I

FRANCES MUECKE

Rome's first "satirists": themes and genre in Ennius and Lucilius

Among the many intriguing aspects of Roman verse satire is the fact that it was such an early creation. Only a generation before, Latin literature had begun with the deliberate translation and adaptation not just of Greek genres, but of individual works, such as Homer's *Odyssey*. Paradoxically to modern perceptions, throughout the history of Latin literature acknowledgment of Greek predecessors was to remain a sign of high poetic ambition. Roman satire, on the other hand, although not totally without precedent in Greek literature, was destined to be the only kind of Latin poetry which had a Latin name and did not openly claim a Greek model.

Owing to the loss of most early Roman literature we simply do not have enough surviving evidence to trace the formation of Roman satire with exactness. To modern literary historians Quintus Ennius (239–169 BCE) represents the first phase in the development of the genre. For the Romans, however, it was created anew by Gaius Lucilius (*floruit* 130–103 BCE). It was the latter, not Ennius, who became the generic exemplar for Roman verse satire (Horace, *Sermones* 1.10.46–9, 64–7; Quintilian, *Institutes* 10.1.95 does not mention Ennius). In fact, it was perhaps not clear until after Lucilius had made *satura* a vehicle of mockery and invective that a new genre had been created.

Poetic genres in antiquity were defined by a characteristic subject matter and the type of verse meter they used. Each genre had its place in a relative hierarchy from high to low, and implied by the hierarchy were certain distinctions of tone (e.g. serious vs. comic) and stylistic register (grand vs. everyday). Such was the scheme set out, for example, in Horace's *Ars Poetica* 73–88. The reality of the poetry itself was infinitely more complex as each poet strove to create something new, within and against the limits of the genre as they were embodied in the work of his predecessors.

In the period before Ennius wrote his *Saturae*, the Hellenistic poets of the Greek cultural diaspora of the third and second centuries BCE had begun to exhibit a new attitude to generic convention. Inversions of the hierarchy,

deviations of focus, new combinations of subject matter and meter, and crossing of borderlines were the order of the day. Experimental combinations sometimes "took" and new genres, such as the bucolic, came into being.

Given this background, and as an almost inevitable function of its secondariness, Roman literature from the beginning was generically self-conscious.[1] Roman satire, then, was not alone in making itself one of its important themes, but it does stand out as an inherently controversial genre. It is controversial in two respects: its literary status and its offensiveness. On the one hand it is a poetic kind that is regarded as so low as almost to verge on the prosaic. Lucilius speaks of his works as *ludus ac sermones* – "trifling and chats" (fr. 1039W) and, in a metaphor suggesting the rough and ready, *schedium* – "something thrown together," "an improvisation" (fr. 1131W, cf. Petronius, *Satyricon* 4.6, Apuleius, *De deo Socratis* 1, Horace, *Sermones* 1.4.47 *sermo merus*, "pure talk"). On the other hand, its free speaking of "the truth" about its victims is seen as likely to cause offense.

Therefore in our survey of the earliest Roman satirists we must follow two lines: textual features and polemical tone. Roman satire came into being through the combination of the negative critical element (satire as a supra-generic mode) with a kind of writing determined only by a very loose set of formal and thematic characteristics, a hybridization of genres, essentially a mixture of serious and comic, high and low. And, it must be added, in practice Roman satire was not always or necessarily "satiric" in tone, although its characteristic flavor was Roman.

In what follows we will attempt to situate early Roman satire within the system of genres already existing in Greek literature, and within the development of early Latin literature. This essay focuses on the internal dynamics of literary history. Considering the way in which early Roman satire was embedded in its historical context is beyond its scope.

Satire as a mode is to be found in a range of Greek literary genres. There are two Greek verbs which may be translated as "to satirize": *iambizein* and *komoidein*. The first, associated with abuse, invective, and lampoon, that is, personal attack, not primarily intended to amuse, belonged to iambic, a word which denotes a genre and a meter of the same name. (Iambic meter had wider uses, being also employed for the dialogue of tragedy and comedy.) The verb *komoidein* initially was coined for a specific aspect of the genre of comedy. From the noun *komoidia* ("revel-song") was created the verb "to ridicule" (Aristophanes "ridiculed the city," *Acharneis* 631). Then the verb was extended from the ridiculing practiced in comedy to ridicule and

[1] Fraenkel (1957) 124.

joking in other circumstances.[2] The shift of meaning from "revel-song" to "ridicule" is analogous to that undergone by the Latin noun *satura*.

