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**Abstract**

This thesis examines the construction and function of dialogue and pseudo-dialogic structures in the satiric poetry of Lucilius, Horace, Persius, and Juvenal. Dialogue is analysed as, to greater and lesser degrees, mimetic of, or informed by, turn-taking structures in multi-speaker communication. Analysis is undertaken using methodologies adapted from the field of Conversation Analysis, as well as recent sociolinguistic studies on Graeco-Roman prose and poetry. In addition to these ‘novel’ tools, traditional philological exegesis is used to explore the inter and intra-textual relationships between forms of speech and speaker. The combination of these approaches generates a multi-layered exegesis of *sermo* in Latin satire, revealing stylistic patterns and innovations, nuanced characterisation of specific speakers, and the narratological function of mimetic structures.

Chapter I introduces the concept of *persona* as relevant to this thesis through an analysis of certain extracts of Lucilius’ poetry. Despite the fragmentary nature of the evidence, I demonstrate that what remains evinces a variety of dialogic modalities, as well as notable sermonic stylistic quirks seen in later representations of *sermo*. I also demonstrate how Cicero’s reception of Lucilius can inform our reading of the author-narrator continuum, and apply my turn-focussed methodology to the study of the ‘Scaevola v Albucius’ debate.

Chapter II introduces the quantitative aspects of this thesis and applies the complete set of analytical tools to the satiric works of Horace. I uphold and advance Freudenburg’s reading of a dichotomy between Epicurean and Stoic *sermo*, and provide detailed exegesis on many forms of dialogue existing in both books of satire. I argue that multiple speakers are given specific idiolects which have, until now, passed unnoticed by scholarship, and that dialogic interactions between the narrator and various interlocutors are critical to reading Horace’s poetic and satiric agendas.

Chapter III continues the full application of socio-linguistic and philological exegesis on the works of Persius. I argue throughout for specific speaker-line attributions
— necessary for conducting my analysis — and through doing so note important moments of intertextuality between Persius and Horace. In my analysis of Persius 3, I make significant contributions to the question of speech/speaker (a debate ongoing for more than a century), and argue that Persius is, generally, subversive of the modalities utilised by Lucilius and Horace.

Chapter IV completes the quadriptych through analysing the role of sermo in the works of Juvenal. While modern scholars may claim that Juvenal is less ‘conversational’ than his predecessors, I argue that dialogue not only remains an integral part of much of Juvenal’s poetry, but even undergoes innovation through the inclusion/creation of new interlocutorial archetypes (the female satirist) and iterated use of multi-speaker (> 2) interactions.
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primum ego me illorum, dederim quibus esse poetas,
exercipam numero: neque enim concludere versum
dixeris esse satis; neque, si qui scribat uti nos
sermoni propiora, putes hunc esse poetam.
ingeniun cui sit, cui mens divinior atque os
magna sonaturum, des nominis huius honorem.
idcirco quidam comoedia necne poema
esse quaesivere, quod acer spiritus ac vis
nec verbis nec rebus inest, nisi quod pede certo
differt sermoni, sermo merus …

First, I would remove myself from that group of people whom I should call ‘poets’; for you wouldn’t say it’s enough to close a verse, nor, if someone writes (as I do) something closer to conversation, would you consider them a poet. Give him the honour of that title, he who has a great spirit, a more divine mind, a greatness of expression. Indeed, for this reason there are some who have questioned whether comedy is really ‘poetry’ – because vigorous spirit and power are present neither in the style nor the matter, and it is really just conversation save for its fixed rhythm…

Horace. Satires. 1.4.40-8
In the extract above, Horace ‘apologises’ not only for his own work, but for his chosen genre. His defence rests on an alleged relationship between satire and sermo — a term associated with conversation, rhetorical speech, and prose literature.\(^1\) Horace’s contention that satire is merely metred sermo is almost immediately undermined by the artistry within the apology itself, and then later in the poem’s punchline where Horace self-identifies as one of many poets.\(^2\) The joke, however, calls attention to a fundamental element of the genre. Lucilius, Horace, Persius, and Juvenal all avail themselves of a wide array of interlocutors, interjectors, dialogic snippets, conversations, and debates. They engage the conversational elements of sermo. In light of recent work undertaken in the study of ‘conversational poetry’, it may prove worthwhile to take Horace’s faux-apology more seriously.\(^3\)

Exactly what is ‘sermonic’ about satire? That is the key research question which this thesis seeks to address. While not the first assessment of the poeta-sermo nexus, this thesis breaks ground with its deployment of classical philology as informed by applied sociolinguistics. In seeking to highlight the dialogic in the poetic, I will present, analyse, (re)interpret, and discuss constructions of dialogue in the works of the four satirists. I argue for the presence of phenomena which engage the concept of sermo as conversation (often through mimesis), that the interplay of such phenomena with poetic stylistics is meaningful for the text and genre, and that the results of this study necessitate a shift in how we approach and discuss the satiric corpus. Quis leget haec? For the one or two that do, I begin this thesis in the manner of the satirists it treats – with an apology.

Speakers - The Elephant(s) in the Room(s)

---

\(^{1}\) See Lewis and Short 1879 Sermo for various meanings. Gowers 2012: 12. Both sermo and poem/t-a are repeated thrice in eight lines – the proximity and tension between the concepts are emphasised.


\(^{3}\) pace Dessen 1967: 81.
Qui parle? – Barthes’ perennial question haunts readers of Roman satire. The problem is most clearly elucidated in Dennis Feeney’s 2011 article, ‘Hic finis fandi’. Lack of original punctuation, difficulties in the manuscript traditions, and the possibility of deliberate authorial obscurity are all factors which render the distribution of speakers as unstable. An investigation of speech in satire must thus be initiated ‘on the defensive’.

This thesis is, au fond, a rejection of and reaction to the claim that attempts to find speech and speakers in satiric poetry is misguided. Though any attempt may impose an ‘unwelcome authority’ (‘melius non tangere!’ cries Horace), it is nonetheless necessary if we are to deepen our understanding of the genre. Freudenburg, writing on Horace’s Satires 2.3 and 2.4, identifies key differences in poetics that relate to and help generate different tones for different speakers, demonstrating the use of metre in shaping and distinguishing speakers. Through expanding his system of quantitative analysis, I will show that speaker-distribution generally conforms to patterns of metrical and linguistic clarity, rather than obscurity, and will thus argue for attributions where the scholarship is divided.

Relevant Scholarship

A brief overview of the scholarship on which this thesis is founded will also introduce the various methodologies it employs.

This thesis is conducted using classical philology as informed by Conversation Analysis (henceforth CA). CA comprises frameworks of analysis developed for the study of dialogue transcripts. Deborah Beck, in her book Homeric Conversation, provides a definition of CA which is suitable for this thesis:

---

4 A series of popular ‘video-essays’ on the problem pertaining to J.K. Rowling (Ellis 2018, 2021) attest to continued use of Barthes’ framework to explore topics such as authorial intention.
5 Littlewood 2002: 57.
6 Freudenburg 1996.
7 See Clift 2016: 30-40.
Conversation analysis describes conversation as basically a turn-taking activity that the participants themselves understand and control. Moreover, the particular social context in which a conversation takes place affects the specific tendencies or rules that govern turn taking in that conversation.’ Beck 2005: 5.

In recent decades, analysis informed by CA has been conducted on written documents and, lately, to fictional dialogue. This development has received a mixed response.\(^8\) The principal reservation among some is that fictional dialogue is an ‘idealised’ representation of conversation, lacking performative markers of naturally occurring speech which transcripts present (‘filler’ sounds, word breaks and repair, etc.), and that the data they can provide is extremely limited.\(^9\) These issues are conventionally acknowledged by most commentators.

The core of the counterargument offered does not seek to contradict these observations, but rather suggests that this new approach broadens the field of CA itself. The bivalent relationships between spoken and written utterances have been noted, and scholars have highlighted how this symbiosis aids in understanding internalised models of conversation and re-productions thereof in text.\(^10\) Furthermore, fictional dialogue can even present advantages for the study of conversation when compared to traditional transcripts. Lloyd writes: ‘literary dialogue has the advantage of being completely transparent in terms of context. All relevant factors are in principle available for anyone to test.’\(^11\) CA’s productivity when applied to fictional texts forms a persuasive argument for this style of inter-disciplinary research.

CA has been used to analyse fictional texts in a variety of studies across numerous disciplines. McHoul’s 1987 paper advances an early argument for such interdisciplinary studies (noted above), an argument which is restated and supported by the various papers collected in Nykänen’s and Koivisto’s (editors) *Literary Linguistics*, in Amador-Moreno’s and McCafferty’s 2011 *Fictionalising Orality*. Bowles’ 2011 paper which chronicles the

---

\(^8\) Nykänen and Kovisto 2016: 1-4.
\(^9\) Bowles 2011: 162.
\(^11\) Lloyd 2004: 75.
contributions of CA to literary criticism. Within the field of Classics proper, several CA studies have been undertaken on a variety of texts. These include Beck’s work *Homeric Conversation*, Krebs’s 2009 article on Cicero’s *De Legibus*, and Brown’s 2006 study on politeness and pragmatics in the *Iliad*. Works that have provided specific frameworks or observations which are pertinent to this thesis include Müller’s 1996 *Sprechen und Sprache: Dialoglinguistische Studiezn zu Terenz*, Karakasis’s 2005 *Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy*, Lloyd’s 2006 paper on politeness in the *Iliad*, Hall’s 2009 *Politeness and Politics in Cicero’s Letters*, Bonifazi et al.’s comprehensive 2016 work *Particles in Ancient Greek Discourse*, and Barrios-Lech’s 2016 *Linguistic Interaction in Roman Comedy*. For the study of satire, Henderson, in his 1999 article ‘BE ALERT (YOUR COUNTRY NEEDS LERTS)…’ argued for the application of ‘pragmatics’ (an umbrella term under which CA falls) to satiric conversation, and indeed conducted a CA-style analysis of the interactions between Horace and his interlocutor. However, such analysis has yet to be revisited or repeated, despite the progress made by CA in analysis of Homer and Roman comedy. Sharland’s 2010 Bakhtinian reading of Horace’s *Satires* emphasised the polyphonic aspect of dialogue, yet with very little attention paid to the actual linguistic manifestation of speech. This thesis, then, expands on the pragmatic analysis of Henderson (and indeed those studies effected elsewhere in Classical Philology) and provides a data-driven analysis of speech as it manifests itself and functions within the text.

