody still in an adverse condition, on the other hand perhaps he himself did not feel that he lived up to this Stoic ideal, and in fact needed to hear the moralizing *sermo* as well. Ofellus' final words about land and that it is only ever for use, never for ownership, undergirds the authority of the entire satire (v. 35 ff.). As a poem it exists as a moral diatribe that only makes sense in so far as the land upon which it takes place belongs to nobody, as time

---

[223] The *Apology* is perhaps a notable exception; however, *The Apology* is an exception within Plato's dialogues in general.

[224] Oliensis, (1998 pp. 51-52)

and fortune can take away any number of luxuries at a moment's notice. Authority is then given to the lived experience of the mouthpiece which Horace uses. Authority is embodied within Ofellus' figure, rather than in the content of his precepts.

Therefore, as I noted above, Horace' report of Ofellus' character and way of life, provide a base-line guarantee of the reliability of the advice given. While authority is then placed on the lived experience of Ofellus, it is further placed back onto Horace, as he is the final link in the chain between the authority of Ofellus, the simple farmer, and the audience, whoever they may be. In fact the address at the start, which echoes the diatribe satires of Book 1, "*Quae virtus et quanta…"* (v. 1) sets the poem up in the style of Horace's original satires (mainly 1.1), but quickly shifts away towards the voice of another. So the satire stands in for the tradition of Horatian satire, while using the voice of another to convey the moral authority needed to communicate the truth of the teachings contained within it. In this way the dialogue allows Horace to reassert some authority over his texts without having to be the speaking *persona*. Horace's authority exists in the liminal gaps between speech and dialogue: while his second book of Satires has only just begun to be unrolled, we have already seen his play with form and content, and here we see how it unwraps itself in the voice of another. Ofellus is the form of satire, with authority wrapped up in his person, and he constitutes the body of the text. At the same time he is the impeccable body Horace chooses to dramatize the loss of authority he himself feels: so that the form obscures the content. Ofellus represents Horace's poetry in this satire. It is the reliable and unassuming poetry of a man who inhabits the correct subjective space: that is the non-landed renter. There are no limits (*finis*) to him, not because his *libertas* ranges everywhere and anywhere like a Lucilian poet, but because he allows only nature to limit himself. Horace's poetry exists in the same condition. Horace's poetry loses its author's ownership once it leaves the book upon which it is written.[225] His poetry is then only for *usus*, only for the possibility of existing on its own in so far as he is actively involved in the writing of it. Perhaps this is

---

[225] See Oliensis (1995) for a discussion of Horace's anxieties about post-publication life of his poetry.

part of why there are representations of writing throughout his poetry: they function as a kind of ecphrasis always allowing his poetry to maintain their material relationship to the moment of writing. Ofellus therefore represents how Horace tries to relate to his own poetry. Ofellus becomes the body of poetry and continues the narrative of Horace as an author.

<u>Sermo 2.3</u>

The next dialogue is between Horace and a failed speculator, Damisippus. The satire is ostensibly about the madness everybody is infected with, who does not follow the teachings of the Stoics.[226]This satire tells the teachings of Stertinius. These are shared with Horace, and then the audience, via Damisippus. However the start of the satire focuses in on Horace's apparently infrequent writing efforts. Damasippus accuses Horace of calling for the paper (*membrana)* of publication only four times a year. Freudenburg notes the back-handed compliment to a Callimachean aesthetic. After all: less is more.[227] However the thrust of the accusation cannot be a primarily ironic criticism/programmatic joking, even if we understand with Oliensis, that in a satire where Horace is accused of not writing enough, he writes the longest.[228]The question itself focuses in on Horace's lifestyle and the conditions in which an author must live. Damasippus laughs at Horace's country retreat from the city, suggesting that it was a vain attempt to encourage writing, away from the bustle of the Saturnalia. Interestingly then the action of writing becomes a private thing for Horace, something to do away from people. This is confluent with Book 1 where he recommends the performance of poetry for only the few.[229] There he had created a line between himself and the writings on the page. Here a period of mental instability has resulted in a lack of writing. Damasippus steps in, and notes the problems with Horace's psyche. He is angry (*iratus*) with himself, either inebriated or asleep, and therefore nothing he sings (*cano*) is worthwhile (*nil*

---

[226] i.e. Faircloughs (1926) straightforward introduction to the satire in the Loeb edition.

[227] Freudenburg (2001 p.113)

[228] Oliensis, (1998 p. 56)

[229] See my discussion of 1.4 above

dignum) but on the other hand even in the empty space (*vacuum*) provided by his Sabine farm he is unable to write anything, though threatning (*minans*) to produce some brilliant (*praeclara*) lines. *Praeclara* has the feeling of more noble poetry than the perceived status of Horace's *Sermo.* This has the effect I think of turning us towards formalistic criticisms of Horace's poetry. These criticisms are similar to 2.1, where Horace complains about those who think he pushes satire beyond its limits (*ultra legem*). In this way then Horace has painted a picture of the building blocks of Horatian poetry - poetry, which is something that Horace never considered himself writing within his *sermo.*[230]Horace is building the narrative of his own reception, even as he is avoiding actively participating in it. This is Horace's authorial voice once again raising issues of form. His *sermones* are criticized using formal terms, such as *praeclara*, in order to efface his own form with the form of another poetic tradition.[231] Satire's content is sidelined as threatening (*minans)* poetry. We can read Damasippus' criticism as a way of saying that Horace's current poetic output as only threatening, not actually participating in threat.[232] The pun though is deliberate: his satires are threatening not just more poetic works, but also threatening to others' lives, politics, and even aesthetic judgments. The same verb is used in 1.3 in Horace's diatribe against the satires: but here it is applied to Horace. Where in 1.3 the Stoic disciple is too harsh, applying an even hand to uneven crimes, Horace becomes not harsh enough in his writing practice. The pun, however, highlights the literary parallels, as Horace's threatening works are considered threats not towards people, but threats of a greater genre. Form and content work together to distract the reader from Horace's satire.

In an article discussing the characterization of Damasippus, Bond considers the possible meanings of *sermo* in 2.3.4. He delineates 4 meanings, and judges that the meaning is related to Stoic principles, and is a way of identifying Damasippus' novel devotion to Stoic teachings and the bumbling jargon that goes

---

[230] *sermo* 1.4 as well

[231] That is to say something more akin to Horace's *Odes.*

[232] *Minito* then becomes a verb that suggests poetry *and* satire, delineating the distinction operating between the two nouns.

with such newly converted exuberance.[233] I think this is true, but that we should not rush over the fact that Horace has chosen to talk about something worth 'talking about' (*sermo*). In Book 1 Horace drew a line between his experience and the written page, most strikingly at the close of 1.5. Here Horace's lack of writing in 2.3 is tied to the failure of his lived experience to actually live up to anything. While in the city he is drunk, while away he is idle: neither states acquire the required content befitting a *sermo*. *Sermo* is a term overlaid with generic meaning. Placed beside *dignum* a word used later in Horace's *Ars* (vv. 138) to make fun of the man who boasts (*promissor),* it places the questions of Horace's poetry in the center of the poem so far. Interestingly the same label is given to Horace by Damasippus in verse six, also in conjunction with *dignum*. So there are -I think- poetic underlays here, not just around characterization, but also around the possibility of writing and what it means to write. That Horace is characterizing himself as a *promissor*, or rather being characterized by his own internal dialogue, heightens the literary possibilities of the frame of 2.3. Horace views writing as the work of somebody used to reflection, but also pretension. Horace's poetry is categorized as the works of somebody who promises much but delivers little. To return then to the relevance of *sermo* in this passage. The passage, full of hints and gestures towards Horace's fraught personal life reveals how the author is oriented towards the text. He is challenged by his material conditions, as Damasippus asserts. Publication is something that apparently eludes our author. He is unable to move beyond the conditions he is writing to produce something properly brilliant.

This has implications for the bulk of the poem where Horace allows Damasippus to run away with words. As an enacted critique of the muddy river of Lucilius, it is perhaps read as an exercise in true satire. Horace is making fun of the evangelistic Stoics, by imputing to them all the poetic vices he eschews in Book 1. Damasippus writes too much, does not edit his words, multiplies examples, and while he criticizes his former self, he is far too earnest for a real satirist, there is no tongue in cheek, no laughter, just criticism stacked on top of diatribe amidst general invective. The author is then able to disconnect the work from himself,

---

[233] Bond (1987) pp. 4-5

and stand almost beside and around it. Horace only exists in the frames, not because that is where we ostensibly hear his voice, but also because they are the section in which the author function, as Foucault puts it exists in a material relation to the satire.[234] He is in that moment, while accused of being bereft of the material possibility of publication, i.e. he has not called for the parchment often enough, been publishing the very thing he is hearing. This is not to say that Horace is becoming an amanuensis for Damasippus, although the illusion of the satire is that this is the case, but we are I think almost encouraged to ignore the bulk of the satire as an exercise in missing the point. Horace is in control, the author exerts power by stepping outside of the space usually afforded an author, he allows the bustle of another man to enter in and take the space. The form of the poem is encapsulated in the frame in a literal manner then. The speech of Damasippus is a satirical speech in the way it participates in the tradition of diatribe.[235] However, Horace has used the frame to distract from the satirical content. Importantly, I am not contending that Horace stands behind Damasippus' words, supporting them by the absence of his voice, rather he uses the opportunity of another voice to show that he is not in fact lazy, that his satires are capable of being produced even in trying circumstances.

