C. Witke, *Latin Satire. The Structure of Persuasion* (Leiden, 1970)
T.P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate 139 B.C. - A.D. 14* (Oxford, 1971)
Roman Studies Literary and Historical (Liverpool/New Hampshire, 1987)
E.C. Woodcock, *A New Latin Syntax* (London, 1959, reprinted 1962)
T. Zielinski, *Horace et la société romain du temps d'Auguste* (Paris, 1938)
F. Zoccali, 'Parodia e Moralismo nella Satira II, 5 di Orazio', *Atti della Accademia Peloritani dei Pericolanti, Classe di Lettere Filosofia e Belle Arti* 55 (1979), 303-321

Introduction

1. HORACE IN THE LATE 30s B.C.

Horace's satires were composed in the politically uncertain and socially traumatic period between Philippi and the aftermath of the battle of Actium (41-29 B.C.). In 42 B.C. in the Philippi campaign Horace served as military tribune under Brutus against Antony and Caesar's heir, the young Octavian. In 31 B.C. he supported, with his words if not also with his presence, Octavian's victorious campaign against Antony. This is also the span of the *Epodes* (published about 30 B.C.). Actium, the great turning point, is given pride of place in the first *Epode*, a poem on Horace's commitment to Maecenas and his cause. If the political context of *Satires* Book 1 (published about 35 B.C.) is Octavian's consolidation of power in Italy and the war against Sextus Pompeius (defeated 36 B.C.), in Book 2 the battle of Actium has been won and Octavian's power is acknowledged as supreme (*Sat.* 2.1.11, *Caesaris invicti res*). Of references which can date the period of composition the latest is to 30 B.C. (*Sat.* 2.6.55f.), the earliest to 33 (*Sat.* 2.3.185, the aedileship of Agrippa).

The first half of the thirties saw Horace establishing himself, though not perhaps in the career for which his education had been preparing him. Pardoned after Philippi, he returned to Rome, and, though his father's lands at Venusia had been confiscated, he was able to purchase the not unimportant position of a treasury official (*scriba quaestorius*). The income from this would have enabled him to live comfortably and, if he could meet the required financial status, he would have been eligible for entry to the equestrian order. At the same time he was becoming recognised as a poet. Close friendships with Virgil and Varius developed, and these led, in 38 B.C., to an introduction to Maecenas, Octavian's influential organiser of public opinion.

Between Books 1 and 2 of the *Satires* the circumstances of Horace's life appear to change. In Book 1 friendship with Maecenas went hand in hand with involvement with a wider circle of literary friends (*Sat.* 1.10.81ff.), of whom only Fundanius, Varius and Viscus Thurinus are mentioned in the later collection (all in *Sat.* 2.8). 'Closer to the gods', Horace now seems a more confident, but more isolated figure. This may just be a function of his new *persona*, that of the detached observer, or the result of his giving less attention (for whatever reason) to the topic of his standing as a poet (but see *Sat.* 2.1). The purchase (with Maecenas's help) of the Sabine estate also makes a difference to the ethos of Book 2. The counterpoint of country and city life dominates two satires (2 and 6) and surfaces in two others (3 and 7). In *Sat.* 2.6 the villa and its landscape begin to take on their emblematic significance for Horace's conception of his life.

In spite of the political turmoil the early thirties were a period of extraordinary literary creativity. Of the works referred to in the list of approved contemporaries at *Sat.* 1.10.40ff., Virgil's *Eclogues* (dating from 42 B.C.) is the only one that has survived. In the exquisiteness of their artistry and their mastery of the principles of Hellenistic poetry these poems set a new agenda for Latin poetry. In Virgil's *Georgics* (completed 29 B.C.?) Callimacheanism is combined with a complex moral response to the

contemporary world. However different in scope and focus were Horace's *Satires* he shared Virgil's poetic ideals.

Horace's life: for a brief summary N-H 1970, xxvii, discussed more fully by Fraenkel 1957, 1-23; in the period of the satires, Armstrong 1989, 26-67; his status at the time of the satires, Armstrong 1986, 255-88; the political itinerary of the *Epodes*, Nisbet, of *Satires* 1, DuQuesnay; friendship with Maecenas, Reckford, E. Lefèvre, 'Horaz und Maecenas', *ANRW* II.31.3 (1981), 1987-2029, DuQuesnay, 24-7; Virgil's Callimacheanism, W.V. Clausen, 'Callimachus and Latin Poetry', *GRBS* 5 (1964), 181-96; influence of *Eclogues,* C.A. van Rooy, *'Imitatio* of Vergil, *Eclogues* in Horace, *Satires* book I', *AClass* 16 (1973), 69-88.