The ‘C’ Word(s)

This thesis diverges from much of previous scholarship on satire in its aversion to the concept of ‘colloquial’ language or register. Although ‘conversational’ and ‘colloquial’ are often used seemingly interchangeably, a brief summary of why recent studies are moving away from the latter and its nebulous ideas — as well as how scholarship is proceeding without it — will both elucidate this thesis’s socio-linguistic framework and justify the use of ‘conversational’ throughout.

Where the terms have not been used interchangeably, ‘conversational’ has been used to describe stylistic phenomena (often expressed metrically) and dialogic modalities (the use of interlocutors, interruptions, etc.). ‘Colloquial’ has often been used to describe vocabulary or syntax pertaining to a general ‘register’ of Latin which is considered proximate to ‘casual’, real-life conversation. Scholarship in recent decades has pushed back against these binary
conceptions of register. James Clackson has argued that use of the term ‘colloquial’ can
generate a false dichotomy between ‘literary’ and ‘colloquial’ language – a binary axis which
is not demonstrable in the texts themselves, and which would obscure the dominant role that
context plays in parsing the ‘mood’ of any given phenomenon.\textsuperscript{12} Clackson also highlights that
the term has fallen out of use in linguistics due to ‘covering too wide a range of different
linguistic phenomena’. Anna Chahoud, in the same book, continues the deconstruction of the
term. She argues that studies on ‘colloquialness’ in Latin literature often employ faulty or
circular lines of argumentation.\textsuperscript{13} Chahoud implies that if scholarship is to continue researching
the various registers of Latin and their relationships, the usual process of identifying ‘colloquial’
aspects – or indeed aspects of any register — must be replaced with a more rigorous method
of inquiry. This sentiment is echoed by R.F. Thomas, who succinctly captures the essence of
new approaches to the topic:

‘Ultimately it is inadequate to register percentages of colloquial versus
uncolloquial; rather every instance needs to be scrutinised to determine what
it means that such elements are present, whether they might have a diachronic
literary pre-history, or if not, what the synchronic literary function might be.’
Thomas 2010: 257.

\textit{Semper ego auditor tantum?} I take up Thomas’s challenge. In my discussion of sermonic
aspects of satiric poetry, I ground the exegesis in recent studies in Latin philology which are
sensitive to this new approach to linguistic registers, as well as in observations from the wider
field of linguistics on the mimesis of conversation across a variety of languages. Thus, I avoid
the use of ‘colloquial’ altogether throughout this thesis. If, for example, a particular word or
construction is present in the text which is heavily (or only) featured elsewhere in Latin comedy,
it suffices to state merely that. However, if phenomena both invoke intertextuality with dialogic
texts (Roman comedy) \textit{and} are frequently observed in the mimesis of conversation more

\textsuperscript{12} Clackson 2010: 9-11.
\textsuperscript{13} See Chahoud 2010: 44 on Zetzel’s analysis of \textit{qui fit}. 
generally, I deem it sufficient to state that those phenomena can be classed as ‘conversational’ if the context is dialogic. ‘Conversational’ thus points to a literary ‘register’ comprising stylistics which are frequently found in theatrical or dialogic poetry, narratological frameworks which emphasise polyphonia, and phenomena which are frequently found in both human conversation and literary mimesis thereof. Thus, my exegesis rests not on particular lexical phenomena belonging a priori to a colloquial register, but rather on the analysis of the aggregation of features with respect to their immediate poetic context, their intertextuality with other dialogic texts, their coherence (or lack thereof) with other phenomena, and how these can be (re)interpreted under the lens of philology informed by socio-linguistics.

**The Search for Sermo**

This context-focussed philological framework is deployed alongside a focus on turn-taking and implicature derived from CA. Grice’s theory of conversational implicature as relevant to classical philology is presented clearly in Lloyd’s 2004 paper. The essence of the theory is that speech-turns whose meaning requires inference on behalf of the listener have ‘off record’ significance. Lloyd quotes Brown and Levinson, who state:

> ‘A communicative act is done off record if it is done in such a way that it is not possible to attribute only one clear communicative intention to the act. In other words, the actor leaves himself an ‘out’ by providing himself with a number of defensible interpretations; he cannot be held to have committed himself to just one particular interpretation of his act.’ Brown and Levinson 1978: 211

Lloyd notes that the contrast between on and off record meaning can produce irony and humour, and it will be shown in this thesis that much of the satiric and poetic value of sermo relies on multi-functionality of individual speech-turns.

Synthesising the theoretical foundations described above, dialogue will be analysed as a turn-taking activity related to, and often mimetic of (but not necessarily so), non-textual
dialogic interaction. These ‘turns’ can be analysed with reference to two broad categories of phenomena:

(1) ‘Transitions’ are where the turn-taking occurs. Phenomena which can be studied to describe this include ‘signals’ — words or constructions which draw attention to the act of speech in relation to setting and turn-taking — interruption, interjection, contiguous speech, and characteristics of exchange — such as stichomythia and conversational disengagement.

(2) ‘Conversational phenomena’ refers to the plethora of stylistics and phenomena which are often produced in dialogue and texts mimetic or representative thereof. This includes idiosyncrasies of pronunciation (elision), repetition, syntactic variation (asyndeton, parataxis), referentiality, and politeness strategies.

Signals

Bonifazi, Drummen, and de Kreij’s monograph *Particles in Ancient Greek Discourse* employs methodology borrowed from CA to analyse turn-taking structures in Greek comedic and tragic texts. The following definition of ‘contextualisation cues’ (signals) is given by Drummen:

‘Most turns without turn-initial particles [signals] are explicitly connected to their co-text and context by other turn-initial expressions. I call these expressions “contextualization cues,” a term coined by Cook-Gumperz and Gumperz, and I include the following forms apart from particles. First [i], a turn is immediately situated if it starts with a reference to the speaker or addressee(s), which can be realized by first- or second-person verb forms, vocatives, and pronouns. Second [ii], subordinating conjunctions and demonstrative pronouns and adverbs also make it clear at the outset how a new turn is responding to the preceding one. Third [iii], lexical repetitions of an element from the preceding turn clarify the response’s focus. Fourth [iv], primary interjections…indicate a reaction to a previous turn or nonverbal action.'
Fifth [v], turn-initial question words and negations usually project part of the nature of the new turn.’ Drummen et.al. 2016: III.4.1.2.12

The definition — and the short typology provided — is suitable for my own study on turn-initial signals. To demonstrate the relevance of this framework to the study of satire, consider Table 1:
Table 1: Signals in Horace Book 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Metrical Position</th>
<th>Replying to:</th>
<th>Signal Word</th>
<th>Turn Position</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5</td>
<td>Trebatius</td>
<td>3F.FC</td>
<td>Praescribe</td>
<td>Quescas</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>5F.1H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6</td>
<td>Trebatius</td>
<td>3F.MC</td>
<td>inquis</td>
<td>Aio</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>4F.MC</td>
<td>ato</td>
<td>Subj. Verb</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.7</td>
<td>Trebatius</td>
<td>5F.FC</td>
<td>Transianto</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.12</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>3F.MC</td>
<td>aude (10)</td>
<td>Fater optime</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.16</td>
<td>Trebatius</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>attamen</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.17</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>5F.5H</td>
<td>Haud*</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i/v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.21</td>
<td>Trebatius</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Qunto</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.24</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Quid</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.60</td>
<td>Trebatius</td>
<td>5F.1H</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.62</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>3F.MC</td>
<td>Quid</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.79</td>
<td>Trebatius</td>
<td>2F.MC</td>
<td>Trebat</td>
<td>equidem</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.83</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>2F.MC</td>
<td></td>
<td>quas</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.86</td>
<td>Trebatius</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Si quis (84)</td>
<td>Fabulae tu</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.86</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>3F.MC</td>
<td>Dasi to Damascus</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.88</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>3F.MC</td>
<td>unde....noxi (?)</td>
<td>postquam</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.26</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>Unde</td>
<td>Nulli</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.31</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>5F.1H</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.300</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Stoic</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.303</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>putas (?) (302)</td>
<td>Quid</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.305</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>tum...vindici (?)</td>
<td>me foteo</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.307</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>5F.1H</td>
<td>edissere (306)</td>
<td>Accipe</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.323</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>4F.MC</td>
<td>iam</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.323</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>Cultum</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>vii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.324</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>3F.MC</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.325</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Foras</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>vii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.326</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1</td>
<td>Catius</td>
<td>3F.MC</td>
<td>Unde...catius?</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.4</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Fater</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.8</td>
<td>Catius</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Quin</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.10</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Edin</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.11</td>
<td>Catius</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Ed...an (10)</td>
<td>Ipsa</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.58</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Docte Cati</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.3</td>
<td>Tiresias</td>
<td>5F.1H</td>
<td>Quid rides</td>
<td>Iamna</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i/v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.5</td>
<td>Ulysses</td>
<td>2F.1H</td>
<td>non satis...adipicere</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.5</td>
<td>Tiresias</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quando</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.18</td>
<td>Ulysses</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Utne</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19</td>
<td>Tiresias</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>Ergo</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.20</td>
<td>Ulysses</td>
<td>2F.MC</td>
<td>Iubebo</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.23</td>
<td>Tiresias</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>dic augur</td>
<td>Dixi</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.58</td>
<td>Ulysses</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.59</td>
<td>Tiresias</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.61</td>
<td>Ulysses</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quid</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.62</td>
<td>Tiresias</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>ede</td>
<td>quo</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.76</td>
<td>Ulysses</td>
<td>5F.FC</td>
<td>putasne...cursu</td>
<td>enim</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.79</td>
<td>Tiresias</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patur</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i/v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.2</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>3F.MC</td>
<td>Dausene</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i/v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.2</td>
<td>Davus</td>
<td>4F.MC</td>
<td>Davusne?</td>
<td>Ita</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.4</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>3F.MC</td>
<td></td>
<td>age</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.6</td>
<td>Davus</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Narra</td>
<td>pars</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.21</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Dices</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.22</td>
<td>Davus</td>
<td>2F.MC</td>
<td>non dices...fucifer</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.22</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>3F.MC</td>
<td>quo</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.22</td>
<td>Davus</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>quo pacto pessime</td>
<td>laudans</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.116</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Unde</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.116</td>
<td>Davus</td>
<td>3F.MC</td>
<td>unde mihi</td>
<td>quorsum</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.116</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>5F.1H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unde</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.117</td>
<td>Davus</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Instinct</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.17</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>5F.1H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tie</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.3</td>
<td>Fundanus</td>
<td>4F.MC</td>
<td>Iuvit te (1)</td>
<td>Sic</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.4</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>4F.MC</td>
<td>Dic</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.6</td>
<td>Fundanus</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Dae...esca</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.18</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>sed</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.20</td>
<td>Fundanus</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>nosse laboro</td>
<td>Summus</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.79</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>niallem</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.80</td>
<td>Fundanus</td>
<td>5F.1H</td>
<td>age...risisti</td>
<td>Vitalius dum</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates a special signal or situation.
Table 1 shows the distribution of signals relative to the speaker, position within the turn (whether it is the first, second, third word spoken — hence ‘initial’, ‘secondary’ etc) and metrical position of the initial turn. I have labelled each signal according to the typology provided by Drummen and have also expanded it to include two additional categories useful for satiric speech.\textsuperscript{14}

The sixth (vi) category reflects when vocabulary or syntax is used which is peculiar to/expected of the idiolect of the speaker. Consider the following exchange between Horace and Trebatius:

\begin{quote}
\textit{optimum erat: verum nequeo dormire’ ‘ter uncti}
\textit{transnanto Tiberim somno quibus est opus alto}
\textit{inriguumque mero sub noctem corpus habento’}
\end{quote}

Hor. Sat. 2.1.7-9

\textit{Transnanto} is the key term here, occupying the tertiary position in the speech turn and functioning to signal the change of speaker. This third person imperative is characteristic of ‘legal’ language, appropriate to the quasi-legislative idiolect of the jurist Trebatius.\textsuperscript{15}

The seventh (vii) category comprises speaker-transitions indicated by continuing the syntax of a previously interrupted statement. This will be treated extensively in the section on overlapping utterances, but I present the excerpt in full below to demonstrate the transition without nuanced exegesis.