Sharland notes this is the first satire that allows another voice to completely override Horace's voice.[236]Sharland however does not use this fact to make note of a narratively informed judgment of Horace's subjectivity. While Trebatius and Horace occupy an equal share of 'dialogue' time in 2.1, and Ofellus is reported speech, rather than narratologically present, Damsippus enters completely. The closest we get to this kind of complete overwriting of Horace's persona is 2.9,

---

[234] Foucault, M., (1998) The Author function for Foucault is the authorizing ability of a unified persona, created (not found) to stand behind a text. The author is the principal by which words are organized and assumed to maintain some coherence. The material relation is then the way in which an author is related to the text: not as the text addresses us (as Foucault says, quoting Beckett: "What does it matter who is speaking?") but as the text proceeds from the imagined biological person. So, the frame is where the author function is found, and allows us to organize the poem within Horace's oeuvre.

[235] Harrison (2013 p. 159)

[236] Sharland (2009 p. 228)

where the pest interrupts Horace, causing him some discomfort. I noted there that dialogue as a form of satire had issues for Horace: however, here I think my own position outlined above, that Book 2 completes and fulfills Book 1, is proven. Whereas in 1.9 the pest interrupts Horace's *nugae* and in a way prevents the ideal conditions for the writing of *sermo*, here Horace uses the interruption for his own writing, so that dialogue no longer troubles his satires, but forms the bulk of them.

Sermo 2.4

Although this satire is barely commented upon in the tradition of scholarship I associate with Freudenburg and Oliensis, as a poem it seems to be a completely perfect satire, in the sense that it offers minimal hooks and barbs to grasp and define meaning; it is what it is about, and nothing more. It is perfectly summed up in the genre of satire. While Rudd deals at length with the content of the food which Catius describes, it is not to place it within Horace's oeuvre, or to engage with it as a satire per se.[237] So the only question seems to be: What are we to do with Catius? Some have said he is similar to Ofellus, a simple moralist, praising the simple pleasures of Roman food, while others have said he represents a parody of the gastronomic tradition within poetry and writing in general.[238]Rudd makes the point that the main way to understand this is within the frames of the poem, where Horace speaks.[239]He notes the fact that this poem is situated within the framework of a Platonic dialogue, where a student reports the speech of his master. This is similar to Ofellus, as in that case, Horace takes the place of a student and relates the precepts of Ofellus, but here we meet a different student: in this scenario Horace is one step removed from the reported lecture. The frame of the poem then suggests that Horace is almost bothering Catius. In an interesting contrast to the pest in 1.9 where Horace is interrupted to try and reach his benefactor; Maecenas, here Horace is the pest bothering Catius, trying to get information out of him. Catius refuses to name the teacher, which I think

---

[237] Rudd (1982 p. 202 ff.)

[238] Rudd (1982 p. 212)

[239] Rudd (1982 pp. 207-208)

suggests that any particular teacher or school of thought is beyond the purview of the poem, unlike with 2.3 where the teacher of Damasippus is mentioned many times.

Sermo 4 then suggests another aspect of Horace's relation to the text. Whereas with 2.2 Horace stands behind Ofellus' moral authority and defends his subjectively assigned authority through his lived experience, in this moral 'diatribe' on the teachings (*praecepta*) of the unnamed teacher, Catius devises himself as the authority on which the teachings stand. He notes the nature of the recitation as a song (*cano*) as if they have some sacred connotations. So the satire is written from memory by Catius. Fisk notes the nature of this as an *apomnēmoneumata*, an example of a disciple narrating the precepts of a master.[240] Horace's use of this I think is a way of distancing himself from the character, and emphasizing the jocularity of Catius as a figure. The conclusion of this satire then has the exposition of the result of this whole narrative by Horace. Horace begs to be taken to the next lecture of the esteemed teacher, (v. 89 ff.). He commends the possibility of a good memory on the part of Catius, but the joke is that this would really not do justice to the whole satire, as Horace not too subtly suggests that Catius is not as enjoyable as the teacher, and he is not able to give Horace the same pleasure (*iuvo*) as the real teacher would give. The possibility of real and true dialogue with the external world is challenged by Horace's satire, as the bulk of the poem is considered to be not even enjoyable, at least not as enjoyable as the real source (*auctor)* of the teachings. Horace satirizes, therefore, the reliability of somebody who identifies too closely with the identity of his or her teacher.[241]However the *auctor* himself is safely hidden away from the point of view of those who wish to criticize him. Oliensis, while discussing the satires around this, considers this to be an example of the self-satirizing Horace, but is it not more the way in which Horace carves out for himself within the world of dialogue the possibility of a safe existence?[242] He is becoming more secure and

---

[240] Fisk. P. (1920 P.53)

[241] Rudd (1982 p. 211 ff.) discusses how Catius is too attached to his master and copies his mannerisms.

[242] Oliensis (1998 pp. 51-54)

the dialogues he has engaged in thus far secure that, while he has been criticized for not writing enough or for writing too harshly, he has managed to protect the identity of an at risk *auctor* through the dialogue form he has engaged in more frequently in Book 2. The anonymity granted to the Epicurean lecturer, while not granted to Horace in reality, is granted by implication rather, since the books that he is writing are the *apomnēmoneumata* of Horace, and while they do not hide the identity of the author, they obscure him in the moment of hearing as the dialogue form shapes the possible responses around not the identity of the *auctor* but the question of the dialogue. The form of satire is then once again used to obscure the author, as the author's voice makes up the content of the satire. The form however can be said to originate outside the author's control, however Horace uses it to hide himself within a veneer of tradition.

Is Horace then set up as the alternative of a reliable narrator in 2.4? Whereas Catius is unable to fully encapsulate the man whose lecture he is reporting, in 2.2, Horace relates himself as the reliable narrator, and even more so gives us an image of his life to back up his reported speech, so that we never have to meet Ofellus in order to trust and enjoy his precepts on simple living. The way that Horace holds himself forward in 2.2, and puts himself in as a reliable amanuensis for a simpler man is contrasted with Catius, and even contrasted with Damasippus, the zealous Stoic, who at least relies on the testimony of Stertinius. The fact that the authority behind Catius is not mentioned then suggests something about his characterization and therefore the relation between himself and Horace, and therefore the relationship between Horace and his poetry, as Horace uses the untethered dialogue of Catius to assert his own position towards the text. [243]

Gowers in her work '*The Loaded Table'* establishes the whole satire under the law of genre and literary analysis. The satire is a recipe for satire. She notes the confluence of gastronomical and literary terms, especially as a way to argue for the creation of the correct kind of satire from a virtual gourmet of literary types,

[243] Untethered to a teacher *auctor*.

such as: *tenuis, purus, lenis* and *angustus*.[244]The angle in the end is almost to portray this as a poem of and about satire in its entirety, as the smorgasbord presented by Catius is collapsed into the purified river of Horatian satire. Gowers sees the argument reach in the culminating point: Horace is the unnamed *auctor*.[245]The poem is then understood as an apologia for Horace's poetry, as it unearths the skeleton and tool box of Horace's poetic method. This is no simple composition dashed off while standing on one foot, but a complicated form of poetry that requires memory, a teacher and so on. What then shall we make of Horace's confessed desire to meet the teacher? How has Catius failed to convey the full impact of the *auctor* if Horace has created a picture of his own aesthetic pretensions? Herein lies the rub: Horace has created a picture of satire only to allow that picture to fall short at the last moment of the satire. The words are not reliable enough, they approach the possibility of knowledge of the teacher, the exchange of ideas, but they do not convey the full weight of the teacher. The teacher and the author of poetry are then compared. While people think they know Horace, Horace creates a distance between himself and his audience. The audience is unable to fully appreciate Horace, or any author, through his texts. Catius is then the poet of satire, perfectly reciting aesthetic principles, who at once brings people closer to the author but at the moment of revelation, refuses to disclose the *Auctor* as well, just as Horace's text do not disclose the identity of the author.

This satire sits at the end of a trio of satires that show Horace in dialogue. However I think here we can see a narrative of replacement though these satires. Horace's voice is replaced slowly by other voices. At first Ofellus is reported through the narrator's voice, then Damasippus enters into the space normally reserved for the satirist, and finally with Catius we enter into the authoritative space of the satire. The difference between Catius and Damasippus is that while Damasippus interrupts Horace, here Horace interrupts Catius. So the satirist willingly gives way to other voices, and thereby willingly gives way to dialogue.