Greek iambic and comedy, then, as genres, provided parallel cases when Roman satirists and theorists wished to account for their own genre and for the presence in it, or in Lucilius, its founding exemplar, of scathing attack. For instance, Diomedes (*GLK* 1.485.11–17) and Apuleius (*Apologia* 10) describe Lucilius as a writer of "iambic" because of his employment of abuse. In the bookcase of the Augustan satirist Horace were the works of Eupolis, a leading writer of Old Comedy, and Archilochus, the seventh-century BCE inventor of iambic (*Sermones* 2.3.12). In his first book Horace asserted the dependence of Lucilius on Old Comedy (*Sermones* 1.4.1–6): the Roman poet showed the same freedom of speech as the writers of Old Comedy in attacking those conspicuous for their crimes.

At this point we should draw some general distinctions. "Savage" iambic was primarily believed to be motivated by a desire for personal revenge, while comic satire was funny as well as political. Iambic, as personal poetry, was closer in form to Roman satire, while Old Comedy, totally distinct in generic form, provided a model for critical engagement with society as a whole; Lucilius, in Horace's words, "scoured *the city* with plenty of salty wit" (*Sermones* 1.10.3–4, cf. Persius 1.114). Fragment 1145–51W, cited below, which depicts "people and senators alike" indiscriminately as shady characters, well illustrates Lucilius' freedom from inhibition. Therefore, neither Greek iambic nor Old Comedy sufficiently furnishes the "determinative repertoire"[3] of Roman satire, since the linking of the satiric impulse with a new set of textual elements must be attributed to Lucilius, the "inventor" of the genre (Horace, *Sermones* 1.10.48).

Compared with the original extent of their works the earliest satirists' remains are few and fragmentary. Of Ennius' satires (that is, a collection conventionally called *Saturae* – an individual book may originally have been a single *satura*, "mélange," "medley") we have only isolated lines (thirty-one in *ROL*). The collection was extensive enough to be divided at a late stage into four (or six?) books.[4] The differences between lines cited from individual books (e.g. book 3) are such as to show that a book contained separate poems in differing meters. This metrical variety was what distinguished Ennius' satire in antiquity (Diomedes *GLK* 1.485.33–4): "Formerly *satura* was the name for the kind of poetry which consisted of a variety of poems, such as Ennius and Pacuvius wrote." The poems were probably written in the later part of Ennius' career, and collected by him, if the title *Satura(e)* is his own.

[2] Silk (2000) 63–4. [3] Silk (2000) 67.
[4] Waszink (1972) 102, 105, Courtney (1993) 7–8, 12.

Ennius, in origin a Messapian from the Sallentine peninsula in the heel of Italy, was brought to Rome in his mid-thirties after serving in the Roman army. Settling in Rome, he acquired Roman citizenship and earned his living as a teacher. As a professional writer, he both modernized and expanded the range of literature in Latin. He composed in all the public genres already imported from Greece into Rome – tragedy, epic, and, less importantly, comedy. The satires, for us perhaps his most original and interesting creation, belong to another sphere of his activity, and are classed among the more experimental "minor works," most of which were closely related to, or based on, Greek writings of the fourth or third centuries. For example, in the *Sota* he adopted the Ionic meter of the Hellenistic poet Sotades (first half of the third century BCE). In the satires, with his use of iambic meters (among others), variety of subject matter, personal expression, "autobiography," incorporation of elements of popular poetry such as fables in a more sophisticated environment, Ennius wrote in the spirit of that Hellenistic poetry which had begun to unravel the traditional generic links between meter, tone, and subject matter.

Iambic meter, which had always had a greater range than its characterization as "abusive" suggests, especially lent itself to such generic experimentation. It became the meter for monologue and dialogue in Attic drama. It also had a long history in personal poetry, where it was used not only for satirical abuse (Archilochus, Semonides) but also for amusing narrations and more serious reflections. Solon (*floruit* 600 BCE) transformed it into a vehicle for vivid personal expression and political justification. As examples of Hellenistic extension of the iambic (both from the mid-third century BCE) we can cite Machon's anecdotes about notorious Athenian parasites and courtesans in iambic trimeters and Herodas' *Mimiamboi*, comic sketches of low-life urban characters. Both of these exhibit comic–iambic combinations but are formally much more homogeneous than the earliest Roman satire. So are Cercidas' slightly later *Meliamboi*, which combined lyric form with satirical, iambic content. Callimachus' *Iambi*, which in theme range beyond the iambic narrowly defined, highlighting the poet's individuality, can be mentioned as a parallel, if not a direct model, for Ennius' satires.[5] Ennius himself does not appear to have acknowledged a close dependence on Callimachus' *Iambi*, or any iambic predecessor.

The variety of Ennius' subject matter and meters distinguishes his *Saturae* from these Hellenistic iambic experiments (his polymetric collections are perhaps more like those of Archilochus or Solon), yet the satires are to be situated in the same category of the realistic and low – which, in ancient terms,

[5] Waszink (1972) 124–6, Gratwick (1982) 160.

usually means colloquial and even obscene language (apparently avoided by Ennius himself), an urban setting, a concentration on characters and affinity with comedy. Indeed, the meters of Ennius' satires – iambic senarii, dactylic hexameters, trochaic septenarii, sotadeans, trochaic tetrameters – were for the most part dramatic meters or also used in drama.