2. SATIRE—AN ANTI-GENRE?

Modern theorists do not regard satire as a genre, but as a mode not confined to any one generic form. But in Roman literature verse satire had a fixed form, arrived at after some early experiments, collections in diverse metres dealing with a variety of subjects (e.g. Ennius's *Saturae*). From Lucilius on (Books 30, 1-21), verse satire used the hexameter, originally the metre of epic.

For this fixing of the metrical form and for his aggressive criticism of individuals, Lucilius was regarded by his followers as the inventor of the genre. His thirty books of satires were composed from about 130 B.C. and demonstrate an intense engagement with the politics and culture of his period. Given his social standing, there is nothing surprising about such an involvement. He was an *eques* ('knight') from an aristocratic and wealthy Campanian family, and he became the friend of Scipio Aemilianus (185/4-129 B.C.), a leading general and politician, as well as patron of literature with his own intellectual interests. What was original about Lucilius was his choice of an informal way of writing largely built upon his and his contemporaries' conversations.

In the generation before Horace's the polymath M. Terentius Varro introduced another kind of satiric writing to Rome. His *Menippean Satires*, imitations of the work of the Cynic philosopher Menippus of Gadara (first half of the third century B.C.), were in prose, with the occasional insertion of verse passages in diverse metres. Of the 150 books he is recorded as having written, only titles and small fragments survive. Though Horace does not refer to Varro as a predecessor, they have a great deal in common, especially their use of the different forms of dialogue, their interest in food and the symposiac setting, and the ethical criticism of current social practices. Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* is a later Menippean satire in Varro's manner, a kind which may also have contributed to Petronius's *Satyricon*. In the second century A.D. Lucian revived Menippus in Greek.

The history of satire at Rome illustrates the diversity which still characterises this kind of writing. The word *satura* itself initially pointed to this diversity, according to the etymological explanations preserved by Diomedes, a late grammarian (*GLK* I 485). The derivations he gives are: 1) from the (Greek) satyrs, 2) from (*lanx*) *satura*, a dish full of many different first-fruits offered to the gods, 3) from a kind of sausage called *satura*, stuffed with many ingredients, and 4) from the legal term *per saturam*, of a law

containing mixed provisions. Of these, the second seems most likely to be the oldest, the first being etymologically impossible and the last an extension of the meaning 'medley'. In spite of the later shift in meaning to 'abusive verse' (see *Sat.* 2.1.1), the notion of mixture or medley is one of the keys to an understanding of the genre, which combines a wide variety of subjects with a range of styles and types of language.

Another important aspect of Roman verse satire is captured by the term *Sermones* ('conversations', 'chats'), Horace's title for his satires, following Lucilius (e.g. 1039W). Satire is talk in verse, Horace's word for their style being *pedester* ('walking'). They go on foot, on the ground, in contrast to the poetic flight of the higher genres (see *Sat.* 1.4.39-62). Much follows from this conception of satire.

Satire, like conversation, is informal and loosely structured. It moves easily from one topic to another. It can be prolix, as was Lucilius (called 'loquacious', *Sat.* 1.4.12). It is talk to someone, either to an addressee imagined as present and able to respond, or between partners in a staged dialogue. It aims to entertain and amuse as well as to inform and reform. The topics of the talk are various as are the forms they take (monologue, dialogue, lecture, letter). Like gossip, satire is interested in what is happening in the streets, market-places, courtrooms, theatres, arcades, dining-rooms and bedrooms of the city. Against such back-drops, as if on a stage, people act out their lives, observed and recorded by the satirist.

It is not possible for the satirist just to record, however, and here his trouble starts. Mentioning a name, singling someone out, depicting a character — all this is inevitably read as meaning something. The point will be assumed to be a critical point. Hence arise both the traditional definition of satire as 'a poem composed to censure people's vices' (Diomedes *GLK* I 485) and the traditional defence on the grounds that the victims deserve exposure. However one-sided in relation to the actual practices of the Roman satirists it may be, this notion of satire is the one that links subsequent writers to the inventor of the genre, Lucilius, who 'scoured the city with plenty of salt' (*Sat.* 1.10.4f.) and 'arraigned the people's leaders and the people tribe by tribe' (*Sat.* 2.1.69).