---

[244] Gowers (1993 pp. 126-160)

[245] Gowers (1993 p. 157)

<u>Sermo 2.5</u>

By *Sermo* 5 Horace has completely disappeared from view, replaced by two characters known by Horace's audience as some of the most important figures from mythological history. Ulysses and Teiresias feature as a dialogic pair, as Ulysses decides how he is going to deal with being a pauper in the new state of affairs he expects on Ithaca. This lack of trust in the inherent right of himself to walk back into his own role as king is interesting, and the fact that he is asking it suggests that Ulysses thinks that the conditions have changed so thoroughly that his former life is gone from him. The issue then of its parodic nature can be further interrogated. As he parodies the epic form he also parodies the closure that Epic gives to such great figures as Homer. In a way Horace's small poem here challenges the standard narrative of the return home, as the new state of affairs Horace found himself in under the Principate forecloses the possibility of a traditional nostos narrative after the civil war.

On the other side is Teiresias, temptingly named a *vates* in verse six. The only usage of a properly poetic term for a poet in the satires in a non self-disparaging way. As Horace has disappeared so thoroughly from the poem, I think we can read Teiresias as a part of Horace's persona as well as Ulysses. While Ulysses might represent the conditions Horace finds himself in, Teiresias represents the drive to continue in spite of these feeble conditions. How, however, did Horace make the most of himself? In a state of ruin Horace managed to hunt and pillage the ruins of a literary world.[246] So Teiresias' advice represents Horace' accent into Maecenas' circle as he used the literary history he had and developed himself into a poet worthy of the name.[247]

While Woods in particular notes it as programmatic due to its connection to 2.1 and others, I would also note the fact that it occupies the centre of the poetic

---

[246] Woods (2012). My discussion here is indebted to Woods' discussion of *Captatio* as a metaphor for literary plunder.

[247] The list of books in 2.3, the genealogy in 1.4 and his constant bickering with the ghost of Lucilius all bear witness to his knowledge of the literary past and his debt to them.

text.[248] While 2.5 is not the exact middle, it is the middle pivot of 2.4 and 2.5 that the rest of the text hangs around, and just as 1.5 can be seen as programmatic and literary minded by virtue of its position, so should 2.5's position in the center pivot of the book alert us to its reflections on the art of satire. Furthermore, the absence of a clear identification of Horace's presence in the poem suggests also that more than a simple satire is being performed here. Horace is negotiating the troubled waters that he lives in, and the literary landscape he is attempting to break into. Woods tends to read *captatio* narratives as negotiating primarily literary landscapes, engaging with the past in a genealogical fashion, as the author devises ways to imprint his authority in the world.[249]I tend however to see that aspect as being determined by the (perceived) material conditions compelling a figure like Horace. In that sense the fear of poverty is not just a literary poverty, but also a literal poverty, as Horace produces his poetry, much like Ulysses he is attempting to steer a course out of the troubled waters he has found himself in. However I do not reduce the poetry thereby to Horace's material life in a way that is merely mimetic, but rather that Horace's artifice is tied up fundamentally with a view 'from poverty'.

While Oliensis and Freudenburg view Ulysses as the primary mask for Horace in this poem, they do not see him as containing any poetic discussion, or room for maneuverability in the persona of Horace within the poem.[250]Oliensis seems to read 2.2 and 2.5 as presenting possible faces of Horace, and the possible slippage between the two is a way of both criticizing the self, and protecting the self. However, they do not have to represent faces at all, but rather represent the conditions of satire, as Ofellus is a satirist, but neither Ulysses nor Teiresias represent satirists in their poem. The genre of satire is upheld here not by the content of the poem, but by the form, and the angle from which it presents itself, that of the poor Ulysses talking to the sage Teiresias. Horace plunders the rich tradition of Greek myth and poetry to create a new form for himself.

---

[248] Woods (2012 p. 26)

[249] Woods, (2012 p. 144)

[250] Oliensis (1998 p. 57), Freudenburg (2001 p. 99)

It fits then in with the narrative of Book 2, as Horace disappears from view. I noted above how there was a narrative of replacement, and here we can see its fulfillment: as Horace has developed his voice in these satires he has slowly disappeared and here he has disappeared completely. However in this there is much power and the author has achieved the possibility of completely disappearing while still maintaining control over his satire. He uses the form of satire to direct away from himself, and this we can most clearly see in this poem.

Sermo 2.6

This celebrated satire has provided much autobiographical fodder for critics, although I think it offers a specific view of what constitutes this author. The poem presents a view of his Sabine Villa inhabiting an idyllic or bucolic realm. The use of *silva* within the first three lines alerts us to the artificial nature of the construction.[251] The poem also closes with the same reference to *silva*. (2.6.116). The mention by the country mouse again is not to give us a perfect geographical map of his hovel, but to emphasize the nature of the bucolic nature of his home. In the larger picture then, the picture is of a life lived in bucolic tranquility.[252] In an extension also to Bowditch's point about the fact that the villa is part of the chain of exchange between the poet and his patron, is the fact that the material world he is living in is converted into a poem. So when we read this description of Horace's life, we are not reading a passive description of Horace as through a looking glass, but actually the site has become activated as poetry. The materiality of Horace's poetry is then viewed not through writing materials in this instance, but the location of writing.[253] The link then to the pastoral tradition

---

[251] On *Silva* as a pastoral genre marker see Martindale (1997b p. 109) This is not to say the image is fictional, but rather that the details are confluent with a pastoral vision. Presumably there were trees over (*super*) his home, but they are important not as physical entities, but as markers and reminders of a world of poetic creation, and the traditions of pastoral poetry.

[252] Bowditch (2001 p. 153) Considers the larger ramifications of the use of the Sabine villa within a relationship of gift exchange, as the villa coverts into poetry. This is definitely true, and to consider the villa apart from its material basis would be to idolise Horace's genius beyond his own wildest dreams.

[253] Contrasted especially with Book 1's insistence on materials used in poetry.

of poetry is apt, as pastoral poetry represents itself from the mouth of a shepherd, or other more rural individuals.[254] In this way Horace located himself in the centre of his poetry. The picture of the villa exists as a way to locate his own poetic activity within the setting of the gift he has been given, and by casting it in a bucolic image, Horace writes from the perspective of a rural simple man, someone like an Ofellus.

The relation then between the description of the house, and the subsequent narrative of Horace's life outside the villa follow naturally, and therefore the corresponding fable about the mice partakes in the same action as the larger setting Horace places himself in. What is unique though is that the properly satiric part, that is the section on mice and their *mores* is told not by Horace, but by Cervius. Meucke here notes the use of *garrire* as a form of comedic talking.[255] It is interestingly the kind of talk that has previously been ascribed to the pest in 1.9 as well as the chit chat of a comic poet, Fundanius. (1.10.41) The pest is found to be praising the cities and the roads of Rome, things that are anathema to Horace and therefore the place of the satirist, while the comic poet is praised as a charming author telling stories of a slave who can trick his master. While on the one hand we have a negative attribute, and the satirist speaking is contrasted with him, on the other it is considered a vital part of the comic style of speech. So, Cervius can then be I think considered the satiric speaker of this poem. Once again though, Horace's voice has been sidelined, so that while the poem remains his, and while the set up is there for Horace's actual life style to carry the moral weight of a diatribe against the city, he instead diverts attention to his neighbor. Once again the satirical force of the poem is displaced to the voice of somebody else, the other speakers continuing to inhabit the formal elements of Horace's satires.

Cervius' speech is narratologically removed from the satire by the presence of the narrator Horace, who first started the poem with the answer to his prayers, and then also by Cervius' voice which is finally moved to the talking mice. It also

---

[254] Theocritus' Polyphemus also fits this. (Theocritus, *Idylls* 6 & 11)

[255] Meucke (1993 p. 207)

is removed by the fact that this is a pastiche from a traditional fable, know from Aesop and probably other traditions.[256]As it is introduced with the verb '*fertur*' (2.6.80)it is removed again by its association with the voices of the past.[257] In this satire then the poem constructs its own authority from the voices of the mythological past. Not even from Cervius, the country neighbor presumably of a similar temperament as Horace, has enough authority to deliver the message. So the book's continual fascination with 'who speaks' continues, as the voice of the poem deflects down 3 levels of characters before it finds itself to have any compelling authority.

It is in this poem I think that we begin to see clearly the use of the dialogue form in Horace's *Satires*. As he has been replacing his own voice, he has been putting the satires into the voices of others, and at various points using their authority to establish the potency of his own poetry.[258] Horace has instead relied on a simpler way of remaining in touch with his own poetry, as he is filtered out through the voices of others. He is the poet speaking directly from material realities. All of the dialogues so far except 2.1 have all discussed the material conditions in which Horace finds himself. In 2.2 he discussed the results of the land confiscations, while 2.3 has been the speech of somebody financially ruined and trying to council wisdom of the Stoic variety. 2.4 has been about food, and as we saw the chef as the poet had many valences to it, so that the unnamed author is Horace, and so it is about the materiality of writing, using the variegated metaphors of food production for literary production, and 2.5 is about a materially bereft Ulysses trying to create a new living for himself in a changed world. In this instance the material conditions of Horace's poetry in book two are revealed, but the authority of the poem goes to Cervius and an older tradition. So then, the relation between the material conditions of satire and the authority that the

---

[256] Meucke (1993 p. 207) has a brief discussion of these other traditions

[257] The use of *fero* as a 'Callimachean footnote' is discussed in many places, its use here is a little less Callimachean and refers to the satire's deep investment in some authority beyond itself, more than just the erudition shown by the author, after all Horace disavows responsibility for its entrance into the satire.