The Roman comedy contemporary with Ennius was *fabula palliata* (Latinized New Comedy) dominated by the verbal brilliance of the prolific Plautus. As a practitioner of tragedy Ennius must have been close to the comic stage and its language. A large proportion of the satiric fragments suggest comedy, in style or situation.[6] Stage language and meter predominate in the fragments, which have a strong dialogic feel. The portrait of a parasite (fr. 14–19W), for example, may be put in the mouth of the fellow himself. Coffey remarks that "It is sometimes impossible to tell the difference between the description of a situation from real life and the retailing of a speech or scene from comedy":[7] this is because low genres such as satire tended to stylize "real life" as comedy. Throughout the history of Roman satire, comedy and the even less respectable mime were to remain sources of both low realism and fictional displacement.[8]

Other comic–satiric types appear in snatches of dialogue – the glutton (fr. 1W) and the slanderer (fr. 8–9W). A fragment in the style of a comic list of verbs in asyndeton (cf. Lucilius, fr. 296–7W) *restitant occurrunt obstant obstringillant obagitant* ("they stand stock still, come against one, get in the way, impede, harass") (fr. 5W) has a close parallel in Plautus (*Curculio* 291) *obstant obsistunt incedunt* . . . ("they get in the way, block the street, move along . . ."). In the play the parasite enters at a run describing how the street is blocked by groups of Greek philosophers conversing among themselves, laden with books and baskets. Ennius' "busybodies," "meddlesome people drawn straight from the Roman forum"[9] may anticipate the crowded street scene so emblematic of satire (see Horace pushing his way through the crowd at *Sermones* 2.6.27–31; Juvenal 1 and 3). The repetitive word play on the subject of the deceiver deceived (fr. 28–31W) is a stylistic device shared with Roman comedy.

Apart from comedy, the best-represented sphere is that of popular moral teaching. Animal fable, of course, was prominent in Greek iambic (Archilochus, frs. 172–81 and 185–7West, Callimachus, *Iambi* 2) and was later to become a characteristic subject matter of Roman satire (see the fable of the ant in Lucilius [fr. 586–7W] and Horace [*Sermones* 1.1.32–5], that

[6] Waszink (1972) 110, 130–3. [7] Coffey (1976) 29.
[8] See Freudenburg (1993) 27–51 for what Horace makes of the legacy of popular comedy.
[9] Van Rooy (1966) 41; cf. Coffey (1976) 29.

of the fox and the sick lion in Lucilius [fr. 1111–20W] and Horace [*Epistles* 1.1.73–5], and, in Horace, the calf and the frog [*Sermones* 2.3.314–20], and the town and country mouse [*Sermones* 2.6.79–117]). In Ennius as well as the fable of the crested lark (*ROL* 389) and the piper and the fish (fr. 20W, cf. Herodotus 1.141), there is the debate between the personified abstracts Life and Death (Quintilian, *Institutes* 9.2.36, *ROL* 395), also with folk-tale origins. Likewise typical of popular moral teaching are the exhortation (fr. 2W), the proverb (fr. 27W), and the animal comparison (fr. 23W) – with etymological word play.

Of great interest for determining Ennius' stance, if it could only be pinned down, is another line using animal imagery: *non est meum ac si me canis memorderit* ("it is not my wont as if a dog has bitten me") (fr. 22W). If the fragment suggests that Ennius does not "bite back" even when attacked, it could be situated in the metaphorical complex of the dog as an image of the iambist or satirist (cf. Horace, *Epodes* 6, *S.* 2.1.84–5, Persius 1.108–10 (?)) or the purveyor of cynic abuse (Horace, *Epistles* 1.17.18).[10] The contrast with Lucilius (fr. 1000–1W) where the speaker identifies with an angry dog ("from there let me fly at him with a dog's grin and eyes") would be telling, if this indeed gives us Lucilius' own attitude.[11]

That Ennius himself was a frequent subject of his satires will be suggested below from external evidence. From the extant fragments again we have his quip in an unplaced line *numquam poetor nisi [si] podager* ("I never poetize except when I'm gouty")[12] (fr. 21W). When Horace remembered this he associated it with Ennius' epic poem (*Epistles* 1.19.7 "Father Ennius himself never sprang to the singing of arms except when drunk"). More serious are the fine lines:

> Enni poeta salue, qui mortalibus
> uersus propinas flammeos medullitus
> (fr. 6–7W)

> Hail, poet Ennius, you who from your innermost being pledge fiery verses to mankind.