The analogy with conversation illuminates only one facet of the satiric style, privileging the illusion of informality and immediacy at the expense of the range and variety of linguistic material drawn upon. The distinctive conversational approach of Horace's satires is an effect produced by considerable artistic skill, as the poet himself indicates. Though at times he may deny that satire is 'poetry', at others he criticises Lucilius for not working at his writing (*Sat.* 1.4.12f.) and he selects 'writing' as the way he himself can improve the genre (*Sat.* 1.10.47), setting out his stylistic requirements of it: readability, control and variety of tone and subtlety of approach (*Sat.* 1.10.9ff.). While preserving the Lucilian sense of casual organisation, Horace unifies his themes and underpins the connections of thought by verbal repetition and patterns of formal symmetry.

If the satires of Book 2 differ from some of those of Book 1 in having a more obvious unity of theme they still combine within them a diverse range of anecdotes and examples (e.g. *Sat.* 2.3). These bring with them linguistic difference since they provide the opportunity to incorporate and exploit pre-formed literary and non-literary material. Horace's satires abound in quotations, imitations and parodies of other poets and literary genres. Linguistic formulae from other sources — the professions, popular language

with its sayings and proverbs — are also deployed with wit to add precision or colour to a context. The right word, be it technical, colloquial or metaphorical, brings a subject into sharp focus and makes for particularity.

Various factors combine to put satire at the bottom of the hierarchy of genres: its affiliations with prose, the every-day material it treats, its use of obscene, colloquial and technical words, its comic qualities of irony, wit and irreverence. Its practitioners exploited this position as its strength. The rules of the genre were not of exclusion but of inclusion. As it claimed the freedom critically to depict the varieties of human behaviour, so it could, indeed had to, draw parasitically or parodically on the full range of genres and discourses to construct its own vision of the world.

Lucilius (180 or 168/7-102/1 B.C.), see Braund 1992, 10-15, Coffey, 35-62, Rudd 1966, 86-131, Gratwick, 160-171, Henderson in Braund 1989, 99-102; Varro see Coffey, 149-64; etymology of *satura*, see Braund 1992, 6-7, Coffey, 3-23; variety, C.J. Classen, 'Satire — The Elusive Genre', *SO* 63 (1988), 95-121; urban genre, M. Hodgart, *Satire* (London, 1969), 129, A. Kernan, *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance* (New Haven, 1959), 7-14; "unity in diversity", Brink 1982, 488-95, 513-22, description and wit, 460-61, associative techniques of conversation, Williams 1972, 17-18, unifying structures, D. Armstrong, 'Horace, *Satires* I, 1-3: A Structural Study', *Arion* 3 (1964), 86-96; anecdotes, Fraenkel 1957, 143 n.1, McGann 1954; linguistic and metrical virtuosity, Coffey, 93-96; generic inclusiveness, Braund 1992, 3-4.

3. THE SATIRIC SELF-PORTRAIT

Lucilius's copious works filled thirty books of which about 1300 lines survive in extracts rarely exceeding two or three lines. From these we can get an idea of the range of his interests. But in attempting to reconstruct Lucilius we must remember that we lack the discursive context of these fragments and that we know relatively little about the poet's socio-cultural milieu.

The subjects of his satires range from poetry, grammar and spelling to politics, military life, a journey, a gladiators' fight, dinner-parties, food and sex. Our fragments reflect the later grammarians' interest in linguistic oddities and so convey at least the lively, if inelegant, particularity of his vocabulary.

Besides the freedom of speech for which he praised Lucilius, Horace singles out the autobiographical approach as a significant feature of his predecessor:

> In the old days, he entrusted his secrets to his books, as though to faithful friends, having no other outlet whether things had gone well or ill. The result is that the old man's whole life is open to view as if sketched on a votive tablet. (*Sat.* 2.1.30-34)

Lucilius is always a presence in his satire, relating his experiences, expressing his reactions and prejudices, and advocating his hobby-horses. He depicts himself and others in ordinary scenes and settings, in a kind of writing in which the poet and his readers connect with each other within the work. For this type of autobiographical approach

Horace uses an image drawn from painting to make us aware that the expression of the man's natural authenticity in his writing is a matter of art. The self is revealed in a self-portrait, shaped more or less well, and for a rhetorical purpose. Lucilius's *persona* (mask) was not simple, however. As speaker, he assumes different roles for different purposes, appearing not only as himself, but as teacher and preacher, clown, or urbane raconteur. This versatility in self-presentation was as important an influence on Horace as the impression of candour.