[258] Especially 2.2

satirist gets are linked in 2.6. As Horace's country life is portrayed as a fundamentally simple life, and supported by the narrative of the country mouse and town mouse, his obvious move is to use the satiric voice to defend his situation against more urban thought. However, he uses the voice of another. Oliensis views this use of other *personae* as a form of defence after the invective of book one, where it deflects blame and censure from Horace onto other figures.[259] This not so much a deflective move as it is a move that brings to fruition the dialogues of Book 1. While there were traces of dialogue present in book one, they become fully developed in book two as Horace as an author refracts his own voice throughout the poem, signaling the fact that an author's voice does not extend from the individual, but blends and mixes with the voices around him.

Sermo 2.7

The setting of this satire, that of the Saturnalia, is mirrored by 2.3, also during the Saturnalia, but unlike in 2.3 Horace is in the city this time. He has again been interrupted, much like Damasippus interrupted im 2.3, but here it is Davus, his slave, a stock character who represents the *servus callidus* of Roman comedy.[260] The timing of the satire on the Saturnalia is planned because it allows Horace to use the voice of a slave to satirize his own behavior. The Saturnalia is a festival on which the usual social relations are suspended and the master and slave can speak frankly.

At the heart of this satire then is the transgression of speech. Davus' speech is only accepted at this time, and this satire is allowed to be written only at this time.[261] In a way it is one of Horace's most direct diatribes, even though it is only directed against him. It is the one which most explicitly names the person being criticized, Horace, and enumerates the list of his sins. While Rudd deals in detail

---

[259] Oliensis, (1998 pp. 51-52)

[260] Muecke (1993 p. 214) also considers Davus a *servus callidus*.

[261] The anxieties of slave-owning masters must in some way be relaxed due to this period of loosening of the standard laws, as it gives them the veneer of equality without any of the power.

with the accuracy of the insults[262]I think the accuracy is not of utmost importance. Rather the tone itself is, as a diatribe satire, it is the most inclusive.[263]It imagines Horace to be in actual fact equal to Davus, and also a slave to his own passions, as it is a Stoic piece, relying on misheard information, similar to Damasippus' reporting of Stertinius' teachings.

In the report, as Horace's sins are listed, we learn the main issue is the fear which it casts over Horace, as he is not allowed to get caught out. This is what makes him similar to the slave, he is not free to do whatever he wants, and finally the slave has the opportunity to point it out, but Horace has no such freedom, as he never gets a Saturnalia, and satire is unable to grant the requisite freedom to point out sins in those greater than him. Finally Davus settles on the issue of gluttony, and brings back the sins of Horace to the nature of his own flesh:

> *obsequium ventris mihi perniciosius est cur?*
>
> *tergo plector enim. qui tu inpunitior illa,*
>
> *quae parvo sumi nequeunt, obsonia captas?*
>
> *nempe inamarescunt epulae sine fine petitae*
>
> *inlusique pedes vitiosum ferre recusant*
>
> *corpus.*
>
> Why is it more pernicious for me, following my stomach?
>
> Truly, I will pay in my back. But you who capture, with more impunity,
>
> those trifles which are unable to be enjoyed for a small price?
>
> Certainly the indulgent feasts without end become bitter, and the feet you
>
> have ridiculed, they refuse to bear your body. (2.7.104-109)

The Saturnalia gives Davus an opportunity to point out the fact that the relationship between Davus and Horace is close; although different in type, they are related in kind. As Davus fears for the beating he will receive (*plector*) so Horace's own body betrays him, as his feet (*pedes*) no longer uphold his body

---

[262] Rudd (1982 p.191 ff)

[263] Rudd (1982 p. 194)

(*corpus*). On the one had the material consequences for Horace are that his body will expand faster than his feet can hold his extended belly could possibly stand. This is a standard satiric line as the body of a person is the traditional target of diatribe satire. Their bodies betray their vices, just as a slave's body will literally betray their own vices on their backs. In a similar way the *servus callidus* in Plautus' *Pseudolos* considers the poet's writing as akin to the punishment he receives on his back. [264] Davus also considers the impact of his own possible thievery, and in the next breath aligns it with the mismatch of Horace's body. The fact that Horace's feet can no longer maintain the weight of the body suggests something of the generic criticism imbedded in the satiric comment on Horace's distended body. Horace's feet, the smallest sections which make up the body of his work, can no longer maintain the possibility of any larger text. Although it is not a question of the amount, while no doubt some Callimachean aesthetics are hidden away here, there are also questions of what makes Horace an author. As the criticism is not that Horace gives into gluttony on account of his riches, but on account of his rich friends, which he inherits through his poetry. (vv. 102-103) Horace's poetry created the situation in which his own writing becomes extended beyond what his feet can carry. It is as if the form of his satire is his own, but the content comes from the men he is pleasing. In this sense Horace's poverty becomes on the one hand the possibility of poetry, as it is what gets him into his Sabine Villa in *sermo* 6, but it also betrays the possibility of writing what he truly wants. He is in the patronage system, and under a new regime. He is unable to write exactly what he wants, just as Davus is not able to eat what he wants for fear of his back being whipped.

At the end of this poem, Horace, the satiric target of the poem lashes out in anger at Davus. His famously short temper comes to bear and he threatens to hit Davus with a stone, or even more seriously with some arrows. The madness of this moment is congruent with the criticisms of Horace earlier, and so the author

[264] Aut si de istac re umquam inter nos convenimus

   quasi in libro quom scribuntur calamo litterae,

   stilis me totum usque ulmeis conscribito (Plautus, *Pseud.* 544-546)

For further discussion see Sciarrino (2011) p. 66

enters his own poetry only to find that it has indeed become hostile to himself. While the Sabine villa comes as a gift that places Horace in some comfort, even allowing another to speak the poetry for him, he suddenly finds that he is not welcome in his own book, he has to scare off the competitive voices, who are taking up his own voice developed in Book 1 and are turning them back on him. Davus' final words are the words which betray the whole enterprise:

Aut insanus homo aut versus facit(1.7.116)

Either you are a man out of your mind, or you are making verse.

As Davus hears the aggressive words of Horace he places two options for interpretation, either he is insane, or he is making verses. Are all of Horace's verses composed (*facere)* in a similar state?[265] Presumably not as Horace needs the quietness of his own villa, at least according to the story he creates in his own text. And yet, Horace is never portrayed as creating poems from the comfort of his own home.[266] Typically the poems take the form of interruptions, another voice enters into Horace's quiet and creative mind, and wrests his thoughts away from what he is really doing, and he is forced to write satire by the interruption of another. Davus is the impetus needed for Horace to write a poem, and yet the whole poem was written by Davus, the struggle to write is even captured by Davus, as Horace is unable to write, always seeking sleep or wine (v. 114) confluent with the criticisms of Damasippus about Horace barely writing in 2.3 (v. 3) his either drunken or asleep state.

 Horace as an author is barely visible in the poem because he can barely get a foot in, and when he does he is unable to even write a coherent verse, rather

---

[265] The insanity of a poet is a well attested classical feature of poetic writing, (in the Stoic view, all exept the *sapiens* are already mad*)* and so on the one hand they are not opposites, but on the other hand, the poet is not usually violent, even in expressing violent themes, the rhapsode would remain unviolent in his own body, hence the incongruence between body and expression that bothered certain early critics.

[266] 2.6 is an exception, however even there his voice is usurped by another guest.

than a contest, Horace defensively attacks his slave, showing the same reaction the masses have had to his own satires in Book 1, and the beginning of Book 2. They wish only to blame him, rather than listen to him. Horace has surely become a part of the audience that he has previously attacked.[267] The duality of this process is captured by the *Callidus Servus* as in the action of being unreasonable, Davus notes that actually Horace is writing. After all, Horace has written this satire, but it is not a recollection of a literal conversation. For Oliensis this means that it is a self-deprecatory poem, meant to divert attention away from the author. But I think it can be more than this. Jennifer Ferris-Hill in a more generic discussion talks about the self-deprecatory nature of Horace's satires as a strategy that wins listeners not just as a technique to get sympathy, but that the laughs are greater, and therefore the author receives more praise.[268]She notes the material nature of this praise, as Horace has earlier cast himself as the son of a freed-man, and so the laughs are greater since he is of lowly status, they are not laughing at the misfortune of a well-to-do man, but one who probably deserved it anyway. This ironically builds up the author even more.[269]Ferris-Hill is right in a strictly economic sense. Freudenburg notes the fact that Davus plays a comic mime, and invites Horace onto the stage. Noting his noble status in earlier verse (vv. 53 ff.) Davus then has him up on the stage in these final verses, performing a downgrading of the author to the actual part of the play.[270] In this way the play reveals the role of the author, not in control of his own writing, as the external characters that represent the content of Horace's *Sermones* have tripped him up, they have extended to beyond what the form can handle, and Horace loses control over his own work.