This fragment from book 3 in which Ennius is addressed by name as "poet" (the term *poeta* is that borrowed from Greek, and is absent from the extant Lucilius) expresses pride in his own achievement, as the reincarnation of Homer (ὁ ποιητής) and the author of the *Annales*. Here he borrows from its

[10] Anderson (1958) 195–7; cf. Muecke (1985) 113–33. [11] Gratwick (1982) 159.
[12] Gout, a painful ailment of the extremities, is associated with good living (cf. Aristophanes, *Plutus* 559–61).

symposiastic setting the metaphor of the "cup of poetry" (Dionysius Chalcus fr. 1 Diehl). Some other associations may point to the frank and free expression of satiric verse (cf. Lucilius fr. 670–1W, *ego ubi quem ex praecordiis | ecfero uersum* ["when I bring forth any verse from the depth of my heart"], Horace, *Sermones* 1.4.88–9).[13]

The hexameter fragments are different again (frs. 3–4W and 10–11W). If he is parodying his own *Annales* Ennius may have already introduced into satire this very characteristic satirical technique.[14] That Ennius' meters in the satires included the dactylic hexameter is noteworthy, as this, the meter of Greek epic and didactic poetry, was to become Roman satire's canonical meter. It was introduced to Rome by Ennius himself, as the proper meter for heroic epic (*Annales*) and, less grandly, for the *Hedyphagetica* ("Delicatessen") (Ennius' translation of Archestratus' *Hedypatheia*), a didactic gastronomic tour of the Mediterranean. Occasionally in this poem Ennius introduces epicisms that make piquant clashes with the subject matter. But arguing that Ennius' adaptation should not be thought of simply as epic parody, Skutsch concludes "to him the mundane and everyday subject matter may well have suggested a metrical as well as a linguistic style close to comedy."[15]

When we consider why Lucilius eventually chose the hexameter as the standard meter of his satires, the precedent of such "low epic" as the *Hedyphagetica* may not be the only influential factor. Ennius included in his historical epic the *Annales* un-Homeric themes which Virgil was to exclude from the surface of his epic – autobiography, literary polemic, grammatical erudition, philosophical speculation – but which, on the other hand, were major themes in Lucilius' hexametric satire.[16] As an example of such "satirical" material in the *Annales*, which at least shows Ennius' strong didactic and moral interest, and at most might be a disguised self-portrait, we can cite the digression which describes the relationship of a great man with his trusted, and more lowly, companion (Ennius, *Annales* fr. 268–86 Sk.):[17]

> Saying this he summoned him with whom he pretty often shared his table and his talk and his consideration of his own private affairs, as he liked, when he was tired after devoting a great part of the day to settling matters of the highest concern in the forum and the holy senate; to whom with confidence he might speak of great and small matters, and jokes, and pour out to him if he wished things good and bad to say and put them in a safe place . . . (268–75)

[13] Jocelyn (1977) 131–51, Waszink (1972) 113–19.
[14] Jocelyn (1972) 1026. [15] Skutsch (1985) 4. [16] Mariotti (1963) 108–16.
[17] Mariotti (1963) 127–30, Van Rooy (1966) 40–1, Badian (1972) 181, 206.

Such friendships between unequals, important as they were in Roman society, became a theme in Roman satire (with an increasing emphasis on inequality), from the easy intimacy of Lucilius and Scipio Aemilianus (when Scipio and Laelius "had withdrawn from the crowd, leaving the public stage for a private place, they used to fool around with him [Lucilius] and play in casual clothes while waiting for the vegetables to cook," Horace, *Sermones* 2.1.73–4) through Horace's less comfortable position as Maecenas' companion (*Sermones* 1.3.63–6, 2.6.40–6) to the perversions of the relationship in Juvenal 5 and 9.

Ennius' satires also present their author as an individual – another urban character. The frequency of first and second persons suggests that Ennius staged scenes or encounters involving himself or other characters. From other sources it can be conjectured that in the satires Ennius told humorous anecdotes of his own life. For example, Cicero refers to Ennius' account of a walk with his neighbor Servius Sulpicius Galba (Cicero, *Academica* 2.51), and recounts the witty *beffa* turned against Ennius by his friend Nasica after he had heard Ennius instructing the maid to say he was not at home: when Ennius objected to being turned away later by Nasica himself, Nasica said "I believed your maid when she said you weren't at home. Won't you believe me in person?" (Cicero, *De oratore* 2.276).[18]

In a small compass many continuities with the multifarious variety of later satire have been detected. Of these the most important thematically are the comic, moral, and autobiographical elements. As to form, the strong presence of dialogue hints at the aspect later highlighted by the designation *sermo*, "conversation," "chat." At the same time it should be stressed that Ennius' satiric fragments, in tone and content, have much in common with his other minor works. This observation confirms the absence not so much of moralizing as of that note of self-assertion and that element of criticism of individuals which, in later eyes, was the distinguishing characteristic of Lucilius.[19]

If with Ennius we were more concerned with what *satura* was made from, with Lucilius we gain a somewhat better idea of what was made. Nonetheless, we still have no whole poems, and minimal context to make sense of Lucilius' vivid and lively detail, the heart of his enterprise. Fragments of 1300 lines or part-lines remain of thirty books. The longest fragment is 1196–1208W, the famous definition of virtue.[20] Three collections are represented: books 26–30 are the earliest (131–ca. 129 BCE), and books 1–21 cover the rest of Lucilius' career. Standing apart from, but transmitted with, the main *œuvre*

[18] See Skutsch (1990) 25–7, Leeman, Pinkster, and Rabbie (1989) 312–13.
[19] Waszink (1972) 111–12. [20] See Mayer p. 152 below.

are books 22–5, consisting of epitaphs and perhaps other occasional poems in elegiac meter.