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{14} Transitions grouped under ii* are responses to direct questions or imperatives which are signalled primarily through context rather than a strong ‘signal word’ e.g. 2.7.5-6; \textit{quando ita maiores voluerunt utere narra’ ‘pars hominum vitis... 2.8.5-6; quae prima iratum ventrem placaverit esca’ ‘in primis... 2.8.80 reddre age quae deinceps risisti’ ‘Vibidius dum...}

\textsuperscript{15} Muecke 1993: 102; Freudenburg 2021: 57.
Both *cultum* and *furores* are objects of *dico*, and belong to Damasippus’ speech despite being separated by Horace’s interjections. Speaker transitions are indicated not only through particles and vocatives, but also through technical language and syntactic constructions.

Table 1, therefore, demonstrates that dialogic turn-taking structures in Book 2 are constructed using signals in similar fashion to that discussed by Bonifazi et al. However, qualitative studies such as that of Langslow’s 2000 article demonstrate the need for contextual analysis in addition to quantitative analysis.16 Reading the texts with due attention given to both the type of turn-initial signal and its metrical position allows us to analyse and discuss the nature of specific speech-turns, as well as patterns of similarity and divergence across speakers, poems, and authors.

**Transitions**

The nature of speaker transitions — especially those which are in some way disruptive — provides ample material for the analysis of conversational phenomena and their role in satiric poetics. First, a few key terms will be defined.

- PI = Principal interlocutor. This refers to speakers who are not subordinated/presented through the speech of others. The satirists themselves, and dialogic partners such as

16 Langslow 2000: 542 responds to Kroon’s 1995 work on discourse particles.
Damasippus (Horace 2.3) and Naevolus (Juvenal 9), are considered principal interlocutors.

- **SI** = Secondary interlocutor. This refers to speakers who are subordinate to other speakers: e.g. Stertinius is presented *through* Damasippus (Horace 2.3), Ofellus is presented *through* Horace (Horace 2.2), Umbricius’ monologue is presented *by* the narrator in Juvenal 3.

- **RI** = Rhetorical interlocutor. While these can be both unmediated (cutting into the speech of a PI/SI without warning) and mediated (e.g. *now someone might say...*), they are classified as fictive dialogue for the purposes of quantitative analysis.

- True dialogue = unmediated speech from a PI.

- Fictive dialogue = mediated speech from any SI or RI.

Transitions — the shift from one speaker to another — can occur both laterally (one PI to another PI) or vertically (SI/RI to PI, and vice-versa). Lateral transitions are the most valuable for this study, as they often feature aggregation of conversational phenomena. However, vertical transitions are common and can prove rich for the analysis of *sermo*. The transitions which require the most preliminary discussion are *faulty* transitions — often termed *interruptions*.

Interruptions are hallmarks of dialogue.\(^{17}\) Research on interruptions in Roman comedy has demonstrated that their functions are various, and that analysis must be informed by both

their linguistic composition and their poetic context. Little work has been undertaken to understand this phenomenon in hexametric poetry of any genre. Throughout this thesis, I will identify, de-construct, and discuss several instances of interruption. I argue that the various methods used to represent interruptions demonstrates mimesis of dialogic phenomena, and that these interruptions are meaningful aspects of the poems.

The terms ‘overlap’, ‘interruption’, and occasionally ‘interjection’ are often used in discussion of similar phenomena. ‘Interjection’ will refer to words such as ohe and hercule, which are not inherently interruptive. Barrios-Lech provides a useful definition of ‘interruption’ proper – ‘any encroachment on the speaker’s turn which leaves his or her talk incomplete’. This can be further subdivided. McHoul identifies two forms of interruption in dialogically-mimetic texts: one where two interlocutors are presented as speaking simultaneously (henceforth Type 1), and one where an interlocutor begins a speech-turn, and the original speaker immediately ceases (Type 2). Type 1 interruptions effect a longer plurality of voices than Type 2.

For the study of Latin poetics, I argue that Type 1 interruptions are represented using elision, and Type 2 interruptions through syntax. I explain the theory underlying the identification of Type 1 interruptions here through an example from Horace Satires 2.1, a dialogue in which Horace consults Trebatius regarding the reception of his satires. Consider the following lines:

‘si mala condiderit in quem quis carmina ius est
iudiciaque’ ‘esto si quis mala sed bona si quis’

Horace. Sat. 2.1.82-83

---

19 Barrios-Lech 2016: 158.
20 McHoul 1987: 89.
There can be no hiatus between iudiciumque and esto — elision must occur between these two words, and thus between the two interlocutors. More than 100 years ago, Harkness argued that pause-elisions (the presence of which he infers from semantic distance between the words in question) avoid an accented long syllable in the second element of the elision (shown in bold iudiciumque esto). This theory has found support in Freudenburg’s study on elision in Horace Satires 2.3 and 2.4. Freudenburg also elaborates on Harkness’s process of identifying pause-elision, arguing that pause-elisions occur over strong punctuation postulating that if the second long syllable is accented, ‘it is, in most cases, a sentence-enclitic (and thus only ‘apparently’ accented)…or an “unemphatic element” of the sentence which would not have a marked sentence-accent’. The majority of elisions which break Harkness’s rule occur in the divisions between speakers — such as that from 2.1.22 Esto is both long and accented, and neither an enclitic nor an ‘unemphatic element’ of the sentence. Indeed, Horace’s pseudo-agreement with Trebatius plays a critical role in his speech-turn — which will be given due exegesis in the chapter proper. Here, I establish that these types of elision are i) exceptional rather than standard in their form, ii) considered in many cases to be exceptional on the grounds of emphasis, and iii) previously discussed as strange and jarring phenomena, but hitherto not given linguistic or literary analysis.

The pronunciation of elisions must also be addressed. Soubiran, in his landmark tome on elision, writes ‘Cette analyse…constituait une présomption très favorable à l’hypothèse de la remanence partielle des finales élidées’23 According to Soubiran, most forms of elisions were pronounced as synaloepha, merging the two vowels in one breath, with the potential exception of enclitics and prodelision of est.24 To return to 2.1, a potential full elision of the final -e on the enclitic of iudiciumque may reduce the sonic ‘harshness’ of the transition. If a reader prefers to read iudiciumque esto as an ‘interruption’ due to a potential complete erasure of -que, it

---

22 Of the examples Harkness 1905: 86 lists (1.3.20, 1.5.12, 2.1.83, 2.30, 3.236, 283, 307, 7.72), only 2.2.30, 2.3.236, and 2.7.72 are not at boundaries between speakers.
24 Soubiran 1966: 617-19 Indeed, to Soubiran the question of pronunciation is subordinate to the question of interpretation, writing: ‘le timbre des voyelles compte moins: c’est la liaison des mots qui est surtout expressive’.
matters little for the sake of my arguments. What is important is that hiatus is absent, and one speaker clips the speech of another.

**Conversational Phenomena**

‘Conversational phenomena’ is not a simple re-branding of what 'has formally referred to as 'colloquial stylistics.’ As scholarship moves away from concepts of the ‘colloquial’, philologists must be careful not to throw the proverbial baby out with the bathwater, at least not yet. We can advance our understanding of linguistic registers and still recognise that dialogic Latin literature engages in considerable stylistic intertextuality to the effect that one can speak about a ‘conversational mode’ of Latin as a literary phenomenon. Particular stylistics are deployed across comedy and satire in greater frequency relative to other genres and often aggregate where the turn-taking apparatus is emphasised.

While my primary focus remains on how phenomena in satire engage this ‘conversational mode’ and generate poetic meaning, I explore here how such phenomena might be understood as patterning with wider representations of speech in literature — drawing on scholarship which studies a variety of texts and languages. Rest assured: I do not draw conclusions through comparative analysis of satire and, for example, Japanese media. I do, however, employ methodologies used elsewhere to study representations of dialogue in fictional texts and, where observations from socio-linguistics coincide with those from Latin philology, I propose the possibility of dialogic mimesis. I study these phenomena with both a ‘top-down’ (sociolinguistic) approach with ‘ground-up’ philology and intertextuality, where possible.

Apologia aside, the recurrent phenomena to be studied are as follows:

**Elision**

---

25 Noting methodologies used in Teshigawara and Kinsui 2011.
According to Soubiran, elision can engender complex wordplay, sonic and symbolic unity or discord, effort, haste, deformity, and a range of other poetic effects. Its presence and absence are meaningful articulations of a poet’s style and often complement stylistics such as vocabulary, metrics, and other literary flourishes.

Elision in Latin is conceptually associated with spoken conversation. Poetic awareness of elision as a deliberate stylistic can be found in Horace. The question, then, is how do fluctuations in elision rate function in satiric dialogue? A study on this in Horace 2.3 and 2.4 has already been done, and I use Freudenburg’s methodology to treat the corpus. Rates of elision will be established for speakers and, where necessary, subdivided into rates for fictive and true dialogue. This allows for analysis of both idiolects and elision as a dialogic stylistic. Modulation of elision will be shown to be significant in certain places for the interpretation of the poem(s), and thus for the relevant literary agendas.