As the penultimate satire in Book 2, it seems to counter my thesis that here is the fruition or completion of Book 1. Here the dialogue form has tripped up and overextended Horace so that he can no longer rely on his form. I do not see this as true. Instead it is actually a testament to the form of Horace's satire. His body

---

[267] This is a part of Sharland's Thesis (2010)

[268] Ferris-Hill (2015 pp. 90-91)

[269] Ferris-Hill (2015 p. 91)

[270] Freudenburg (1993 pp. 225-226)

is not visible behind the feet which he writing, and instead he has become an almost invisible satirist in Book 2. He is removing himself from the narrative, and slowly replacing his voices with others. The content of the satires are being obscured more and more behind the novel form that the author is able to inject himself into.

Sermo 2.8

This final poem is an odd end to the book. The closure of *Sermo* 10 in Book 1 is not replicated. There is no reference to the writing of his book, the artifice has disappeared behind a veritable *farrago* of other characters. The author, Horace, is almost nowhere to be seen. Fundanius, his friend, was not able to come to his dinner party because of a party at Nasidienus' house. Horace, as an interested over-reader wishes to hear the comic poets description of the dinner he was not invited to, even though his patron was there.[271]One gets the feeling at this point, it was one of the dinners that had Horace been invited as Maecenas' *umbra* he would have dropped everything and gone straight away, as Davus, his slave critically complained in the previous satire. Second best, however, is to be present in a retelling of the event. Horace's request to hear Fundanius tell the story if it is not too heavy (*gravis*) alerts us to the fact that what is about to be told will not be a disinterested tale of the various foods eaten, but a satirically charged retelling of a dinner that, while Fundanius claims was the best dinner of his life, has nothing to do with the food itself. The *Gravis* suggests that Horace does not want a serious retelling, not an epic, but a comic mime in the tradition of the comic poet that is Fundanius. The food then will not be disinterested parts of the setting of this satire, but characters and satirically charged entrants into the final stage of Horace's book.

---

[271] Oliensis uses the prase 'over-reader' to refer to the various persons interested in hearing Horace (including Horace himself) and uses it to describe how Horace's poetry functions as addressing a potential listener. (1998 pp. 6-7)

Gowers has already alerted us to the satiric potential of food in her text *The Loaded Table* and I will not enumerate her various observations here.[272] Suffice to say that at this point, some readers maybe will have an irate stomach, as Horace asks what were the dishes that first filled the *iratus venter*. The book up until now has perhaps not quite satisfied the reader in its dialogic form. Horace hopes the final poem will cure these ailments. The poem fills the final point of the narrative, and portrays Horace finally as the final stage in the production of a poem. Horace is the final link in the chain between event and retelling, using his most beloved comic poet Fundanius as the reliable narrator. He is the first narrator who is not either hostile to Horace (Davus and Damasippus) or not quite reliable (Catius). He completes the chain between the event Horace missed, and the event itself. Fundanius is a mouth piece in the proper sense of the word as his words do not challenge or critique Horace's persona, but act in accordance with it, with the exception of gesturing to the fact that he was not where Horace wanted him the night before.

The *ius* in verse 45 is the final part of the satiric layer that washes out Nasidienus' unfortunate meal. The pun is obvious from the start, known from 1.7 and flagged at the start of the book as Horace is discussing the way his *sermones* relate to the law. Of course, this meal is its own satire, as a law unto itself. The mixture of bitter ingredients mixes all through the absurd dinner, and the bitter acerbic juice suggests the whole meal is a farce. Gowers takes it further to satirize the comfortable search for justice in Greek symposia (*dikē* being relevant to *ius*) and in that sense scrubbing the whole enterprise with the brush of satire.[273]It really is the last straw for the diners though, while they still await one more course, the rowdier members begin to get truly restless, asking for more wine and waiting for just one more ball to drop before they lose their patience.

At this point many people, with a collapsed roof would call it a night, but Nasidienus rallies. Still nobody has yet clearly pointed out to Nasidienus the absurdity of his own party. Freudenburg considers the silent whispering in v. 78

---

[272]Gowers' (1993 pp. 161-179) section on 2.8 is thorough.
[273]Gowers (1993 p. 174)

to be evidence of the silence people are keeping in front of Maecenas, even though we all expect laughter.[274] To tell the truth laughing, the hall mark of satire according to Horace, is here not being practiced. There is the slight hint of it by Varius who smothers his laughter with a napkin (63). The satiric moments are barely peeping out of the corners of this *sermo*. The satire then is made up of hints and traces of satire, but mostly pregnant descriptions of food. Finally it all becomes too much as the dismembered parts of the final meal arrive.

Gowers notes the similarity to dismembered poets in book one.[275] She uses it to suggest that you will find the limbs of a poet in a failed cook, although I think it would be pushing it a little too far to suggest that. The similarity is there though, as in 1.4 Horace upholds Ennius as a poet proper, with a real *ingenium*. He has, however, noted that the cook is trying to mend misfortune by art,(84-85) the techniques of a poet are an art, and while one might find the limbs of a poet amongst his broken up rearranged verses, it would be harder pressed to find the limbs of a party organizer amongst the ruins of his over the top dinner. Instead the link suggests to me that Horace reminds us that cooks and satirists are not poets, the effect of finding the limbs of Ennius in a torn apart version of his poems is to confirm his greatness, but here at the final stroke, Horace suggests that a ruined meal is a ruined meal. The cook/party convener, Nasidienus, is unable to bounce back from this. But still the guests are silent.

The final lines are apt, as the guests make a quick getaway. They are however still in silence. They escape, and the final lines are about Horace's arch nemesis, Canidia, the witch from 1.8 who Horace/Priapus statue barely beats, and does so by accident. But here Canidia is referenced, not as a person, but as a myth, to heighten the horrid things the guests are fleeing. Their silent flight is in marked contrast to the flight scene we have in 1.8 where the satirical body finally scared away the witches, and there was much jocularity and laughter (1.8.48-50). The reappearance of Canidia suggests that Horace's satire still at this final point has failed. Not even his description of a hilarious dish is enough to establish a satiric

[274] Freudenburg (2001 p. 119)

[275] Gowers (1993 p.178)

voice in total. It approaches it, and Varius' barely contained sniggers come close, but in the end the figure of Canidia haunts Horace's satires. They have become a kind of poltergeist, inhabiting the description of food given by Fundanius. Oliensis notes the similarity, but considers it as a way to erase the 'face' of Book 1.[276] I see it as a way for Horace to signal the end of this part of his generic project.

At the beginning of my discussion of this poem I already noted the way Horace brought up his own query, as he noted the fact that he had been left out of the party, and had heard about it only because of his own failed party. Horace loses the possibility for satire that he had at his last party in 2.6, and so has to seek it out. The genre of satire becomes about the author's failure to create the perfect situation to write satire. This has been the constant refrain of Book 2, as Horace has either been drunk, tired, or too put off by the city to write his satires. His satires are thwarted by the condition of his own body. While his body has been strangely absent from Book 2, surfacing only briefly here and there, less frequently interrupting satire as in Book 1, but simply stopping it in its tracks. Here then at the end of Book 2, Horace's body completely moves aside. While in Book 1 Horace did not even write the last word, but the final words were kept in by his amanuensis, here he does not even get in a last word. He does not complete the poem with laughter as one might expect, especially with a Canidia around. Instead Horace lets Fundanius finish Book 2 for him. Book 2 dramatizes the effect that society has had on the author. The climb in status that Horace has experienced impacts the poet, and his authorship is challenged. Satire is fundamentally a poetry of poverty, but Horace no longer has that voice to speak from, so in the last analysis, Fundanius speaks at the end, the comic poet praised in Book 1 will have to do. Horace then has completely hidden himself. Whereas in Book 1 he showed himself forward and put his body out there, here he now hides it behind the form of satire that he created. The content is not even biographical, as he is not even present at the final dinner party. The narrative concludes: Horace is not there.

---

[276] Oliensis (1998 p. 62)

Conclusions

"Quo res haec pertinent?" (Horace, *S*. 1.2.23)

Horace's presence throughout his satires has been at various points negotiable, fraught, inscribed, and invisible. The authority given to him on the one hand by the presence of his name at the beginning of any collection of his *Sermones* is undercut by the way in which the dialogue of each of the poems reaches outwards, beginning with Maecenas in *Sermo* 1, Book 1, and ending with the report of Fundanius in *Sermo* 8, Book 2.