In the beginning Lucilius, following Ennius, used dramatic meters. The first two books were in trochaic septenarii, the next two contained satires in trochaic septenarii, iambic senarii and hexameters respectively. The hexameter may have been used in book 28 for the sake of epic parody (cf. frs. 845W and 848W). The subject of the satire is obscure. In book 29 the hexameter was appropriate for a didactic treatment of the topic of choosing a woman (cf. fr. 910–11W). Finally in book 30 Lucilius settled on this meter exclusively, and made it the sole meter of his second collection. The decision was momentous for the establishment of the genre and its nature. A stable meter of its own gave the genre a recognizable status, as did the fact that Lucilius made his reputation as a poet in this kind of poetry alone.

The hexameter itself was a suitable vehicle for what has been dubbed stylistic "mobility,"[21] the comic or ironic switch from one stylistic register to another, exploited by all the Roman verse satirists. Writing in this meter allowed them to adopt, if they wished, the technical advances of the writers of serious hexameter poetry (epic, didactic), and to parody their style. Lucilius himself created a casual, conversational tone, in opposition to the more formal, literary medium. His looseness, like his prolixity, was to provoke Horace's criticism (cf. *Sermones* 1.10.56–61, *S.* 1.4.9–11).[22] For example, from the famous journey of book 3 (fr. 102–5W):

> uerum haec ludus ibi, susque omnia deque fuerunt,
> susque haec deque fuere inquam omnia ludus iocusque;
> illud opus durum, ut Setinum accessimus finem,
> αἰγίλιποι montes, Aetnea omnes, asperi Athones.
>
> But there all this was child's play, nothing to worry about [lit. both up and down], all this, I say again, was nothing to worry about, fun and games. That was hard work, when we came to the region of Setia, goat-deserted mountains, Etnas all, rugged Athoses.

Earlier we pointed to the occasional untraditional themes of Ennius' *Annales*. These were now taken up at greater length and in other forms by Lucilius and his contemporary Accius, tragedian and literary historian. Satire and its associated material, which was a minor part of Ennius' *œuvre*, for Lucilius was a *raison d'être*. In him again, autobiography is a mode and source of material for satire (Horace, *Sermones* 2.1.30–4):

[21] Silk (2000) 110. See Petersmann (1999) 291, 296. [22] See Rudd (1966) ch. 4.

> 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 the man of old's whole life is open to view as if sketched in a votive tablet.

Right from the beginning Lucilius was a vivid presence. In books 26–30 his name appears six times in confident (frs. 650–1, 763–5 and 791–2W) and joking (fr. 929–30W, "that rascal Lucilius," cf. frs. 1077 and 865W) assertions of his identity as a man and satirist (fr. 1075W). He drew material from such personal experiences as a journey (book 3, cf. Horace, *Sermones* 1.5), an illness (book 5), and his love affairs (fr. 892–9W, etc.), although everything he touched received the stamp of his individual outlook.

Lucilius' self-assertion and polemical stance, which transformed the mode of comic realism he took up from Ennius, must be linked to his higher social position. If Ennius acquired a certain status from his writing, he remained in modest circumstances, socially dependent upon the politically powerful figures who were his patrons. One of these was M. Fulvius Nobilior, on whose staff he went to Aetolia in 189 BCE and whose deeds he celebrated in a play as well as in book 15 of the *Annales*. The tradition that the poet's statue was placed in front of the tomb of the Scipios well illustrates the subordinate nature of the position he acquired (Cicero, *Pro Archia* 22, Livy, *Ab urbe condita* 38.56.4). In contrast, when Lucilius died, we are told, he was honored by a public funeral (Jerome, *Chronicles* p. 148eH), the prerogative of the rich and powerful senatorial class to which he belonged. Although he had chosen not to pursue his natural career as a statesman, Lucilius maintained a proprietorial engagement with Rome's political life. As a member of the élite, he could address his peers as equals and range freely over all levels of society, "people and senators alike" (fr. 1146W). That such a man should address himself self-confidently and polemically in the fiercely competitive world of the Roman aristocracy is not surprising. What is extraordinary is that he should do so through his verse, for poetry, especially of this kind, was not a mode of élite self-expression. The writer and his writing, then, become a topic of some prominence.