In Horace's satires there is a fascinating interplay between the different roles the poet assumes. The satiric 'speaker', especially the speaker of the monologues in Book 1, is not to be identified with the author. This is a voice constructed from the didactic-philosophical tradition, though not simply a reproduction of it. At the same time in examples, anecdotes and 'autobiographical' episodes, the satires present fragmentary visions of 'Horace' the man, as he shows himself or is seen by others to behave. This 'Horace' has a recognisable identity but is a bundle of contradictions, who nevertheless aspires to a consistent moral ideal, from which he reveals himself occasionally falling short. His failure to practise what he preaches does not necessarily devalue his ethical vision.

Modern scholars' disagreements on what the satires are about spring from the ways they understand this ironic, mock-humble self-presentation. Is Horace's irony a sign of intellectual freedom or is his wit merely harmless, a disguise of temporising servility? Do we share his vision of civilised urbanity or do we regard it as an insidious tranquilliser? For some, Horace is 'above all a poet of personal ethos and ethics' (Brink 1982, 539), concerned to fashion a way of writing that bears on his own and his fellows' problems of living; for others, his story 'reinforces the values and exclusivity' (Braund 1992, 22) of Maecenas's circle, an élite group. However apolitical they seem, it is argued, the satires are at the service of partisan politics and a particular political programme. However, the real question is not whether the satires are ethical or political (for all texts can be seen as both political and ethical in some way), but how? What kind of community do they constitute, with what values, and do those values indeed correspond to an Augustan political programme?

Horace *Sat.* 2.1.30-34: simile involves hint of naive artistry, Anderson 1982, 30-32, Horace also claiming this low status for himself, Harrison, 38-52; autobiographical approach, Harrison, 38-40; *persona* or *personae* of Horace in the satires, K.J. Reckford, *Horace* (New York, 1969), 35, Anderson 1982, 28-30, J.F.G. Zetzel, 'Horace's *Liber Sermonum*: The Structure of Ambiguity', *Arethusa* 13 (1980), 59-77; unity of ethos, Reinelt; interesting treatment of 18th century interpretations of Horace, Stack, 3-17; assessments of Horace, Braund 1992, 22, Henderson in Braund 1989, 102-3; G. Williams, 'Augustan Literary Patronage', in Raaflaub and Toher, 258-75, draws the distinction between personal panegyric and support of a programme; ethical Horace, Brouwer, 163-187, Macleod 1983, 280-91; apolitical, Rudd 1966, 10; partisan politics, DuQuesnay with D. Kennedy, *LCM* 9 (1984), 157-60; text as constitutive of community, James Boyd White, *Justice as Translation. An Essay in Cultural and Legal Criticism* (Chicago and London, 1990); for positive assessments of Augustan humanism see Z. Yavetz, 'The Personality of Augustus', in Raaflaub and Toher, 21-41, K. Galinsky, 'Recent Trends in the Interpretation of the Augustan Age', *AugAge* 5 (1986), 22-36.

4. 'DIATRIBE', DIALOGUE AND PHILOSOPHY

In Latin literary history the word 'diatribe' has acquired a special meaning. It refers to a short ethical discourse in a particular rhetorical style. The 'diatribe-style' (which may be found in a range of genres) is characterised by concrete language and vivid imagery and the use of fables, proverbs and anecdotes. It has a quasi-dramatic element in that it is addressed directly to the listener and at times incorporates the rejoinders of an imaginary interlocutor. There are examples of this style in Cicero's *Stoic Paradoxes*, Lucretius (esp. Book 3) and Seneca's *Moral Epistles* as well as Horace's *Satires*.

The use of the word 'diatribe' for this style makes the assumption that there was a particular genre of Greek popular philosophy (associated with Bion, a Cynicising philosopher of the Hellenistic period, cf. *Epist.* 2.2.59-60) which influenced Roman satire. This theory has recently been subject to sceptical scrutiny and the argument put forward that, as the Greek term 'diatribe' did not refer to a particular literary form, we should not use the derived English word as if it had an ancient equivalent.