In my conclusion I want to try and draw together the various threads I have discussed throughout Book 1 and Book 2 of Horace's *Sermones*. In particular I will focus on the content of his satires, and how the narratives inherent within them. Then I will move towards form, the other feature of satire. Here I will discuss in particular how the author manipulates his form in relation to the content and the narratives found here.

Finally, in the interplay of these two elements I will discuss the author of the *Sermones* and how he is developed through this dialogue of form and content.

Content and Narrative

In my analysis of Book 1 I discussed how the narrative of the book develops towards Horace's eventually externalized writing process in the slave of *Sermo*

10. Throughout this we saw how Horace's content shifted. Traditionally academics have dealt with the books with the content of each satire determining and defining the categories in which they are discussed. So, there are Horace's three diatribe satires, followed by Horace's two literary satires (1.4 & 1.6). 1.5 usually gets its own discussion, and then 1.7-1.9 are dealt with together as satires dealing with characters other than Horace, 1.10 usually gets its own closing section.[277]Content therefore takes precedence over the texts own order in the Books. I, however, think that the content can be read in the order given in the Books, and I have already made my case for this approach in chapter 1.

I think my analysis can also strengthen this argument, as it shows Horace discussing the material elements of his writing in nearly all of his satires. The material elements of writing, from 1.1's *lippus* Crispinus through to the *libellus* of 1.10, are an important theme for Horace. The materiality of writing, and how Horace engages with it, creates a narrative of writing. While poetic media in Rome often attempt to transcend their material circumstances, Horace never moves beyond the page he is writing on.[278] While Rome had a rich culture of the circulation of texts, the idea of your text being circulated did not seem to bring corresponding visions of fame and rejoicing.[279]This idea of the location of poetic writing is important. So, in 1.5 where Horace ends the poem with a reference to the bottom of the page, we are reminded of the artificial nature of the poem, and the journey to Brundisium at once. As *Brundisium longae finis chartaeque viaeque est* (1.5.104) ends with reference to the poet's own writing practice, the use of *finis* both reminds us of Horace's lot in life (c.f. 1.1) as well as the literal end of

---

[277] So Schlegel (2005), Rudd (1982), Oliensis (1998). Freudenburg (2001) is a slight exception, although he jumps around a bit throughout the satires. Zetzel (1980) is another exception; his article ostensibly lays the groundwork making my approach possible.

[278] I.e. Virgil's *arma virumque cano* which (*Aeneid* 1.1) emphasizes the song-nature of the epic, participating in Homer's tradition, and privileging the speaking voice over the written word.

[279] Houston (2014). For the fear of publication see Oliensis (1995) Alternatively Horace's own praise of his *Odes* (3.30.1) acknowledges the staying power of his verses after publication. In a way both admissions befit the genre's they inhabit, lyric subjectivity demands an ostentatious *persona*, while epistolary subjectivity demands the opposite.

the page. Horace's *persona* is limited by the material nature of his writing, and thereby the material location of his poetry. Book 1 ultimately places Horace within the heart of the content of his poetry. Horace's poetry touches upon his own self, and there is an alignment between his verses and his soul.

The content then of Book 1 hinges upon the dialogue between Horace and his book. Horace is located in proximity to the text throughout his text, and finally in proximity to the slave of 1.10, Horace is therefore in constant dialogue with his blank page. The traces of dialogue I analyzed and discussed in Book 1 were always between him and the possibility of freedom in his texts. This freedom was never quite realized, and ultimately the dialogic elements of his voice were challenged and shaped by the pest in 1.9. Horace forcefully reasserts himself in 1.10, and the dialogue of the open book is closed with the cheeky addition of the slave's final lines in 1.10.

By Book 2 however the dialogues of Horace have re-entered the place where previously Horace had stood. The content then of Horace's satires are changed. In Chapter 3 I argued that Book 2 of Horace's *Satires* revisits and expands the dialogue-form, fulfilling some of the expectations of the content of Book 1.[280]The location of the poet to the content of his satires is important, and the celebrated poem about his Sabine villa (2.6) locates the poet in his home, however even here another, Cervius, delivers the satirical elements of his poem. The final poem in this book displaces Horace from the center of the poetic location as the content is delivered by Fundanius, and unlike some other reported teachings by the likes of Damasippus and Catius, here a narrative develops with even Maecenas present, and Horace is absent. While this may seem to be a disavowal of poetic authority, I argue that Horace's absence underscores the dialogue-form's triumph in Horace's poetic development.

---

[280] I have already noted this contrast in my opinion to other scholars, but for other opinions see Oliensis (1998), Schlegel (2005), Fruedenburg (2001), and Sharland (2010).

Form and Narrative

In chapter 1 I mentioned the odd form/content relation in satire. There are no obvious codes or rules. Lucilius' muddy river apparently provided no clear model for content. While the form of the hexameter is present in Lucilius' extant fragments, Horace does not directly credit Lucilius with that innovation. Form is not summed up in meter. The register and tone of the satire, as well as the general shape of individual satires, are an important part of the form.[281] Throughout this then the manipulation of form are important sites in which we understand and witness the freedom of the author.

Throughout Book 1 I discussed how Horace, at various points, manipulates and plays with his form. The main element of this though is how Horace magnifies the form of the book itself. The end of Book 1 places the book placed alongside the slave as constitutive elements of his satiric text. Horace's body and the book are slowly elided so that the form of Horace as an author eventually fills the filed of vision of the reader.[282] This process begins with the *lippus* Crispinus, who signifies the possibility of being too bookish. By 1.4 and 1.5 the satirized body becomes the body of Horace, as the scribblings (*illinere*) happen on his very body. So at that point we have the narrative of Horace becoming a *charta* upon which he writes his own poems. By 1.10 the book is placed alongside Horace's body, and is extended to him through the *instrumentum vocale* of his slave. So, Horace encloses the book with his body.

This development of the form of his satires, whereby the author himself becomes an element of the poetry itself, allows Horace to utilize satire in a potentially hostile environment. Whereas Schlegel sees Horace's satires as attempts to blunt the threatening speech of satire, I see Horace's manipulation of form as a

---

[281] So witness Bond's discussion of the 'frame' of *Sermo* 2.3. (1987)

[282] See Sciarinno (2015) for a discussion of the hyperreality of texts

strategy of distraction.[283] So in 1.5 we see his body obscuring the narrative of the trip to Brundisium and the attempted truce between Augustus and Marc Antony. His narrative might have been dangerous, but instead the form of the satire expands to cover our own vision, thereby infecting even the reader with the eye infection that blurs Horace's own vision (1.5.30). The deflationary command, recorded by a cheeky slave in 1.10 follows Horace's list of *amici* who he deploys to defend his poetry. The threat is deflected by the magnification of the book (*libellus*) and the mention of the slave. The form of Horace's satire takes full place and the content is actually over-written.

In Book 2 the form of Horace's satire again interrupts and displaces the content of Horace's satires. In 2.1 Horace's entire discussion with Trebatius is undercut by punning on the adjectives *bonus* and *malus* as he utilizes them formally, rather than legally. In this way he dodges the legal cases possibly brought against his use of satire by form rather than content. Throughout his satires in Book 2 the same operation is performed by Horace, however, over time, the form begins to replace Horace's body. While in Book 1 Horace's body is elided with the form of the book, here in Book 2 other bodies begin to inhabit the satiric space previously occupied by his body. Ofellus, Damasippus, Catius, Cervius, Ulysses and Tiresias, and Fundanius all become formal elements in Horace's satires as the dialogue form takes prominence. So Horace's authority extends to beyond his own body. While the form of the satires has shaped and eventually replaced his own body, this is another way that Horace is able to make his authority felt, and thereby his presence as an author. He now bends the forms other bodies to his will, and can use elements of reported speech to shape his satires.

The Author narrated

"Ede hominis nomen, simul et, Romanus an hospes" (Horace *S.* 2.4.10)

---

[283] Schlegel (2005 p. 18)

The question of this first person speaker in *Sermo* 2.4 reveals the nature of the voice and the person. Catius refuses to tell the speaker (and us) the name of the speaker, but describes him as an *auctor*. My thesis has asked the same question of Horace. For the most part the author has been narratologically present as an obvious 'I' speaking at various points, listening at various points, and entering other *personae* at others. The narratological question, which investigates the revealed author, is not quite the same as the question I have put to Horace.[284] Instead I have attempted to understand how an author is related to the text. I have found that perhaps the best way to understand the author is through the narrative development of the text, and thus to create a picture of the author based on the complex realities which writing thrusts upon him or her.

The answer of 'who' the author is though is in a way a question more of what authority the text bears. Is the authority of the text concretely related to the speaker cum writer, or is the authority of the text absconded by authorities external to the text.[285] I have attempted to see through the various poems the ways in which the author is part of the text, is taken to precede the text, and is produced from the text. Texts after all are primarily producers of authors. The historical nature of texts and our epistemological position vis-à-vis the person 'behind' any text means our knowledge of them always follows the text, rather than anticipating them. A contemporary author is quite a different kind of human from a dead one. Having said that, the author is still made present to us through their text, and the enduring achievement of the Augustan poets is the fame their poetry still attracts even in these darker days of philistine apathy.