Literary polemic provides the peg for generic self-definition. The satirist as literary critic is also defender and definer of his own rôle and status. Books 26–30 present the satirist as writer, conscious of his audience, and aware of the need to demarcate his genre (traces in books 26, 27, 29, 30). In some difficult fragments (frs. 632–4 and 635W), which Warmington puts at the beginning of book 26, Lucilius said he wished to be read by neither the very learned nor the very ignorant. In fact the primary audience for which he wrote was a group of friends – his interlocutors are often "friends" – and many of his themes reflect the cultural and political concerns of the

governing class (cf. Horace, *Sermones* 2.1.62–74).[23] The need for the satirist to negotiate a delicate course between friends and enemies, inclusion and exclusion, made friendship itself one of satire's themes (frs. 694, 695, 859–78, 957–8 and 959–60W, cf. Horace, *Sermones* 1.3, 1.4; cf. Ennius, *Annales* 268–86 above).

Self-conscious apology and justification for polemic or revealing outspokenness appear predominantly in the early books, combined with parody of higher genres such as tragedy, as a way of implicitly defining the genre. It is in these books that Horace has Lucilius "exposing each man's inner foulness" and "smothering Metellus and Lupus with slanderous verses" (cf. Horace, *Sermones* 2.1.64–8), yet their preserved fragments do not present many examples of this sort of attack. Metellus' speech on the unfortunate necessity of marriage was ridiculed in book 26 (frs. 644–5 and 646W), and Lupus' harshness as a judge made fun of in book 28 (fr. 805–11W). Other leading themes are comic, philosophic, or to do with social behavior in matters such as sexual relations, business affairs, and dining.

In the second collection, literary polemic provides the peg for grammatical erudition. In books 9 and 10 Lucilius discussed literary and grammatical questions, arguing against Accius on the rules of good spelling, defining poetic terminology (fr. 401–10W), criticizing other writers, and laying down principles of composition (fr. 417–18W). The scholarly and theoretical nature of the treatment may well have given the "very uneducated" pause. But before we make the easy assumption that such material was not "satirical," we should remember that Persius (according to *Vita Persi* 51–2) was inspired to compose satire, especially his first satire, by reading Lucilius book 10. Evidently the link to contemporary literary controversy of the theoretical discussions was marked and memorable (see Horace, *Sermones* 1.4 and 1.10, *Ars Poetica*, Persius 1, Juvenal 7).

Beside grammatical studies a significant theme was philosophy, another topic in which an aristocratic, Hellenized audience might be expected to take an interest. The two were not entirely unrelated, as Elizabeth Rawson reminds us: "Abstract discussion of problems of literary aesthetics was something for which the impulse came on the whole from philosophy."[24] In the 140s Panaetius, the Greek Stoic philosopher, had moved to Rome where he benefited from the patronage of Lucilius' friend, the great general and politician Scipio Aemilianus. We do not find Panaetius' name in the satires,[25] but other Greek philosophers are mentioned; for example, in book 1 Carneades for the power of his argumentation. His recent death was topical and suited

[23] Puelma Piwonka (1949) esp. 74–80.

[24] Rawson (1985) 279. [25] But see Cichorius (1922) 75–7.

the subject of the satire (fr. 35W). In book 28 the doctrines and leading personalities of the Epicurean and Academic schools were discussed at a Greek symposium (frs. 815, 820, 821, and 822–3W).

When criticizing the judicial rigor of Lupus (fr. 805–11W), Lucilius incongruously played on the terminology of natural philosophy, saying that Lupus would deprive the defendant of all four elements: fire, water, earth, and air. The comic point, I believe, lies mainly in the juxtaposition of the unrelated spheres of activity. Such comparisons, through metaphor or simile, were part of Lucilius' comic charm. Another striking instance is the simile of the victorious fighting cock raising itself on its toes, applied to a good wife (?) (fr. 328–9W).

So far we have seen Lucilius' development of distinctive themes that linked early Roman literature and culture with aspects of Hellenistic literature, scholarship, and thought. If we now turn to examine generic continuity between Ennian and Lucilian satire, we must highlight as well the associations with comedy, in theme, dialogic form, and style. Earlier I adopted Waszink's proposition that Ennius was influenced by "existing drama . . . the then already flourishing Roman comedy."[26] When Lucilius was writing, tragedy and comedy were still the most important public and popular genres in Rome. As Elizabeth Rawson stated, "it is becoming more and more widely recognised that . . . theatre was one of the central institutions of Roman culture."[27] Accordingly, drama was the main target of Lucilius' literary parody and criticism in books 26 and 29.