Other modern terms applied to Horace's 'diatribe' satires, such as 'sermons', 'homilies', 'preaching', also point to the moralising content and the direct relationship between speaker and audience. This is not technical philosophy addressed to an audience of students, but popular moralising aimed at the unconverted. If we can assume a tradition of the popular philosophical lecture in a rhetorical style the question then arises of how closely Horace's satires were connected with it and to what extent the poet is self-consciously setting himself within it and against it. He never subscribes exclusively to one philosophical system, constantly ironising the professional philosophical teachers (e.g. *Sat.* 1.3.133ff., *Sat.* 2.3), who lack the true wisdom that comes from experience of life (cf. Ofellus).

The first three satires of Horace's first book are monologues in which the satirist or 'speaker' explores a succession of moral topics. The setting may be conversational but the speaker becomes more formally didactic, adopting at times a confrontational attitude towards the fictitious representative of the audience drawn into the satire. Here already Horace displayed a certain discomfort with his dual role as satirist and moral teacher, these three poems exemplifying the kind of satire that he justifies in *Sat.* 1.4 with the argument that he was really only trying to teach himself. Still, such an apology is a rhetorical tactic, which allows the teaching to continue. In Book 2 he avoids the dilemma by placing himself in the position of someone being taught and criticised by a series of 'experts' or 'would-be-experts'.

This new role means that 'Horace' the satiric speaker completely disappears (except in *Sat.* 2.2), and dialogue becomes the dominant form. Book 1 had mainly consisted of different kinds of monologue, which might incorporate snatches of quoted direct speech. Conversation now appears in its own right as dramatic dialogue, independently, or as a frame for the set-piece lectures. At first sight the distinctions of form are more clear-cut than in the monologues where 'I' is both poet and satiric speaker, yet these structures too provide the opportunity for built-in ambivalence, through which the reader is enlisted in the unmasking of the dogmatic speakers. Parodic ambiguity arises either from an ironically incongruous content (as in *Sat.* 2.4) or from the setting of the lecture in an

ironic perspective (Damasippus quotes Stertinius in *Sat.* 2.3, Davus's third-hand philosophy comes from Crispinus's door-keeper in *Sat.* 2.7).

In the individual satires the dialogue-form is deployed with considerable variety. The term 'dialogue' covers a number of practices: it implies the presence of more than one speaker, the representation through direct speech of a realistic, dramatic interaction and an affiliation to the genre of the philosophical dialogue. The playful allusions to Plato and Platonic dialogue at the beginnings of *Sat.* 2.2 and 2.4 are hints about the general ethos of the book, which is at once more dramatic and more philosophical than Book 1. The content of Sat. 2.8, for example, is not philosophical, yet this poem too is linked to this aspect of the book by its Platonic allusion and the bow to Plato's *Symposium*. In fact, Horace's dialogues are as close to the Aristotelian/Ciceronian form as to the Platonic, in that they mainly consist of set speeches setting out a particular point of view.

However, we should not forget that the philosophic character of the satires is always tempered by its satiric setting. Philosophical dialogue aims to expound or follow the lines of ideas and arguments; satire humorously to expose the folly of dogmatists and ideologues. For Aristotle the idea of moral virtue as the mean between two extremes implied a flexible specification of moral conduct, while for Horace it was often also a way of exploiting comically exaggerated opposites. Examples often come as opposed pairs (e.g. *Sat.* 1.1.100-7, 2.2.55-69), in congruence with the Aristotelian definition of the virtues each as a mean between a pair of opposed vices. Horace sees human behaviour as a tangle of contradictions and inconsistencies: we are all lost in the wood wandering in different directions (*Sat.* 2.3.48-51), and sometimes two directions at once! This consciousness of inconsistency contributes to the ironic ambiguity, or doubleness of vision, that characterises Horace's work. The moral dialectic has its structural analogue in the frequent use of comparison and contrast and of puns and ambiguities on the semantic and syntactic levels.

Much of the moralising content that seems to belong to popular philosophy is conventional and too typical of ancient thinking about life in general to be attributed to a particular philosophical school. The three leading moral ideas of the satires, the mean, natural limits, and self-sufficiency, cohere as a personal vision of life, in spite of their eclectic origins. On the other hand, Horace had an interest in ethical problems and a good knowledge of philosophy. It is easy to recognise in his work the influence of texts that we still possess, Lucretius and Cicero's philosophical works, for example, which were written for a non-specialist public. He appears to know Aristotle's *Ethics*, but whether at first-hand is difficult to say.