---

[284] See Winkler (1985) for a use of narratology to discover the 'name' of the author. For a critical perspective on the use of narratology in classics see Whitmarsh (2009), although he explicitly discounts Winkler (1985) from his criticisms.

[285] I have throughout this thesis avoided directly asking the question of the dichotomy between the spoken and the written word. There are so many books dealing with this that I will name only a small representative here: Dupont (1999 = 1994), Ong (1982), Goldberg (2005), Habinek (1998 & 2005b) are both relevant here as well, as is Sciarrino (2011).

Throughout Book 1 I noticed, and have already discussed above, the ubiquitous presence of Horace's body and the way in which it becomes an analogue for the book, and even for form. I then discussed Book 2 and the gradually disappearing body of Horace. I have argued that the invisibility of Horace grants him a certain authority that is lacking in Book 1, and that can only be built up through the narrative of his satires.[286] I will not belabor these points anymore but I thought it best to use these final pages of my thesis to relate my findings back to my introduction and literature review where I discussed the various elements of a satiric author.

In my review I described how Quintilian constructed satire as 'totally Roman'. Horace's use of satire then can be seen as in part an attempt to create this 'roman' genre. The quotation from *Sermo* 2.4 at the start of this final section of my conclusion highlights the questions we can ask of an authoritative figure: is he roman or an alien (*hospes*). The authority in question is presumably secured by the identification of the author with Rome, and thereby with an identity that precedes any special skill or dangerous magic.[287] Horace's own poetry is I think representative of this roman tradition, and I pointed out how Horace places his own satire within the republican tradition of poetry.

By the same token, Freudenburg's thesis that Horace is agonizing over the death of *Libertas*, is related to the '*romanitas*' of Horace's satires.[288] His location of the author between the genre and the text is however I think a little under-theorized and therefore not quite right. The genre of the satire *as* satire is difficult. The lack

---

[286] It strikes me that this is the general shape of the satires in Rome. By Juvenal the author is absent in an even more obvious way than Horace or Perseus. Is the absent authority the only kind available as the Emperors of Rome become more and more dictatorial and ruthless? See Uden (2014) for more on the invisibility of Juvenal, and his place within the second century roman world.

[287] The association of Greek literature with poison can be seen for example in Cato *Ad Filium* (Pliny *NH* 29.14 = 1 C&Sbl). Elliott's (1966) work could also be read in this light, and thereby related to Schlegel's (2005) reading of Horace as an attempt to purge satire of invective.

[288] Freudenburg (2001)

of corresponding form and content has been an important question for me. I have noted extensively how Horace utilizes the form of his poetry to obscure the content, and this can be seen as a result of this incongruity between form and content. Horace as an author sees himself as in control of form, while experiencing a lack of control over content. This can be seen as the narrative of the content slowly excludes the character of Horace from the content of the satires from Book 1 to Book 2.

The authority of Horace however is found in his use of form. Here Lowrie's work on the authority of poets and the interest with which they invested in their works is relevant. Horace as an author expresses authority through his manipulations of form, shaping the reception of the content, and thereby his own reception as an author through the shaping of his form. This is perhaps clearest in 2.1 where Horace puns on the usage of *bonus* as both legal and literary terms. The narrative of Horace's authority as form is one in which slowly Horace operates mostly within the frames of his poetry and manipulates the form of his satires to shape his own very self.

The final poem in the book will be a good place to close. As Fundanius is the invited guest to Nasidienus, he is the privileged speaker and the body we encounter is his rather than Horace's. The form of the satire is introduced though merely by the presence of Horace as the manipulator of dialogue. Throughout the satires Horace has been creating a dialogue for us to engage with.[289]Finally we engage with this poem, the content of which seems harmless enough. The amusing tale of a dinner-party gone wrong, the presence however of Maecenas alerts us to the possibility of a sting. The 'lesson' of such a satire does not concern me, but the fact that a disarming tale can become the possibility of invective suggests the power Horace creates with his formal manipulation. It suggests the power of the song he is able to create. The category of song which I discussed, following Habinek, was primarily to discuss satire's ludic

---

[289] Oliensis (1998) tacitly suggests this with her discussion of 'over-readers', while Sharland (2010) explicitly discusses this phenomenon.

qualities.[290]The idea of play can perhaps apply here to consider Horace's satire's as participating in a narrative progression towards his more 'serious' works like the *Odes* and *Epodes*. The creation then of a certain kind of author is importantly cast as a narrative creation, which is revealed rather than told.

In this thesis then we can discover an author who expresses authority slowly but surely. While he initially he enters into the poetry and expresses his authority as a kind of embodied experience, he slowly leaves this and we can see this as a process of allowing the *form* of satire do the work his body did in Book 1. The author of Horace's *Sermones* performs the embodying of authority, expressing his authority through his material poetic tools and the place of his poetry and then the dialogues of Book 2 fulfill these expectations and allow the poetry qua poetry speak for itself through the form of satire, the place where the author resides. The disappearance of the author into the poetic text, initially attempted through Horace's body, and the conflation of book, form, and poet, finally rests when the form takes over and allows the author to manipulate the text *in absentia*. Horace is not there.[291]

---

[290] Habinek (2005a) & (2005b).

[291] My title is indebted to two films released in the last decade and a half. The first: *American Psycho* by Mary Harron (2000) in which the protagonist, Patrick Bateman (Christian Bale), is an American investment banker whose only pleasures in life are the material and external accouterments he acquires. The beginning of the movie is a lengthy monologue by Bateman that concludes with the phrase 'I simply am not there'. The other debt is to the biographical film *I'm not there* by Todd Haynes (2007). This biographical film covers the life and times of Bob Dylan through a kaleidoscopic focalization technique, involving multiple different actors who play different iterations of Bob Dylan's complex *persona*.

Bibliography

Texts and commentaries

Brown, P.M., 1993. *Horace,* Satires *I.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

Dindorf, L., (Ed.) 1864. *Dionis Cassii Cocceiani:* Historia Romana. Leipzig: B.G, Teubner

Fairclough, H.R., (Ed., Trans.) 1926. *Horace* Satires, Epistles & Ars Poetica. Great Britain: Harvard University Press.

Fleckeiseni, A., (Ed.) 1869. *Plautus* Comedies Vol. 1. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner

Gowers, E., 2012. *Horace,* Satires*: Book I.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klingner, F., 1959. (Ed.) *Horatius Opera*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

Muecke, F., 1993. *Horace* Satires *II,* Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

Russel, D.A., 2001 (Ed. Trans.) *Quintilian,* The Orator's Education *Books 9-10*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Warmington, E.H., (Ed., Trans.) 1938. *Remains of Old Latin III: Lucilius, Laws of the XII Tables*. Great Britain: Harvard University Press.

Williams, W.G., (Ed., Trans.) 1929. *Cicero* Letters to his Friends II. Great Britain: Harvard University Press.

Secondary Sources

Adams, J., 2015. Fabulae Hygini: *The Social and Ideological Context of Mythography*. Honours Thesis. Canterbury University, Christchurch.

Anderson, W.S., 1982b. 'The Form, Purpose, and Position of Horace's *Satire* 1.8' in *Essays on Roman Satire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 74-83

      2005=1982a 'Roman Satirists and Literary Criticism' in *Latin Verse Satire* Miller, P.A., (Ed.) *Latin Verse Satire.* London: Routledge Publishers

Barchiesi, A. and Cucchiarelli A., 2005. 'Satire and the Poet: The Body as Self-Referential Symbol' in Freudenburg. K., (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 207-223

Barthes, R., 1977. 'The Death of the Author' in Heath. S., (ed.) *Image, Music, Text.* London: Fontana Press. 142-148

Benjamin, W., 1970. 'The Story Teller' in Arendt, H., (ed.) *Illuminations* London: Lowe & Brydone, Zohn, J., (trans.) 83-110

Boll, F., 1913. 'Die Anordnung im zweiten Buch von Horaz' Satiren.' *Hermes* 48: 143-5.

Bond, R.P., 1985. 'Dialectic, Eclectic and Myth (?) in Horace, *Satires* 2.6.' in Antichton Vol. 19, January. 68-86

      1987. 'The Characterisation of the Interlocutors in Horace' in *Prudentia* Vol. XIX, No. 1 1-21

      2009. 'Horace's Political Journey' in Domink, W.J., Garthwaite, J., & Roche, P.A., (eds.) *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome.* Leiden:Brill 133-152

Bowditch, P.L., 2001. *The Gift Economy of Patronage in Horace* Berkely:
University of California Press

Braund, S. (ed.) 1989. *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome.* Exeter: Exeter
University Publications
        1992. *Roman Verse Satire.* Oxford: Oxford University Press
        1996. *The Roman Satirists and their Masks.* London: Bristol Classical Press

Breed, B.W., 2008. 'Harrison, S.J., *Generic Enrichment in Vergil & Horace'* (book
review) Bryn Mawr Classical Review

Brink, C.O., 1963. *Horace on Poetry: Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles.*
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Clay, D., 1998. 'The Theory of the Literary Persona in Antiquity' in *Materiali e
discussion per l'analisi dei testi classici,* no. 40, 9-40.