**Satzvers**

*Satzvers* is the coincidence of a complete grammatical or syntactic structure with an entire line of poetry – in this case, one line of hexameter. Essentially, if the line can be read on its own and make complete grammatical sense, it is Satzvers. The anti-thesis of enjambment, *Satzvers* is noted to lend a ‘pithy, epigrammatic quality’ to the contents of the line. Given detailed study by both Nilsson and Freudenburg, I expand the latter’s investigation of the use of *Satzvers* in Horace 2.3 and 2.4 to explore how it is used alongside and, often, in contrast to conversational phenomena. While it is enjambment rather than *Satzvers* which has been traditionally associated with satiric/sermonic style, I demonstrate in this thesis that speech is often delivered in this

---

26 Soubiran 1966: 617.
28 Soubiran 1966: 63-72. Hor. Sat. 1.4.11 *lutulentus* perhaps referencing Lucilius’ high rate of elision (84.8%).
29 Freudenburg 1996.
30 Note also the inclusion of subject-only sentences in Nilsson’s definition – ‘die von einem (in der Regel) satzeinleitenden Subjekt ganz gefüllt werden, dass durch die Ausbreitung über den Vers grosses Eigengewicht bekommen hat’.
31 Freudenburg 1996: 203.
vaguely Neoteric construction — especially quips from rhetorical interlocutors, or interjections from over-eager philosophers.

Syntax

Certain syntactic constructions, such as forms of parataxis or asyndeton, have been discussed as belonging to ‘colloquial’ or ‘conversational’ Latin. This idea — that a particular syntactic form inherently belongs to a particular register of the language — has received significant revision in recent years, with scholars emphasising the importance of qualitative, contextual analysis over quantitative methodologies. Although parataxis and asyndeton are often seen in texts which employ dialogic modalities or emphasise conversation, reading any particular tone should be informed by the stylistic ‘sum’ of aggregated phenomena functioning alongside the syntax, such as repetition, vocabulary, metrical features etc. This idea is expounded numerous times throughout Adams’ 2021 tome on asyndeton in Latin, where he writes:

‘Such clausal asyndeton was ubiquitous in the language, and not restricted to colloquial registers…it is their function, not their stylistic level, that the motivation of these structures should be sought.’ Adams 2021: 27.

and

‘It is above all the components of an asyndetic coordination, not the asyndetic coordination in itself, that may establish the stylistic tone of a sequence.’ Adams 2021: 403.

This is not to say that syntactic forms have no primary resonances: the proliferation of asyndeton in a wide-array of texts that are mimetic of orality (speech, magic chants) allow for a more direct form of intertextuality with certain texts, as will be seen in this thesis. Another example is noted by Reinhardt, who writes that ‘asyndeton or the use of aut with two elements
of close semantic similarity mimics the speech of someone excited or exasperated’, citing this excerpt from Terence (among others):

*Laches: bene, ita me di ament, nuntias, et gaudeo

natum, tibi illam salvam, sed quid mulieris

Terence *Hecyra* 642-3

I agree with Reinhardt’s interpretation of this passage as ‘excited/exasperated’, though I disagree that this is read primarily or solely on the grounds of asyndeton. Consider the other phenomena present. Expressions such as *me di ament* are considered (semi-) formulaic in oral contexts and have parenthetical function, often seen in extemporaneous speech. Barrios-Lech notes that clauses which bridge verses such as *gaudeo natum* are mimetic of prosaic dialogue through avoiding *Satzvers*. I disagree with Reinhardt that any and all uses of that construction inherently mimic such speech or link to Terence, but I do maintain that if other elements of the speech-turn point towards intertextuality with Roman comedy, the syntax likely communicates a similar tone. The asyndeton is thus contextualised by other conversational stylistics — see the use of personal pronouns and ‘concrete’ language (as opposed to abstract imagery, seen in the previous example). The combination of particular phenomena generates tone — asyndeton does not inherently belong to a ‘high’ or ‘low’ register, but can be rendered either through context. For satire, I will argue that such structures also often convey the compression of time through the literal compression of syntax.

I note also the findings Drummen with regards to what they term ‘syntactic build-up’. The presentation of a subordinate clause (or clauses) before the main clause, or the situation of subordinate clauses in the middle of a main clause, is often used to parody Socratic/sophistic/philosophical style in Greek comedy. This ‘sophistic’ syntax is often juxtaposed against ‘jerky’ syntax which denies syntactic anticipation, often through asyndeton and parataxis. This observation broadly aligns with Brown and Yule’s observation that the syntax of ‘spoken speech’ is typically less complex and/or structured than that of written language or speech mimetic thereof. I note these here not to deploy these findings to determine
the tone of particular syntax in the satires, but as a framework against which we may understand the numerous occasions of contrastive syntax amongst speakers.

Repetition

Ferri reads in Latin epic a ‘desire to avoid repetition’; conversely, satire is full of it.32 Scholars from philology and sociolinguistics note that repetition often has ‘oral’, and especially dialogic, connotations – occurring far more often in spoken conversation than literature, and often used in the latter to evoke the former.33 Like syntax such as asyndeton, repetition has no inherent function in satire – interpretation is, again, driven by context.

Morphemes, phonemes, grammatical structures, and, as I will argue, metrics, are all subject to repetition.34 Dialogic repetition — where speaker A repeats something from speaker B — demonstrates conversational attention (A listens to B) and often emphasises the repeated subject.35 Furthermore, the iterated item is often given new context and thus its meaning is transformed, often to parodic effect in satire.36 These twin effects — attention and transformation — will be shown to be thematic motifs of dialogic repetition.

Referentiality

Speakers in conversation, ‘real’ or fictionalised, often refer to shared experiences and derive sense from situational context.37 This is often expressed overtly through direct references to phenomena such as the physical locale of the conversation, the interlocutors’ past interactions, and meta-commentary on the dialogue itself. More subtle forms of referentiality which are especially relevant to the study of satire include mimicry/parody, and the use of what is often termed ‘vivid’ language. On the latter, socio-linguists and philologists note frequent use of

---

32 Ferri 2011: 352.
strong/exaggerated, physical imagery in ‘real’ conversation and dialogic Latin texts respectively – as opposed to abstract and ‘imaginative’ language. Mimicry is the modulation of one’s speech to match aspects of one’s interlocutor — to do so with humorous or invective intent is parody. While scholars have already noted the parodic element of Roman satire — often mimicking other genres with aggressive intent — there has been little discussion of mimicry as an active phenomenon taking place between speakers.

**Politeness**

‘Politeness’ is a studied as a speech-act phenomenon by socio-linguists, and its manifestation in some classical texts has been studied — most notably in John Hall’s *Politeness and Politics in Cicero’s Letters*. Brown and Levinson’s landmark 1987 study *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage* continues to form the core of most popular models of politeness. This holds true for the model proposed by Geoffrey Leech in *The Pragmatics of Politeness* (2014), which is the model used in this thesis. Leech’s model is preferred as it takes into account a far larger corpus of politeness-focused literature from a greater variety of academic disciplines and human cultures/languages.

Leech defines politeness in the following way:

‘[Politeness is] a form of communicative behaviour found very generally in human languages and among human cultures; indeed, it has been claimed as a universal phenomenon of human society. What it means to be polite, I will argue, is to speak or behave in such a way as to (appear to) give benefit or value not to yourself but

---

39 Couper-Kuhlen 1996 is a key source for this as occurring in ‘real’ conversation. See also Kreuz and Roberts 1993: 104; Berger 2016: 123. For the bivalence of mimicry see Yu 2012: 129
41 The full details of his synthesis of scholarship are found in pages 43-77 of his work.
to the other person(s), especially the person(s) you are conversing with.’ Leech 2014: 3.

His model for the study of politeness can be summarised as follows. Politeness is manifested through redressive speech-acts linked to a request. ‘Neg-politeness’ (negative politeness) seeks to mitigate and/or reduce possible causes of offense and/or the magnitude of the imposition. This includes indirectness, giving deference, apologising, im-personalisation, and permission-seeking.\(^42\) ‘Pos-politeness’ (positive) attempts to assign positive social value to the addressee. This includes giving compliments, seeking agreement/avoiding disagreement, and reciprocity.\(^43\) I will demonstrate that politeness is present in satiric poetry, that it can be understood under the model provided by Leech, and that it is a meaningful element of the text(s).

**Methodological Summary**

Sermo will be studied through the identification and exegesis of the structures and phenomena outlined above. I employ methodologies from CA as well as recent philological scholarship to analyse individual passages and broader trends across poems and authors. This allows for a comparative study of ‘sermonic stylistics’. Yet the representation of conversation is not only a stylistic endeavour. Multiple speakers can engender multiple perspectives – especially considering how satire is often self-conscious and meta-poetic, constantly blurring the lines between author and narrator, fact and fiction. The construction of idiolects for various speakers, and the homogeneity of rhetorical interlocutors and the shadowy ‘other’, inevitably influence how we read these poems as cultural artefacts.

\(^{42}\) Leech 2014: 11. Note that these phenomena as discussed in B&L (Brown and Levinson 1987: 130-180) retain their classification in both Leech’s model and in their discussion by John Hall. Hall, however, discusses politeness in the categories of ‘respect’, ‘affiliative, and ‘deference’ – though noting that the behaviours retain their positive/negative classification.

\(^{43}\) Leech 2014: 147-179. Note that Leech relegates behaviour such as using ‘in-group’ language to the term *camaraderie*, which he argues is an alternative to politeness, rather than part of pos-politeness as under B&L’s model. However, in several places, Leech notes that it is often deployed alongside other, formally ‘polite’ phenomena, and I find the distinction unhelpful for the present analysis. Therefore, Lakoff’s *camaraderie* will be discussed as a form of pos-politeness.
Chapter One: Gaius Lucilius

Introduction

Lucilius’ fragments inaugurate this study and his genre; fragments in which we see the beginning of self-reflection on satiric poetry and authorship.\(^{44}\) It is perhaps this self-awareness that earned him, and not Ennius, the esteemed position as the father of satire.\(^{45}\) A study of his fragments is thus the study of a phenomenon that instigated and continued to shape a genre and a literary ideology, the influence of which proved inescapable for the later satirists.

The fragments are woven from a variety of languages, idiolects, dialogic interactions, conversational phenomena, and meta-commentary on said phenomena. Several of the chapters published in Breed and Keitel’s 2018 handbook on Lucilius analyse these aspects using interdisciplinary methodologies, and in this chapter I advance many of the arguments made by Chahoud, Poccetti, and Keane.