Similarly, in the early books, apart from the use of stage meters, we find a vivid account of an attack by citizens and slaves on the house of another man (a pimp?), in search of a woman (fr. 793–814W). The threats in direct speech are linguistically very reminiscent of comedy (e.g. *malo hercle uestro, confectores cardinum* ("be it to your harm, hinge-smashers") (fr. 795W cf. Ennius, *Saturae* 1), *orationem facere conpendi potes*; | *salue, dum saluo in tergo et tergino licet* ("you can spare your speech; off with you, while you can get off with your back and the whip intact") (fr. 796–7W, which is put in another context by Krenkel).[28] The house-attack scene must be based on an episode of New Comedy (cf. Menander, *Perikeiromene* 467–85, Terence, *Adelphi* 88–91, *Eunuchus* 771–816). In a similar scene in book 29 of a lover's attack on a house (937–48), the Menandrian-Terentian name Gnatho is used (*Gnatho, quid actum est? Depilati omnes sumus* "Gnatho, what is up?" "We've all been fleeced," [fr. 945W]; *Caede ostium, Gnatho, urgue. Restant, periimus*, "Chop down the door, Gnatho, use force!" "They won't

[26] Waszink (1972) 130. [27] Rawson (1987) 88. [28] Krenkel (1970) II 430–1.

move; we're finished," [fr. 946W]; compare Plautus, *Curculio* 395–8 with fr. 943–4W). The stereotypical depiction of nagging and scheming wives and greedy courtesans must also be linked to comedy (e.g. fr. 640–1W (the grotesque exaggeration of the coinages is comic), fr. 642–3W, cf. Plautus *Aulularia* 478–524, especially 508–22, *Truculentus* 52; with fr. 296–7W (a comic list), cf. Plautus *Poenulus* 220).[29] The following fragment is a good example of a comic character sketch (fr. 278–81W):

> He who has no mule, no slave, nor any companion, himself keeps with him his satchel, with whatever cash he has; he eats, sleeps and bathes with his satchel; all the fellow's goods are in the one satchel; this satchel is tightly tied to his shoulder.

Satire and comedy also share Greek popular moralizing, and the use of proverbial expressions. Elizabeth Rawson argued that the moral lessons and sententious utterances in Roman comedy were meant both to be approved for their own sake, and laughed at when put into incongruous mouths.[30] Roman satire adopted a similar ambivalence.

Whereas relatively few direct verbal borrowings from Plautus, Caecilius, and Terence have been identified – and perhaps they should not be expected – the stylistic influence is pervasive, both in the creation of a racy colloquialism and in the use of comic coinages, vulgarisms, and other devices of popular comedy.[31] For example, the metaphorical "identification" of fragment 746W *Quae pietas? Monogrammi quinque adducti; pietatem uocant!* ("What sense of duty? Five outline sketches were brought in; duty they call it!"). In connection with the coinages of fragment 640–1W, Rudd comments, "This is Lucilius the heir of Plautus."[32] Dramatization of narrative and anecdote by the extensive use of direct speech (see books 1 and 2, the council of the gods and the trial of Scaevola) is an important technique – so much so that we should always reckon with the possibility that someone other than the satirist is speaking. Nor should we forget those (admittedly rare) passages in Plautus which address life in Rome directly. The passage in Plautus (*Curculio* 466–85; cf. *Curculio* 285–98, 499–515), where the Choragus locates unsavory types in the Roman Forum, provides a precedent for that of Lucilius on the corruption of modern ways of life, so emblematic of Roman satire (fr. 1145–51W):[33]

[29] Gruen (1993) 286–7.
[30] Rawson (1987) 83–4. See also Freudenburg (1993) 21–39 on the "moralizing buffoon."
[31] Petersmann (1999) 296–310. [32] Rudd (1966) 104.
[33] See Marx (1904–1905) I XVI.

> Now indeed from dawn to dusk, on holidays and workdays, all the people and all the senators alike busy themselves in the forum, never leaving it. All have given themselves over to one and the same study and art – to be able to swindle without getting caught, to fight by cunning, to compete by smooth talking, pretend to be a fine fellow, to lay traps as if all are enemies of all.

Terence retreated from Plautus' satiric involvement with Roman social and political issues. It was, however, the direct response to contemporary personalities or events that typified Lucilian satire, even if it cannot fully account for it.[34] In book 1 a savage political and moral attack on the recently dead Lupus (*princeps senatus* 131–25 BCE) was worked into a parodic council of the gods (based on the divine council in Ennius' *Annales* 1). There the gods, as a heavenly version of the Roman senate, discussed the degraded state of Roman morals – luxury, debauchery, gluttony – for which Lupus might have been held responsible. Lupus' arrival among the gods seems to have caused consternation: *Quae facies, qui uultus uiro? – Vultus item ut facies, mors, icterus morbus, uenenum* ("What is the man's look, and his expression?" – "His expression is the same as his look, death, jaundice, poison.") (frs. 36 and 37W, cf. Horace, *Sermones* 1.7.1, Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis* 5.2–3; on Lupus again see fr. 1138–41W).