Conte, G.B. 1994. *Genres and Readers* trans. Trans: Most, G. Maryland: John
Hopkins University Press

Cucchiarelli, A., 2001. *La Satira e il poeta Orazio tra Epodi e Sermones* Pisa:
Giardini

Dupont, F., 1999. *The Invention of Literature: From Greek Intoxication to the Latin
Book.* Trans: Lloyd, J., Maryland: John Hopkins University Press.

De Jong, I.J.F., 2014. *Narratology & Classics A Practical Guide.*Oxford: Oxford
University Press

De Jong, I.J.F., & Sullivan, J.P., (Eds.) 1994. *Modern Critical Theory & Classical
Literature.* Lieden: Brill

Depew, M., & Obink, D., (Eds.) 2000. *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Eagleton, T., 2012. *The Event of Literature.* London: Yale University Press

Edmonds, L., 2001. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

Elliott, R.C., 1966. *The Power of Satire. Magic, Ritual, Art.* Princeton: Princeton University Press

Feeney, D. 2005 'The Beginnings of a Literature in Latin.' *Journal of Roman Studies* 95: 226-40

Feeney, D. and Katz, J.T. 2006. 'T. Habinek. *The World of Roman Song: from Ritualized Speech to Social Order'* (review). *Journal of Roman Studies* 96: 240-42

Ferriss-Hill, J., 'A Stroll with Lucilius: Horace, Satires 1.9 Reconsidered,' *AJP* 132.3 (2011): 429-55.

       2015. *Roman Satire and the Old Comic Tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Fiske, G.C., 1920. *Lucilius and Horace A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press

Foucault, M., 1972. *The Archeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language* New York: Pantheon Books. Trans. Sheridan Smith, A.M.

       1998. 'What is an Author?' in Faubion J.D., (ed.) *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology* New York: The New York Press 205- 222 Trans. Faubion J.D.

Fraenkel, E., 1957. *Horace*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Freudenberg, K., 1993. *The Walking Muse Horace on the theory of Satire*
Princeton: Princeton University Press
      2001 *Satires of Rome, Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal.*
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Goldberg, S.M., 2005. *Construction Literature in the Roman Republic.* Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press

Gowers, E., 1993. *The Loaded Table Representations of Food in Roman Literature*
Oxford: Clarendon Press
      2003. 'Fragments of Autobiography in Horace Satires 1' in *Classical Antiquity* vol.22, No.1 55-91
      2010 'The Ends of the Beginning: Horace, *Satires* 1. In Houghton, L.B.T., &
Wyke, M., (Eds.) *Perceptions of Horace: A Poet and His Readers.* Cambridge,
Cambridge University Press. 39-60

Habinek, T., 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in
Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
      2005a. 'Satire as Aristocratic Play' in Freudenburg K. (ed.), *Cambridge
Companion to Roman Satire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 177-191
      2005b. *The World of Roman Song: from Ritualized Speech to Social Order.*
John Hopkins University Press.

Harrison G., 1987. 'The Confessions of Lucilius (Horace "Sat." 2.1.30-34): A
Defence of Autobiographical Satire?' in *Classical Antiquity* vol. 6, No. 38-52

Harrison S.J., 2001. *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory and Classical
Literature* (ed.) Oxford:)Oxford University Press
      2005 (ed.) *A companion to Latin Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing
      2007. *Generic Enrichment in Vergil & Horace.* Oxford: Oxford University
Press

2013. 'Author and Speaker(s) in Horace's *Satires* 2' in Marmodoro A., & Hill J., (Eds.) *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity* Oxford: Oxford University Press 153-171

Henderson J., 1989 'Satire writes Woman: Gendersong' *PCPS* 35: 50-80
1993. 'Be Alert (your country needs lerts): Horace, *Satires* 1.9' in *PCPS* 39: 67-93
1994. 'On Getting Rid of Kings: Horace Satire 1.7' *The Classical Quarterly,* vol. 44, No. 1: 146-170

Hinds S., 1998. *Allusion and Intertext, dynamics of appropriation in Roman Poetry.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Houston, G.W., 2014. *Inside Roman Libraries Book collections and their Management in Antiquity*. North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press.

Keane, C., 2002. Satiric Memories: Autobiography and the Construction of Genre in *The Classical Journal,* Vol. 97, No. 3 (Feb-March) 215-231
2006. *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Kennedy J.F., 1992. ''Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan': Reflections on Terms of Reference' in Powell A. (Ed.) *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the age of Augustus* London: Bristol Classical Press 26-58

Kilpatrick, R., 1986. *The Poetry of Friendship: Horace* Epistles *Book 1*. Alberta: University of Alberta Press.

Lively, G., and Sulzman-Mitchell, P., 2008. *Latin Elegy and Narratology: Fragments of a Story.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press

Lowrie M., 2009. *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome.* New York: Oxford University Press

Martindale, C., 1993. *Redeeming the Text, Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

   1997 'Green Politics: The *Eclogues*' in Martindale, C., (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 107-124

Mccarthy K., 2010. 'First Person Poetry' in Barchiesi A., & Schiedel, W., (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Studies.* Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press. 435-449

McNeill, R.B., 2001. *Horace. Image, Identity, and Audience.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press

Miller, P. ed. 2005. *Latin Verse Satire.* New York: Routledge

Muecke F., 1979 'Horace and the Satirists: Form and Method in 1.4' in *Prudentia* 11: 55-68

Oliensis E., 1995. 'Life After Publication: Horace Epistles I.20.' in *Arethusa* 28: 209-24

   1998. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Onega, S., & Garcia Landa, J.A., (Eds.) 1996. *Narratology.* New York: Longman Publishing

Ong, W., 1982 *Orality and Literacy: The technologizing of the word.* New York: Routledge

Ramage E. S., D. L. Sigsbee, and S. C. Fredericks. 1974. *Roman Satirists and their Satire: The Fine Art of Criticism in Ancient Rome.* Park Ridge, NJ: Noyes Press.

Richlin 1983. *The Garden of Priapus* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Roman L., 2001. 'The representation of Literary materiality in Martial's "Epigrams"' in *The Journal of Roman Studies.* Vol. 91: 113-145

Rudd N., 1982. *The Satires of Horace*. Los Agneles: University of California Press.

Schlegel, C.M., 2005 *Satire and the Threat of Speech: Horace's* Satires Book 1. London: University of Wisconsin Press
        2010 'Horace and the Satirists's Mask: Shadowboxing with Lucilius in Davis, G., (ed.) *A Companion to Horace.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. 253-270

Sciarrino, E., 2011. *Cato the Censor and the Beginnings of Latin Prose*. Ohio: Ohio State University Press
        2015. 'Hyperreality, Intertextuality, and the Study of Latin Poetry' in *Arethusa* 48: 369-390

Sharland, S. 2010. Horace in Dialogue: Bakhtinian Readings in the Satires. Oxford: Peter Lang.

Uden, J., 2014. *The Invisible Satirist: Juvenal and Second-Century Rome.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Van Rooy, C.A., 1955. 'Quintilian X 1, 93 Once more' in *Mnemosyne ,* Fourth Series, Vol. 8, Fasc. 4 305-310
                1971. 'Arrangment and structure of satires in Horace, *Sermones,* Book 1: Satire 7 as related to Satires 10 and 8', *Acta Classica* 14:67-90

Wark, M., 2011. *The Beach Beneath the Street: The Everyday Life and Glorious Times of the Situationist International*. London: Verso

White, P., 1993. *Promised Verse.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Whitmarsh, T., 2009. 'An I for an I: Reading fictional autobiography' in Marmodoro A., & Hill J., (Eds.) *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity* Oxford: Oxford University Press 233-250

Whybrew, L., *The Relationsip Between Horace's* Sermones *and* Epistulae *Book 1: "Are the Letters of Horace Satires?"* Ph.D. Thesis, Canterbury University, Christchurch.

Winkler, J.J., 1985. *Auctor & Actor: A Narratological Reading of Apuleius's* The Golden Ass. California: University of California Press.

Witke, C., 1970. *Latin Satire The Structure of Persuasion.* Leiden: Brill
Wiseman, T.P., 2008. *Unwritten Rome.* Exeter: University of Exeter Press

Woodman, T., & Feeney, D., (eds.) 2002. *Traditions & Contexts in the Poetry of Horace.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Woods, Heather A. 2012. *Hunting literary legacies: captatio in Roman satire.* Retrieved from the University of Minnesota Digital Conservancy, http://purl.umn.edu/144349.

Zetzel, J.E.G. 1980. 'Horace's Liber Sermonum: The Structure of Ambiguity.' in *Arethusa* 13.1: 59–77.