On diatribe and the 'diatribe-style', see e.g. D.A. Russell, *Plutarch* (London, 1973), 29-31, the style is well described by M.C. Randolph, 'The Structural Design of Formal Verse Satire', *PhQ* 21 (1942), 386-84; for Bion and diatribe see Kindstrand, 23-5, 97-9; the debate over the term, H.D. Jocelyn, *LCM* 7.1 (1982), 3-7, 8.6 (1983), 89-91 and H.B. Gottshalk, *LCM* 7.6 (1982), 91-9, 8.6 (1983), 91-2; Greek background to the satires, Lejay, vii-xxxvi, Witke, 21-48 etc.; on *Sat.* 1.1-3, Wimmel 1962, Rudd 1966, 1-35, D. Armstrong, 'Horace, *Satires* I, 1-3: A Structural Study', *Arion* 3 (1964), 86-96; Platonic allusions, Fraenkel 1957, 136-7; dialogue in Book 2, Maisack, E.H. Haight, 'Menander at the Sabine Farm, "Exemplar Vitae" ', *CPh* 41 (1947), 147-55, Knoche, 85-88, Williams 1972, 18-19; Socratic irony, Anderson

1982, 13-49, Braund 1988, 143-48; parody, Frischer 1991, 97-100; philosophy, a basic introduction to Hellenistic philosophy, M. Schofield, M. Burnyeat, J. Barnes (edd.), *Doubt and Dogmatism Studies in Hellenistic Philosophy* (Oxford, 1980), 1-19, further, C.W. Mendell, 'Satire as Popular Philosophy', *CPh* 15 (1920), 138-57, McGann 1969, 30-32; R. Mayer, 'Horace's *Epistles* I and Philosophy', *AJPh* 107 (1986), 55-73, is a fresh look at Horace's 'eclecticism' as an original (and Socratic) quest for independence; on Horace's knowledge of Aristotle, M. Wigodsky, 'Horace's Miser (*S.* 1 1 108) and Aristotelian Self-love', *SO* 5 (1980), 35-58.

5. THE STRUCTURAL PATTERNS OF BOOK 2

Whatever the pre-publication history of the satires, Book 2 is presented and constructed as a separate entity from Book 1. Horace rounds off his first book with a literary epilogue (*Sat.* 1.10), which he gives something of the appearance of an after-thought. Its last line self-consciously closes the book. The first lines of the new book appear to spring from the poet's reaction to the critical reception of the previous one, assuming its publication, and an ensuing gap in time.

In Book 1 Horace had put more or less similar satires together in groups (esp. *Sat.* 1.1-3). There also seems to be a concentric pattern of connections between satires (4 with 10, 5 with 9, 7 with 8). In Book 2 Horace follows a more obvious schema. The book falls into two symmetrical halves, with correspondences between the two series of satires. The simplest version of the pattern is Boll's:

1	consultations	5
2	rural simplicity	6
3	Stoic sermons	7
4	follies of gastronomy	8

Subsequent critics have wondered if the symmetry is really complete, especially as regards 1 and 5, and have also stressed the importance of variety in the patterning, taking form and setting into account as well as theme. Since the parallelisms of form support Boll's thematic connections, it may be helpful to set out the formal features of each satire:

1. Dialogue between Horace and Trebatius: longest speech 35 lines.
2. Monologue of Horace: quotes Ofellus at end (20 lines).
3. Introductory and concluding dialogue between Horace and Damasippus: Damasippus's uninterrupted speech consists mostly of a report of Stertinius's advice.
4. Introductory dialogue between Horace and Catius: Catius reports his teacher's doctrine: Horace concludes.
5. Dialogue between Ulysses and Teiresias: longest speech 35 lines.
6. Monologue of Horace: quotes Cervius at end (38 lines).
7. Introductory and concluding dialogue between Horace and Davus: Davus's uninterrupted speech claims inspiration from Crispinus's doorkeeper.

8. Short introductory dialogue between Horace and Fundanius: Fundanius's narrative relates the events of Nasidienus's dinner-party: Horace's comments interrupt the account: no formal conclusion.