In book 2 Lucilius exploited the satiric and comic possibilities of a battle in court between Q. Mucius Scaevola the "Augur" (praetor 120, consul 117) and Titus Albucius, who accused him of extortion after his governorship of Asia (119/18). An enmity had arisen between the two when Scaevola had made fun of Albucius' extreme philhellenism (fr. 87–93W). The satire depicted vicious attacks on either side, typical of the often slanderous (and factitious) invective of the Roman courtroom (frs. 54–5, 57 and 67–9W; cf. Horace, *Sermones* 1.7). The Neronian satirist Persius remembered these two books as examples of Lucilius' hostile attacks on Lupus and Mucius: *secuit Lucilius urbem, | te Lupe, te Muci, et genuinum fregit in illis* ("Lucilius lacerated the city – you, Lupus, and you, Mucius – and broke his molar on them") (1.114–15, cf. Juvenal 1.153–4), and Cicero spoke of Lucilius being "annoyed" at Mucius (*De oratore* 1.72). It is not surprising that ancient readers attributed the hostility to Lucilius himself, but we should distinguish between the satirist and the scurrilities he retailed, while noting nevertheless the satirist's freedom to include them.[35]

The accusations of debauchery (frs. 33 and 63W) and gluttony (frs. 46, 50–1, 67–9 and 70W) which are found in these two satires are standard subjects for the blackening of an opponent's character, in politics or the courtroom. In censuring and exposing the stains on others' lives (frs. 852–3

[34] Fraenkel (1957) 79–80. [35] Gruen (1992) 290–1.

and 1070W) satire finds considerable scope for itself in the stuff of corporeality – sex and food. Longer episodes are preserved as well as isolated coarse comments (e.g. frs. 61, 361 and 1182W). Disquisitions on food give scope for philosophizing and moralizing (or the parody of it) (frs. 200–7, 1022–3, and 1234W), and descriptions of dinner parties for retailing amusing and no doubt indiscreet conversation. L. Licinius Crassus' dinner at the home of Granius the auctioneer was a splendid and sumptuous affair (fr. 601–3W), but Granius was also a very funny man (fr. 448–9W, Cicero, *Brutus* 172). The consumption and offering of food must be emphasized as one of satire's enduring themes, and a rich source of tropes and self-reflexive metaphors.[36]

The freedom and confidence of Lucilius' expression made a deep impression on later readers. He was of high social standing in Rome, and though he himself did not pursue a political career, at a period of crucial social, political, and cultural developments, he was close to, but critically detached from, Rome's political and intellectual life.[37] In a rare expression of the positive purpose of his writing, possibly from an *envoi* or a dedication, he portrays himself as working for the general good, so aligning satire with Rome's most dominating social value (fr. 791–2W):

> Rem, populi salutem fictis versibus Lucilius
> quibus potest inpertit, totumque hoc studiose et sedulo.
>
> To the verses he has written as best he can, Lucilius imparts the people's prosperity, a matter of importance, and all this with zeal and earnestness.

Further reading

Studies of Ennius and Lucilius may be found in the general books on Roman satire. Particularly comprehensive is Coffey (1976). Gratwick (1982) 156–71 is an adventurous and stimulating treatment. For those with Latin, Petersmann (1999) 289–310 illustrates the linguistic variety of both satirists and Lucilius' great artistry in language.

For more on Ennius see Mariotti (reprinted Urbino, 1991), Jocelyn (1972) 987–1026, Waszink (1972) 99–137.

Apart from the specific treatments of Lucilius, much of value will be found in the many studies of the later satirists' works. For a thorough survey of work on Lucilius see Christes (1972) 1182–239. Rudd (1986) is an attractive presentation of Lucilius in the context of Roman satire overall. Fiske (1920) is more detailed and more speculative. For Lucilius in his contemporary context see E. S. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (Ithaca, 1992) 272–317 and for the Late Republican reception Rawson (1985) and Freudenburg (1993).

[36] Gowers (1993a) ch. 3, Griffin (1994) 190–7. [37] Gruen (1992) ch. 7 *passim*.

THE CAMBRIDGE COMPANION TO ROMAN SATIRE

EDITED BY

KIRK FREUDENBURG

Professor and Chair, Department of the Classics, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521803595

First published 2005

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
The Cambridge companion to Roman satire / edited by Kirk Freudenburg.
p. cm. – (Cambridge companions to literature)
Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.
ISBN 0-521-80359-4 – ISBN 0-521-00627-9 (pbk.)
1. Satire, Latin – History and criticism. 2. Rome – In literature. I. Freudenburg, Kirk, 1961– II. Series.
PA6095.C36 2005
877'.010932376 – dc22 2004057024

ISBN 13 978 0 521 80359 5 hardback
ISBN 10 0 521 80359 4 hardback
ISBN 13 978 0 521 00627 9 paperback
ISBN 10 0 521 00627 9 paperback