The fragmentary nature of Lucilius’ works makes any cohesive study difficult – doubly so for any quantitative analysis. This chapter, then, will explore the varying manifestations of *sermo* in the fragments of Lucilius as foundational generic structures. The variety of phenomena and dialogic modalities are thus read as an element of satiric Latin poetry *ab initio*. This, in turn, influences how we read the later authors — the modalities they engage and their use of particular stylistics can be read as *generic choices*. This is not to imply that later satirists lack innovation, or that they are best understood as Lucilius *mutatis mutandis*. Rather, it is to establish that sermonic variety (*sermo, satura*) is a central and ever-present concern of the poets — deriving either from direct intertextuality with Lucilius’ foundations, or from a shared poetic inheritance extending beyond conventional generic boundaries.\(^{46}\) I will also discuss the question of *persona* as pertinent to the satires, establishing my approach through elucidating the ‘mask’ of Lucilius.

\(^{44}\) Keane 2018: 229.
\(^{45}\) Ousting also Varro — see den Heijer 2014: 439, Goldberg 2018.
\(^{46}\) Considering Old Comic and iambic traditions.
Whose Fragments?

Critical editions of Lucilius’ satires remain, unfortunately, almost as problematic as the fragmentary nature of the corpus itself. In my study, I most often use Christes and Garbugino’s 2015 edition. The authors synthesize much of previous scholarship, and present the fragments with clarity as to their reconstructed order. Although my analysis does not concern itself with particularly controversial fragments, I will identify where the editors disagree and justify my choices. At this stage in Lucilian scholarship, as is evinced by the tables of correspondence that accompany most analyses, utilising the critical editions in the spirit of collaboration rather than that of antagonism seems to produce the most cogent exegesis.

Lucilius’ Personae

The question of persona is relevant to the study of all Latin satirists and is notoriously complex. The problem asks where the borders between historical author and fictional representation(s) exist, if they exist at all. While persona-centric studies have been a mainstay of satiric scholarship in recent decades, for Lucilius, persona-focused reception is several millennia old. Cicero provides a perspective on the author-character dilemma which is not only proximate (temporally, culturally) to Lucilius’ works, but also illuminating in its simplicity.

Fragments G77-78(84-85) are preserved in book 3 of Cicero’s De Oratore. They belong to Lucilius’ re-telling of the confrontation between Titus Albucius and Quintus Mucius Scaevola; a dialogue that will be treated extensively later in the chapter. The fragments appear in Cicero’s own dialogue, where Crassus holds forth on the finer aspects of verbal composition, citing the fragment of Lucilius as an elegant example. The lines in question are as follows:

Cicero then has Crassus make the following remark on the excerpt:

‘conlocationis est componere et struere verba sic ut neve asper eorum concursus neve hiulcus sit, sed quodam modo coagmentatus et levis. in quo lepide soceri mei persona lusit is qui elegantissime id facere potuit
Lucilius’ Cicero De. Orat. 3.171

The line in bold evinces a reception of Lucilius which recognises the historical author (Lucilius) and his adoption of a particular mask (Scaevola), a persona which exists in a relationship to a real, near-contemporary figure. The process by which this persona is utilised is described as a form of ludere — a word used elsewhere in Cicero to indicate ridicule (Cic. Q. Fr. 2.15a 13, De Or.1.12.50) and, importantly, mimicry (Cic. Fam. 8.9.1). The term also has important connotations for satire – Lucilius describes his works as ludus, and the concept of play seems to be an integral part of the poems. Note that Scaevola’s speech is given in direct discourse, rather than through indirect report. Consider the following fragment from the same poem:

fandam atque auditam iterabimus (famam.)

48 Mankin 2011: 261 glosses persona as ‘in the guise of’, which neatly encapsulates the idea of visual imitation associated with the term.
49 Lewis and Short 1879: ludo. Playful mockery, literary or otherwise, need not to be necessarily invective — see Yu 2012.
All commentators read this fragment as a narratorial introduction to the dispute, with the first-person plural representing Lucilius’ poetic ‘we’. Assuming the distribution of fragments is correct (and that Cicero was a thorough reader), this indicates that Cicero’s conception of \textit{persona} functions independent of any meta-poetic narratology in the text. Although Lucilius explicitly calls attention to the crafted nature of the story (‘breaking the fourth wall’), he is still considered to have adopted the \textit{personae} of particular characters. For Cicero, and perhaps for other Roman readers, the use of \textit{personae} is thus predicated on the presence of speech from different characters, and not on narratological structures or a suspension of disbelief. A \textit{persona} does not have to be delivered in ‘true dialogue’ à la Book Two of Horace’s \textit{Sermones}. It is possible that the smallest interjection from a rhetorical interlocutor is understood as a (micro)\textit{persona}, and thus subject to variations in stylistic phenomena for the purposes of characterisation.

This conceptualisation of \textit{persona} leads naturally towards a study of idiolect/characterlect. First, however, I will map Lucilius’ various dialogic modalities. This will contextualise the dialogic exchanges themselves (their narratological context, whether they are subordinated to a parallel story. etc.) and demonstrate that Lucilius’ satiric inheritors had a wealth of dialogic forms to choose from, thus arguing that their monologic/dialogic choices were \textit{deliberate} and \textit{informed}.

\textbf{A Lucilian Typology of Dialogue}

Lucilius’ fragments, though an early stage in the genre’s development, contain almost all of the possible dialogic modalities achieved between the four authors.$^{51}$

I begin with unmediated dialogue. This modality features two or more characters’ speech without any third-person narration or first-person commentary, and is most clearly realised

\textit{51} Lacking only Persius’ explicit appeal to the interlocutor’s fictiveness at 1.44, and possibly change of addressee mid-speech seen in Juvenal 1.125-6, 4.133-135.
later in Horace’s second book of satires. The fragments of the fourth satire from book 29 indicate the presence of unmediated dialogue, though a disagreement between Krenkel and Warmington on the matter must be examined:

‘amicos Hodie cum improbo illo audivimus
Lucilio advocasse’

G886-887

For this fragment, Krenkel’s analysis is more cogent than Warmington’s. All the reader can infer from Warmington’s edition is that the satiric narrator (often identified with Lucilius) speaks this fragment — an unlikely reconstruction, as the mention of Lucilius’ name instantiates the satirist as a character in the drama and is indicative that someone other than Lucilius is speaking. Krenkel’s reconstruction reads the entire poem as unmediated dialogue in imitation of comic dinner scenes.\(^52\) Christes and Garbugino agree.\(^53\) Krenkel’s proposal fits contextually with later fragments which Warmington too posits as an interlocutor’s speech concerning Lucilius’ (the character’s) arrival.\(^54\) After this fragment, the poem then devolves into a satiric-comic siege of a host by uninvited guests, who are eventually driven back.\(^55\)

No commentators identify any fragments in this series as being spoken by a satiric narrator. The evidence suggests that unmediated dialogue is used throughout. Unmediated dialogue in satire is often mimetic of other texts which use the modality — Roman comedy and Platonic dialogue.\(^56\) It is unclear whether this form of dialogue was used elsewhere in Lucilius’ works,

---

\(^{52}\) Krenkel 1970: 96.
\(^{53}\) Christes and Garbugino 2015 on G886-887.
\(^{54}\) Warmington 1938: 301 which is argued more cogently in Krenkel 1970: 97.
\(^{55}\) Krenkel 1970: 96-7
\(^{56}\) Indeed, fragments G888-G900 play out as a comic scene — Warmington 1938: 302 citing Arist. Vesp. 184 for line 912. For another Gnatho trying to get to a dinner by any means necessary, see Terence’s *Eunuchus*. 
though I footnote some possible occurrences. Horace’s various dialogues in Book 2 therefore have satiric precedent, though this style proved less popular with later Latin satirists.

The absence of mediation — philosophical or satiric — contributes to what Blondell terms ‘dramatic transparency’ in her discussion of Platonic unmediated dialogue. It is an act of narratological mimesis rather than deixis. Blondell argues that this mimetic aspect of the modality focuses the reader’s attention on the dialogue and discrete characterisations of the speakers’ themselves, rather than on the instantiation of the author or the act of transmission.

When applied to satiric texts, this concept of ‘dramatic transparency’ reveals the foregrounding or de-emphasis of particular perspectives. Unmediated dialogue allows Lucilius to situate himself as a character/speaker, rather than narrator/satirist, de-emphasising ‘his’ perspective on the situation. This can produce familiar comic humour, as the audience supposedly possesses information that the satiric characters do not (the conversation about Lucilius that Lucilius is not present for). This generation of humour/irony through dramatic transparency provides a primarily mimetic field in which to carry out characterisation, as well as a method to carry out self-satirisation. Lucilius becomes a dramatic character, subject to the plot like any other.

Mediated dialogue — speech which is presented via narration, either by the (implied) satirist or via another character — is also present. This modality is seen in later satiric works such as Horace S. 1.7, 1.9, and Juvenal 3. Mediated dialogue is often signposted with verbs of speaking, seen in the fragments below. The following exchange is preceded by the narration of

57 Fragments G740-752 seem to be a dialogue between a master and slave, perhaps the model for Hor. Sat. 2.7; G763-782 seems to be a dialogue in which the characters recount a house-siege (and Lucilius is mentioned in the third person).
58 Blondell 2002: 42.
60 For dramatic irony, see Kreuz and Roberts 1993: 98-101. This works alongside conversational implicature, as the audience can read off record speech-acts that may be misinterpreted by interlocutors due to a lack of extra-dialogic information.
61 This is, of course, not the only method to achieve self-satirisation. Scholars (including myself) have argued for the presence of self- indictment through defective monologues (Horace) or extreme hyperbole (Juvenal), contributing to a layer of self-satirisation in the texts.
a breakdown in relations between an army, a commander, and his quaestor, and the use of *inquin* marks this speech as being *narrated* rather than presented sans Lucilius.  

‘cenam’ *inquin* ‘nullam neque divo prosectam ullam?’

G465

An element of deixis is necessarily present in mediated dialogue, as the conversation is referred to or navigated rather than *solely* acted out. This is not to say that this modality cannot also be mimetic. As we have seen in the fragments dealing with Albucius and Scaevola, direct speech was considered by Cicero to be mimetic *even if* it is introduced in the third person by the satirist/narrator. Rather, this modality adds another lens through which we can study the function of *sermo* — conversational layering, the intratextuality of ‘nested’ dialogues.