Horace generally establishes setting indirectly. The following points contribute to the patterning. In 2.3 Horace is at his country villa when Damasippus interrupts, whereas the conversation with Davus in 2.7 takes place in his town-house. In 2.4 and 2.8 the conversations arise from chance encounters in the street. So both are 'promenade-dialogues' which may be set in a tradition begun by Plato's *Phaedrus*. There are no hints of setting for the dialogues of 1 and 5, though consultations perhaps entail visits. Genre is more important than setting for 2.2 and 2.6, the one identifying itself as a lecture, the other beginning as a prayer.

The latest treatment of this question (by Ludwig) overlays the clear scheme that Rudd has identified as 'architecture' with a more complex set of relations of contrast and connexion (Rudd's 'texture'). For example, 2 and 4 and 6 and 8 can be seen as contrasted pairs. Then, if we look at the satires in their numerical order, significant contrasts begin to appear. In 1 Horace defends his own life, in 2 he interprets Ofellus's. Damasippus and Ofellus are opposed in their reactions to their misfortunes. The unscrupulous attitude to enrichment through self-abasing scheming exposed in 5 is juxtaposed with the complex feelings of gratitude and independence expressed in 6, while the ideal imagined in 6 is undercut by Davus's cynical picture of the 'real' Horace in 7. The differences between the satires as we encounter them are sufficient to counter the sense of predictability that could come from the strong architectural scheme, and in spite of the repetitions of theme and form, the prevailing impression is of variety.

Williams 1972, 20 suggests that *Sat.* 1 and 2 were published together, but the *communis opinio* still prevails; arrangement of Book 1: N. Rudd, *Lines of Enquiry. Studies in Latin Poetry* (Cambridge, 1976), 119-44, at 142-3, Book 2, F. Boll, *Hermes* 48 (1913), 143-5, Fraenkel 1957, 137, Rudd 1966, 160-61, W. Ludwig, *Poetica* 2 (1968), 304-25; formal features: my list was inspired by Rudd's similar analysis of the *Eclogues* (1976, 128) — did that book's experimentation with genres of discourse influence Horace?; 'promenade-dialogues', Braund 1988, 148; 'architecture' vs. 'texture', Rudd 1976, 144; juxtapostion of 5 and 6, C. Becker, *Gnomon* 31 (1959), 600.

6. THE FOCUS ON FOOD

A striking difference between *Satires* Books 1 and 2 is the pervasive interest in food in the later book. Every satire notices it in some way (e.g. *Sat.* 2.1.74, 2.5.10-14, 80) and in four it is integral to the conception of the piece. In Book 1 the simple meal had appeared as the emblem of the Epicurean way of life (*Sat.* 1.6.111-31) and in *Sat.* 1.1 food imagery had illustrated the main (Epicurean) theme of limiting desires to what natural needs require. Such symbolism is developed at more length in Book 2, side by side with a new concern both with dietetic and culinary lore and with hospitality, that is,

the consumption of food in a particular social setting. Before we condemn the dominance of this theme as a failure of imagination, let us consider its manifold attractions for the satirist and the diverse ways in which Horace exploited it.

First, though, two barriers to our appreciation of this theme must be admitted. The original impact of Horace's descriptions of the different kinds of foods is irretrievable. We have no experience of the tastes of Roman food and sometimes even the type of food cannot be securely identified. Then there were the shared cultural assumptions, the implicit meanings with which the different foodstuffs and the rituals of food were charged. These can be reconstructed only with difficulty because, within particular social groups, they are taken for granted. Horace, and the other writers who discuss food, have in mind, but do not themselves create, these shared symbolic patterns that organise the values of food.

In Horace's contemporary social environment food was the site of competing cultural values: on the one hand, the pursuit of pleasure or prestige through competitive and ostentatious extravagance, on the other, legal regulation of expenditure (the seemingly ineffective sumptuary laws) and moral condemnation prompted by the traditional association of luxury with decadence. The old Roman diet was under pressure from the fads of fashion and the authority of gastronomical experts, who sometimes succeeded in winning acceptance for their discoveries, which were disseminated and recorded. Gossip about the latest scandalous excess or new dish was a source of vicarious enjoyment, with the added spice of moral disapproval easily thrown in.

Though there was a great increase in the élite's wealth and luxury during the period of the satires (Sen. *Suas.* 6.7-9, Tac. *Ann.* 3.55, André[2], 224f.), this is not enough to explain Horace's preoccupation with this particular form of conspicuous consumption, which had been building up for some time. Unlike Juvenal he does not develop the theme's satiric potential to attack the rich man's selfishness or gourmandism's physically disgusting aspects, but gently demonstrates the folly of leaving the path of moderation (cf. Nep. *Att.* 14.2). As important as the depiction of contemporary social mores is the complex orchestration of textual interconnections.