Finally, Lucilius also makes use of the ‘fictive interlocutor’. This phrase is often used in modern scholarship to refer to the diatribic/rhetorical technique of voicing an (often dissenting) opinion as if it were spoken by another person, anonymous or specified. For non-specific fictive interlocutors, pronouns such as *quidam* are sometimes employed in the set-up, seen in the example below:


-es’ *ait quidam, ‘senium atque, insulse, sophista*’

G1132

Fiske notes that Lucilius found themes for his satires in Stoic and Cynic diatribe, particularly those of Bion of Borysthenes, and that fragments such as that above evince the adoption of

---

63 Scodel 1987: 201.
diatribe ‘quasi-discourse’ into satire’s rhetorical tool-kit.\textsuperscript{64} However, Kindstrand has argued that the dialogic element of this technique as used by Bion has been over-emphasised, and that cases of the technique in the fragments are ‘comparatively few…and of a completely rhetorical character’.\textsuperscript{65} Other origins of this technique are possible. The use of \textit{quidam} in particular seems influenced from its use in comedy, as described by Karakasis:

| Colloquial is the use of \textit{quidam} referring with contempt to a well-known person or someone present at the moment of the utterance. This usage appears in comedy as well as in satire … Karakasis 2005: 38 |

Leaving aside questions of ‘colloquial’, the aspect of contempt that Karakasis highlights seems especially relevant for its use in satire, where the fictive-interlocutor is used most often as a voice of dissent and/or public opinion.

Lucilius’ satires contain dialogic modalities mirrored in a wide variety of different texts, and through presenting them together, often in parody, the author creates an intertextual pastiche of speech. Lucilius’ poetry explores different and often inter-locking manifestations of \textit{sermo}, and is seminal for later satiric forays into the fusion of dialogue and hexameter poetry.

\textbf{CA on Satire: A Case Study}

The dialogic modalities (unmediated dialogue, mediated dialogue, narration, second-person interaction) described are the scaffold for conversational interaction. It is in the interactions themselves that conversational phenomena become meaningful.

Idiolect — vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation characteristic of or idiosyncratic to an individual — in Latin literature has been the subject of scholarship from the fields of both

\textsuperscript{64} Fiske 1920: 28, 182.
\textsuperscript{65} Kindstrand 1976: 30.
textual criticism and sociolinguistics. An obvious example is the presentation of Arrius in Catullus 84. Less obvious idiolects have been identified in Horace 2.3 and 2.4 by Freudenburg.

Lucilius’ use of Greek is notorious. Recent developments in Graeco-Roman sociolinguistics compel a reassessment of certain aspects of Lucilius’ bilingualism, particularly accusations of ‘code-switching’. Here, I examine the use of Greek in satiric dialogue as an exercise in ethopoeia, mimetic of Lucilius’ world and representing various receptions of so-called ‘bilingualism’.

Idiolect in Lucilius has received significant but not exhaustive treatment in Poccetti’s chapter, ‘Another image of literary Latin’. Poccetti argues that the impression of ‘realism’ is generated by imitating a variety of idiolects and dialects. One also finds Lucilius’ interest in pronunciation, regional Latin vocabulary, and non-Latin (Greek, Celtic, Oscan) languages. I will argue that this macro-mimesis of his contemporary world is mirrored also by micro-mimesis of character-specific speech patterns.

I return to the subject of Albucius v. Scaevola. Goh describes the historical context as ‘a trial of 119 BC was an attempt to prosecute Scaevola on a charge of repetundae under the lex Acilia (123/122 BC), and related to the defendant’s term as governor of Asia in 121 BC.’ Lucilius re-presents this trial with direct speech. Scaevola attacks Albucius for his rhetorical flourishes, and recalls Albucius’ desire to be greeted in Greek when in Athens. While Clackson notes that speaking too much Greek as a Roman official could invite criticism, given Lucilius’ own bilingual use of Greek, it is necessary to unpack these fragments and identify which aspect of Albucius’ idiolect incites censure, and how this idiolect functions in a dialogic and satiric

---

67 *Chommoda* dicebat, si quando *commode* vellet | dicere, et *insidias* Arrius *hinsidias*...
68 See Freudenburg’s 1996 article ‘Verse-Technique and Moral Extremism in Two Satires of Horace (Sermones 2.3 and 2.4)’
69 Hor. Sat. 1.10.21-21.
70 See Clackson’s 2015 *Language and Society in the Greek and Roman Worlds*.
72 Ibid 111, 113, 114, 116
73 Goh 2018: 34-5.
context. I present the fragments in full, to contextualise the discussion of idiolect and bilingualism. Below, the English translation is first provided in full (Warmington’s), after which I extract lines and passages in Latin.

Regarding speaker attribution, there is, thankfully, scholarly consensus on the lines of significant importance. The nature of the evidence makes any reconstruction plausible at best, but I find that presented by Christes and Garbugino most plausible, so the fragments are presented in their order. I note (CG = Christes and Garbugino, K = Krenkel, W = Warmington, *A = Albucius as speaker, *S = Scaevola) where there is disagreement regarding speaker. I present the English (Warmington’s) translation for ease of reading – the Latin will be dealt with separately. Parts relevant for the exegesis are in bold.

_Lucilius introduces the tale:_

(G55) Lucilius: We will tell you again a tale that may be told – a tale already often heard.

_Albucius charges Scaevola:_

(G56-57) ‘I do not say ‘let him win the case’; no, let him be an exiled vagabond and an outlawed wanderer.

(G58) ‘He’s a foul wretch and a foot-pad, going scot free too.’

(G59-69) ‘all of which were made away with within two hours after sun set and by night.’

(G61-62) CG-*S, K-S, W-*A: ‘which I now fore-chant to Aemilius here, which I force out and chant out.’

(G63-64): ‘Now I shall speak regarding the charge, which I shall take from the witnesses myself through questioning.’

---

74 ibid.
That this scoundrel made for his gullet, winded him, knocked him out.

a mere sketch of a man, hardly alive.

to penetrate into a hairy bag.

If he has marked his buttocks with a writher, thick and headed,

By then he burns out all lust for boys.

golden-buckled sleeved tunics, head-veils, bodices, headbands.

For what need had he of a phallic emblem thus affixed? That he might stuff himself by guzzling up bacon-fat and stripping meat-hooks?

Good living to you, you gluttons, you guzzlers, good living to you, you bellies!

Scaevola Defends Himself

As one learned in law...

How charming are ses dits put together – artfully like all the little stone dice of mosaic in a paved floor in an inlay of wriggly pattern!

Crassus have I as son-in-law, lest you be too much l’orateur.

What say you? Why comes it that you make that contention of yours?

When they, Hortensius and Postumius and the rest of them too, saw that in the coffin there lay not this man but another.

Then all was done aright, I was purified.

cleansed, made pure.

Ah, to hell with you, you lout!’ and he goes on and on.
(G86-92) ‘You have preferred to be called a Greek, Albucius, rather than a Roman and a Sabine, a fellow-townsman of Pontius and Tritanus, of centurions, of famous and foremost men, yes, standard-bearerers. Therefore I as praetor greet you at Athens in Greek, when you approach me, just as you preferred. ‘Good-cheer, Titus’ say I in Greek. ‘Good-cheer, Titus’ likewise say all the attendants, all my troop and band. That’s why Albucius is foe to me, that’s why he’s an enemy!’

Scholars have discussed this dialogue with regards to the use of Greek by Roman officials and how such practices were received.\(^75\) However, there has been little commentary on the use of Greek*within* the dialogue itself, and it is on this aspect of these fragments that I now focus.\(^76\) The key question is: does Lucilius give Albucius a Greek-ish idiolect?

Let us first examine the distribution and function of Greek words for each speaker. What constitutes a ‘Greek’ word is not entirely self-evident. Plautus, writing slightly earlier than Lucilius, uses Greek words that seem to have been ‘naturalised’ into Latin language.\(^77\) However, as Hough argues, naturalisation does not necessarily imply that words discard their ‘foreign flavour’.\(^78\) Therefore, it is difficult to measure how ‘Greek’ individual loan-words sounded to a reader/listener of Lucilius’ satires. I will attempt to navigate this problem as pertaining to Lucilius by looking at the distribution of particular words elsewhere in the corpus.

Albucius’ speech features several words of Greek origin. In the fragment below, Albucius notes items stolen by or under the praetorship of Scaevola:

\textit{chirodyti aurati, ricae, toracia, mitrae}

G71

\(^{75}\) Adams 2003: 353; Chahoud 2004: 34.
\(^{76}\) Except for O’Sullivan 2012 on \textit{Choere, Tite}.
\(^{77}\) Clackson 2015: 90
\(^{78}\) Hough 1934: 348-50.
Poccetti notes that *chirodyti, mitrae*, and *thoracia* are patently Greek.\(^79\) I argue that their use may contribute to the image of Albucius as ‘more Greek than the Greeks’.\(^80\) A counter-argument could be raised that the use of such words in a ‘legal’ setting would not constitute any Hellenophilic tendency or idiolect, as it is merely a descriptive list.\(^81\) However, Chahoud suggests that the use of *clinopodas* in another set of fragments (G21-22), a technical Greek term, has moral connotations, occurring in a speech regarding linguistic practices amongst the Gods.\(^82\) A similar argument can be made here — that Albucius’ use of Greek technical vocabulary indicates familiarity with the language. In the absence of more evidence, it is problematic to settle on either interpretation. Let us proceed, then, to another instance of Greek:

\[
\text{vix vivo homini ac monogrammo}
\]

G67

The Greek (or, if naturalised, ‘Greekish’) *monogrammo* is invective description of Scaevola.\(^83\) This word is seen also in a satire on ‘Love’s Madness’ — a decidedly Greek *topos*, and occurs in other fragments which Nonnius records as employing Greek or Greek-derived vocabulary.\(^84\) Furthermore, it is difficult to imagine an argument that *monogrammus* is used due to what Hough terms ‘*linguae latinae egestatem*’, considering Lucilius’ deft use of Latin insults elsewhere.\(^85\) I propose that this derisive use of Greek vocabulary is meaningful given the words’

---

\(^{79}\) Poccetti 2018: 115.
\(^{80}\) Quote from Adams 2003: 353.
\(^{81}\) Indeed, we might expect such terminology to be used as Scaevola was accused of theft during his praetorship in Asia, the *lingua franca* of which was Greek — Rochette 2011: 549; McElduff 2013: 31.
\(^{82}\) Chahoud 2004: 29.
\(^{83}\) Argued by Nonnius to be derived from ‘sketch-paintings’ — Warmingtont 1938: 21.
\(^{84}\) The specific fragment is W746 *Quae pietas? Monogrammi quinque adducti; | pietatem vocant*. W744 features *maltam*, which Nonnius writes as *a Graeco, quasi μαλακοὺς* (Warmingtont 1931: 241).
\(^{85}\) For the Latin flourish see Hough 1934: 348. Indeed we see the diminutive of *macer* in G247 *Si nosti, non magnus homo est, nasutus macellus*. *Monogrammo* has scant distribution according to TLL.
overtly-Hellenic intertextuality, its rare occurrence elsewhere, and in light of Scaevola’s later accusation of Albucius’ Hellenophilism. The next fragment runs:

*pedicum* ... *iam excoquit omne*

G70

Steenblock writes that *pedicum* ‘ist außer bei Lucilius nicht belegt und offenbar ein Gräzismus,’ and highlights the sexual-moral dimension of Albucius’ indictment of Scaevola here and in G69. As in the previous instance, Lucilius presents Albucius utilising Greek vocabulary to slander Scaevola. The term used is, like *monogrammo*, not well attested — possibly indicating that it was not a common or ‘naturalised’ Greek word.

The final extract to analyse is of contested attribution, and is not featured in the reconstruction above. Warmington guesses Scaevola as the speaker — Krenkel, Albucius. Christes and Garbugino do not even include it in the debate itself. The fragment is:

‘Hostilius contra

*pestem permitiemque* *catax* *quam et Manlius nobis*’

G94-95

I add only that, if we *are* to include this in the reconstruction, it seems likely to be another instance of Albucius’ invective use of Greek vocabulary. This is because Scaevola employs Greek or Greek-derived vocabulary elsewhere *only* in mocking response to/meta-commentary

86 Steenblock 2013: 41.
87 See *pedicum* in the TLL.
89 Holyoake 1648: *Catax*. One also notes the deployment of alliteration, possibly tying in to the charge of *compositio* levelled against Albucius.
on Albucius’ own language, whereas, as we have seen, Albucius employs Greek-derived words to slander his opponents outside a referential framework. The fragment above reads, out of context, closer to the latter.

Several scholars have already noted that Scaevola’s use of Greek is, in part, mockery of Albucius’ alleged Greek-ish tendencies. However, no scholar has discussed whether this parody of Albucius is derived from the image of Albucius in Greece painted by Scaevola in fragments G86-92, or if it is also (and/or primarily) related to the language employed by Albucius immediately preceding Scaevola’s responses. Does Scaevola mock Albucius as Scaevola presents him, or as Albucius presents himself? Lucilius has Albucius employ both Greek technical vocabulary (which may be expected in legal disputation involving theft of said items) and seemingly uncommon Greek words to slander his opponent. I propose that this is done to display Albucius’ Greek-influenced idiolect. This then contextualises both Scaevola’s anecdote of Albucius in Greece as immediately relevant to the dialogue and Scaevola’s own use of Greek as immediate, inventive mimicry.

Scholars agree that G77-78 begins Scaevola’s attack on Albucius’ language and demeanour. This fragment contains two clearly ‘Greek’ terms, all weaponised by Scaevola:

‘Quam lepide lexis conpostae ut tesserulae omnes
arte pavimento atque emblemate vermiculato.
Crassum habeo generum ne rhetoricoterus tu seis’

There may be a sexual-moral theme to Albucius’ Greek vocabulary. Greek clothing, and mitra especially, are associated with effeminacy — see Tatham 1990: 560-561. Pedicum is likely a comment on Scaevola’s sexuality, and monogrammus a hostile description of emaciation, also associated with effeminate or pathic sexuality.

For the importance of recognition in parody, mimicry, and satire see Simpson 2003: 43, 86, 93.
The words in question are *lexis* and *rhetoricoterus.* Warmington writes that ‘Scaevola mocks Albucius’ oratory with its Greek terms – presumably with reference to the use of *lexis*, a Greek critical term. Indeed, Warmington translates *lexis* with the French *ses dits* — a choice that makes sense in the context of this particular fragment, but one might wonder why it is only *lexis* and *rhetoricoterus* that receive this *traitement français.* Warmington’s decision to translate *monogrammo* and *catax* into plain English is one that reflects how Albucius’ idiolect has so far passed without comment from modern editors. Chahoud comes close to highlighting this element in her discussion of this fragment:

Scaevola accommodates his speech to the ethos of the ‘almost Greek’ Albucius, whose phrases are *lexis* rather than *uocabula* or *sententiae*, because that is most probably what he would call them, just as he would qualify himself as *rhetoricos* rather than *facundus* or a similar Latin equivalent. The hybrid form *rhetoricoterus* (with Latin ending) is suggestive of Albucius’ ambiguous identity, and the comparative, unattested in Greek, looks like an on-the-spot formation of the kind familiar to readers of Plautus. Chahoud 2004: 35

Scaevola *mimics* Albucius’ idiolect as we (the readers) have already encountered it – littered with weaponised Greek vocabulary. Both Warmington and Krenkel place these fragments *before* Scaevola’s recollection of Albucius in Greece, so while we might read the use of *lexis* and *rhetoricoterus* as anticipatory of Scaevola’s proceeding attack (based on Albucius’ action in Athens), a reading attentive to ‘code-switching’ of Albucius *within the dialogue itself* reveals that Scaevola’s use of Greek is directly responsive to that of Albucius. A reading that Scaevola is mimicking/parodying Albucius’ idiolect is supported by the following extract:

---

93 *Tesserulae* is clearly derived from the Greek *tessera*, but it is unclear if it carries particular Greek or invective weight.

Scaevola recollects speaking to Albucius in the manner Albucius preferred — the exchange of the Greek *chaere* and the use of the vocative praenomen. Yet, as Couper-Kuhlen notes, ‘mimicry of form is not equivalent to mimicry of function’. O’Sullivan has cogently argued that Scaevola’s mimicry of Albucius’ Greek greeting (in Athens) functions to ridicule Albucius; the transformation of the praenomen to *Tite* evokes the Greek τίτι from τίτις – meaning ‘small bird’ but also the equivalent of the Latin *cunnus*. What I propose is that this attack occurs on two levels. Scaevola parodies Albucius’ Greek twice — once directly, responding to Greek vocabulary used to attack him (Scaevola), and again in recollection of his interaction with Albucius in Athens. Scaevola not only attacks Albucius with regards to his behaviour while in Athens, but also *mimics* Albucius’ idiolect as manifested *during* the legal dispute.

---

95 Chahoud 2004: 33. Notice also the use of *chorusque* — possibly another instance of Scaevola employing Greek-ish vocabulary to slander Albucius by reference to his attendants.
96 Couper-Kuhlen 1996: 368.
98 Chahoud 2004: 34 notes the force of the attack deriving from attitudes towards uses of Greek by Roman officials.
Lucilius represents contemporary and near-contemporary figures with far more frequency and, allegedly, invective intent than his satiric inheritors. Although Breed writes that Lucilius ‘had no need for a mask’, the use of personae above demonstrates the value of a ‘mask’ in crafting dialogically rich satiric poetry. By speaking predominantly through the guise of characters in direct speech, rather than of the characters, our attention is directed to the manner and content of the speech itself, rather than on narrative. In an aural/literary medium, mimetic characterisation of others is predominantly achieved through dialogue. Lucilius allows his contemporaries to ‘represent themselves’ — his parody is effective because it is rooted in ‘reality’.

The modulation of one’s manner of speech to match one’s interlocutor is well-documented in CA. This modulation can serve a variety of purposes — one of which is, of course, parody. Lucilius’ presentation of such modulation is thus mimetic of a dialogic phenomenon. Furthermore, it is presented alongside other phenomena associated with ‘realism’ or ‘vividness’ — Goh notes that the use of direct speech and ‘vivid’ present tense verbs (accedes and salute) creates a sense of immediacy. Idiolect and parody manifest in a broadly mimetic style of satire, generating a unity of form and content which emphasises conversational interaction over authorial narration. A reading of Lucilius attentive to presence and function of idiolect allows for a deeper understanding of corpus, and provides evidence for early poetic interpretations of conversational phenomena.

Early Uses of Conversational Phenomena

The case study above demonstrates the value of reading satire with attention to turn-taking and dialogic phenomena. Here, I will briefly explore other such phenomena in Lucilius. In

---

101 Compare the fragments to Horace S 1.7, where attention is split between Horace’s narration of events and quotation of direct speech.
102 Indirect dialogue is seen in Horace 1.9 and Juvenal 3.
103 Chahoud 2004: 5.
105 Goh 2018: 35, 39; see also Chahoud 2010: 46; Reinhardt 2010: 208.
106 This unity is not standard or pervasive — compare with Horace 1.9 in which the focus is on both, or 2.2 which juxtaposes direct and indirect speech.
presenting this miscellany, I argue that the genre — from its pseudo-inception — modulates poetic and syntactic constructions (flagged in this thesis’ introduction) to construct, convey, and modulate dialogue. Though fragmentary, sermonic stylistics are identifiable, variated, and meaningful for the interpretation of the text.

The fragments below are from the so-called ‘Council of the Gods’, a dialogue of deities.

\[ \begin{align*}
    Si me & nescire hoc nescis quod quae rere dico, \\
    quare & divinas quicquam? An tu qua<ere>re debes \\
    ipse? & Et si scis q<uard> b<ellum> e<st> scire, hoc \\
    d<are> t<empta> & \\
\end{align*} \]

*G43-45

[A] ‘Quae facies, qui vultus viro?’

[B] ‘Vultus item ut facies, mors, icterus morbus, venenum’

*G29-G30

Both Chahoud and Goh note that the use of Greek by one of the divine interlocutors is indicative of code-switching — mimetic of the linguistic milieu of Lucilius’ contemporary world.\(^{107}\) Poccetti has identified the combination of synonyms, frequent in Lucilius, in two fragments belonging to this dialogue.\(^{108}\) This form of short pleonasm is often found in

\(^{107}\) Chahoud 2004: 29; Goh 2011: 59.

\(^{108}\) Poccetti 2018: 94 on G*29 and G*47-50, though a case for pleonasm could also be made for G51-53 ut multos mensesque diesque...
conversationally-mimetic texts. One also sees asyndeton (W37 ‘vultus item ut facies, mors, icterus morbus, venenum ’), a variety of registers indicated by the presence of both ‘proverbial’ language (W33 ‘stulte saltatum te inter venisse cinaedos ’), elevated quotation (W28-9 ‘ut contendere possem | Thesitados Ledae atque Ixionies alochoeo.’) and emphatic use of personal pronouns (seen below in W30-32, 36-37). Repetition is used for comic effect in the first fragment, and to convey attentive dialogic exchange in the second.

The first fragment contains two examples of repetition. The first is internal repetition of *qu*— + noun spoken by the initial interlocutor [A]. The second is the repetition of [A]’s *facies* and *vultus* by [B]. Both types of repetition — internal and between speakers — are seen frequently in conversational/dialogic Latin literature and in spoken dialogue.

Repetition characterises the dialogue as lively conversation. Its appearance alongside asyndeton mimics the quasi-stichomythic back-and-forth of comedic dialogue — an iterative style of poetic conversation antithetical to the majority of dialogue found in Latin epic. One also sees parenthetical statements which generate conversational referentiality (*ventum, inquam, tollas G47-50, ut diximus ante G24-25*). Other fragments which are composed of similar iterative structures, and are also identified as belonging to a dialogic modality, include G125, G463-464, G555-556, G708-709, and G888.