Before Horace, much had already been written about food in non-literary texts. In their ethics philosophers made prescriptions concerning food, and regulation of diet was of great interest to medical theorists. In the Hellenistic period dinners were described and cook-books were written. An interesting off-shoot of such interests is the 'Cook's tour' of delicacies, mainly Mediterranean fish, Archestratus's *Hedypatheia*, written in hexameters and adapted by Ennius in Latin at the beginning of the second century B.C. as the *Hedyphagetica*. At the upper end of the hierarchy epic did have its hospitality scenes, with details, even homely details, of food in a heroic setting. The context may dignify or allow a comic effect. On the whole, though, the higher genres exclude details of food and eating. These belong, with other natural bodily functions (such as sex and excretion), to the realism and social criticism of comedy and satire.

Satire was the Latin literary genre which allowed all these different discourses to meet within it. So in treating food and the dinner-party Horace was taking up possibilities offered by his genre. The theme of the dinner-party was as Lucilian (in Books 5, 13, 20 and 30) as the journey (Book 3, see *Sat.* 1.5). Varro's *Menippean Satires* also dealt with food and the conduct of the dinner-party as well as using it as a

setting for conversation on the model of Plato's or Xenophon's *Symposia*. It is also tempting to play with the idea of an apt metaphorical connection based on one of the suggested etymologies of the Latin word *satura* — a 'mixed-dish'. If dinners are microcosms of life, then dinner-party satires are microcosms of satire itself.

Food, already mediated through a wide range of texts, as we have seen, offers the satirist a multi-faceted perspective on human behaviour. Eating as a basic bodily function and the social elaboration of food in its preparation, presentation and contexts of consumption provide much scope for the kind of concrete detail on which satire depends for its being. Like sex, food is a site of desire subject to normative regulations of all kinds, and like sex again, it is a difficult matter to get right. We either dismiss it as trivial (and so deny its basic importance to life) or we treat it as all-important in an unbalanced way. Gastronomy, as a rival path to the good life, forms a link with, and parodic contrast to, the overall preoccupation of Horace's *Satires* with the art of living well, as is encapsulated in the pun on *sapiens*: the wise man has good taste (see Cic. *Fin.* 2.24, *Sat.* 2.4.44N).

Horace's food satires contain varying portions of the following ingredients: moral symbolism, culinary prescription and the social environment (or hospitality). In *Sat.* 2.2 food is spoken of in a very general way and there is very little in the way of practical guidance. Choice of food is a question of values and an index of a way of life. While the philosophical framework of 2.4 remains Epicurean, the food is described with a much greater particularity and the emphasis is on its culinary use. *Sat.* 2.6 foregrounds the link between food and way of life in the moment of hospitality, as does 2.8. Here Horace moves the doctrine of 2.4 from the realm of theory to that of practice, from the stage of preparation to that of meeting the food on the table. Nasidienus is largely defined by the food he serves and the way he serves it, and the guests' refusal to finish the meal is poetic justice with a vengeance.

Food symbolism in the satires, J. Glazewski, *'Plenus Vitae Conviva*: A Lucretian Concept in Horace's Satires', *CB* 47 (1971), 85-88; social background, Griffin, 11-12, 66, 81-82; literary history, Rudd 1966, 161-65, 202-23; hospitality theme, A.S. Hollis, *Callimachus Hecale* (Oxford, 1990), 341-54; food in literature, Hudson in Braund 1989, 69-87, A. Richlin, 'Systems of Food Imagery in Catullus', *CW* 81 (1988), 355-363, E. Gowers, *The Loaded Table: representations of food in Roman Literature* (Oxford, 1993) (which I have not seen), dinners as microcosms, A. Richlin, *The Garden of Priapus. Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor* (New Haven and London, 1983), 180-82; Lucilian background, Fiske, 399-400, 408-15, Shero; food and verbal inventiveness, M. Jeanneret, *A Feast of Words: Banquets and Table Talk in the Renaissance* Trans. J. Whiteley and E. Hughes (Cambridge, 1991); on manners and much else, M. Visser, *The Rituals of Dinner: The Origins, Evolution, Eccentricities and Meaning of Table Manners* (New York, 1991); etymology, see Introduction §2, Jeanneret, 152f.