Book 7 contains fragments of a vaguely erotic-sexual nature. Of interest is the use of asyndetic structures in speech *in association* with this theme. Consider the following:

‘*rador, subvellor, desquamor, pumicor, ornor*  
*expolior, pingor*’

110 Warmington 1938: 12 notes the proverb. For proverbs and conversation see Coleman 2010: 307; Barrios Lech 2016: 159. For elevated register and Homeric quotation see Bakkum 2009: 134.
112 Krebs 2009: 93; ibid.
113 For the avoidance of repetition in Latin Epic see Ferri 2011: 352.
114 Christes and Garbugino 2015: 98.
These fragments appear to instantiate the generic use of paratactic/asynthetic structures in relation to sexual-moral theme and to express iterative action/temporal compression.\(^\text{115}\) The intertextuality with Ovid’s *Ars Amatoria* 3.193-204 and Plautus’ *Poenulus* 219-224, identified by Christes and Garbugino, would imply that the verbs used in the first fragment are associated with feminine beauty practices, though given satire’s pre-occupation with identifying the feminine in the masculine and vice-versa, we ought not to pre-suppose a feminine speaker.\(^\text{116}\) One can see a similar use of verb-heavy parataxis in poetry dealing with love/lust in fragments G708-709.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have argued that Lucilius’ works contain a variety of dialogic modalities and stylistics which are foundational for the genre of Latin satire. While the corpus is in no state to be analysed through complete quantitative (or qualitative) analysis, the fragments do indicate that, even at this seminal stage of the genre’s development, *sermo* played a fundamental role not only in the ideology of satire, but also in its execution. The intricate tensions between various modes of narratology, and the inclusion of the author as an interlocutorial character, evinces an awareness of the complex problems of authorial representation and dialogic poetry — problems which the later satirists tackle explicitly.

\(^{115}\) Discussed in reference to Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.120, 1.5.12, 1.6.29, Pers 5.58-91, Juv 9.38-39.

\(^{116}\) Christes and Garbugino 2015: 98.
Chapter Two: Quintus Horatius Flaccus

Introduction

In this chapter, I present an analysis of *sermo* in Horace’s satires. Procedural exegesis of each poem will follow the natural procession of dialogic themes — focusing on the use of rhetorical interlocutors and stereotypical *exempla* in the early works of Book 1, to the ‘remembered’ conversations of 1.5, 1.7, and 1.9, to the pseudo-platonic dialogues of Book 2. The ‘true’ conversations of 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, and 2.8 are almost unique in the generic corpus (save Juvenal 9), as they provide the opportunity to compare the stylistics of different established speakers against a ‘stable’ interlocutor — Horace himself. Accordingly, the quantitative analysis presented in this chapter is more fully realised than those pertaining to Persius and Juvenal. The results will be shown to have implications not only for the reading of Book 2, but indeed for our understanding of certain stylistic distributions across Horace’s *sermones*.

The following conclusions are reached in this chapter. Horace weaves conversational phenomena into his hexametric stylictics, characterising speech and speakers. This is especially prevalent in his use of elision and *Satzvers*. Idiolect/characterlect is seen most clearly in the juxtaposition of Epicurean and Stoic speakers in the second book. The satires present a remarkably nuanced integration of conversational stylictics with literary-philosophical content.

Preliminary Data

The data presented below has been collected using both the Teubner edition by S. Borzsák and the commentary of Kiessling-Heinze as guides. I note throughout where I diverge from these editions in my interpretation. The results of this study provide general, preliminary observations, and contextualise the later analysis of certain phenomena (turn-initial position, elision).
Speech Tables

Table 2 shows the figures for the number of speech-lines within poems. SI refers to the quotation of Ofellus, Stertinius, and Catius’ culinary philosopher in their respective poems.117

Table 2 Dialogue Lines and Turns in Horace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>True Dialogue</th>
<th>Fictive Dialogue</th>
<th>SI Speech</th>
<th>Turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book One Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1031</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
<td><strong>149</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>256.5</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book Two Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1083</strong></td>
<td><strong>699.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
<td><strong>313.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>192</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satires Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>2114</strong></td>
<td><strong>699.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>307</strong></td>
<td><strong>313.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>341</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

117 See introduction on SI — I have separated them from the general category of ‘fictive speech’ as their quotations are lengthy enough to contain enough information for substantial quantitative analysis.
Table 3 Metrical Distribution of Turn-Initial Words in Horace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Turns</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>1 MC</th>
<th>2 Initial</th>
<th>2 MC</th>
<th>2 FC</th>
<th>3 Initial</th>
<th>3 MC</th>
<th>3 FC</th>
<th>4 Initial</th>
<th>4 MC</th>
<th>5 B.D.</th>
<th>5 MC</th>
<th>5 FC</th>
<th>6 Initial</th>
<th>6 C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book One Totals</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(2 EL)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2 EL)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(5 EL)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(1 EL)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2 EL)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1 EL)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1 EL)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1 EL)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(1 EL)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1 EL)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Two Totals</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(2 EL)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(1 EL)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3 EL)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(2 EL)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(4 EL)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satires Totals</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(1 EL)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(4 EL)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(5 EL)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1 EL)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(5 EL)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1 EL)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1 EL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the distribution of turn-initial words relative to their metrical position. It should be noted I consider the beginning of the fictive dialogue one turn, and the resumption of the narrator’s voice another. The key to Table 3 is as follows. NL (‘New Line’) refers to turns that begin at the start of a new line. 6 Initial indicates turns beginning at the start of the relevant foot. FC and MC refer to turns beginning at the feminine or masculine caesura within the respective foot. 6 C refers to a turn beginning in the middle of the anceps. 5 B.D. refers to turns beginning at the start of the fifth foot, so named for the bucolic dieresis.\(^{118}\) EL refers to a turn that begins on an elision, a (relatively) rare but interesting phenomenon to be studied in the relevant section.\(^{119}\)

The data above shows the following. The most common metrical position to begin dialogue is at the beginning of a new line (132 instances out of 341 turns). This, in addition to the preponderance of turns beginning at the penthemimeral caesura (63/341) and the bucolic dieresis (49/341), indicates that dialogue often begins at expected pauses in the metre (243/341).

\(^{118}\) Whether or not a bucolic dieresis can follow a short syllable on the fourth foot is somewhat debated – see Nilsson 1952: 41 and Tyrrell 1882: 343. For pause length see Zumpt 1832: 454-455.

\(^{119}\) I consider the caesura to precede the elided syllable: the example provided in Zumpt 1832: 455 demonstrates this: *Fortunam Priami cantabo et nobile bellum* (Hor. *Ep.* 2.3.137) features the caesura at *Fortunam Priami cantab*’ || et nobile bellum. In the data, this would be represented as 4 MC (El).
Yet there remains considerable flexibility, with marked use of beginning and middle of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} foot, and the anceps at the end of the line.

**Elision Tables**

Discussion of general rates of elision allows one to draw basic stylistic comparisons (e.g. Horace’s lower rate of elision compared to Persius may be a product of Callimachean stylistics).  

\textsuperscript{120} Focused study of elision as a technique deliberately executed in particular contexts yields more nuanced and, arguably, more beneficial insights. We know how often Horace elides in his satiric poetry — now let us explore where and why.

Freudenburg’s 1996 article ‘Verse-Technique and Moral Extremism in Two Satires of Horace (Sermones 2.3 and 2.4)’ thoroughly develops this line of inquiry. The comparison of stylistics such as Satzvers and elision in 2.3 and 2.4 demonstrates an alignment of didactic content (Stoicism vs. ‘Epicurean’ gourmandising) and style of speech (heavy elision vs. Satzvers and ‘clean’ word divisions).\textsuperscript{121} The ethos of Horace’s speakers is expressed through both message and medium, with elision used to create idiolect. Freudenburg’s work has provided inspiration and a methodology with which the relationship between elision and speech/speaker can be analysed, and here I expand this framework.

The following tables analyse the rate of elision in speech within Horace’s Satires. ‘Speech’ includes both true and fictive speech as discussed earlier in the chapter. Fictive speakers (excepting of Ofellus, Stertinius, Catius’ ‘gourmand’, and Cervius) are not analysed in these tables, and their speech is attributed to the relevant primary speaker (e.g. the speech of ‘Agamemnon’ in the dialogue 2.3.188-207 falls under Stertinius’ ‘fictive speech’ category). ‘Full dialogue’ encompasses all speech that falls under one of the primary speakers (e.g. Damasippus’ speech includes Stertinius, etc.). These divisions allow for a comparative study

\hspace{1cm}

\textsuperscript{120} See Harrison 1987: 48 and Farmer 2013: 482 on Horace’s use of \textit{lutulentus} to critique Lucilius in Callimachean terms, seen also in Hor. \textit{Sat.} 2.1 – see Clauss 1985.

\textsuperscript{121} For Epicureanism in 2.4 see Caston 1997: 238.
of elision rates across all ‘main’ speakers of the Satires, and can either include or exclude their ‘quotation’ of other speakers in Book Two. Note that 1.8 has no narratologically distinct speech.

Table 4 Elisions in Fictive Speech, Book One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Fictive Speech Lines</th>
<th>Fictive Speech Elisions</th>
<th>Elision Rate (%) in Fictive Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Total</td>
<td>142.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Elisions in True Dialogue and Narration, Book One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Fictive Dialogue Lines</th>
<th>Non-Fictive Dialogue Elisions</th>
<th>Elision Rate in Non-Fictive Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>837.5</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 Elisions in Fictive Speech, Book Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Fictive Speech Lines</th>
<th>Fictive Speech Elisions</th>
<th>Elision Rate (%) in Fictive Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Horace</td>
<td>Trebatius</td>
<td>Horace Trebatius</td>
<td>Horace Trebatius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Horace</td>
<td>&quot;Ofellus&quot;</td>
<td>Horace &quot;Ofellus&quot;</td>
<td>Horace &quot;Ofellus&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Horace</td>
<td>Damasippus &quot;Stertinius&quot;</td>
<td>Horace Damasippus &quot;Stertinius&quot;</td>
<td>Horace Damasippus &quot;Stertinius&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Horace</td>
<td>Catus &quot;Gourmand&quot;</td>
<td>Horace Catus &quot;Gourmand&quot;</td>
<td>Horace Catus &quot;Gourmand&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Ulysses</td>
<td>Tiresias</td>
<td>Ulysses Tiresias</td>
<td>Ulysses Tiresias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Horace</td>
<td>&quot;Cervius&quot;</td>
<td>Horace &quot;Cervius&quot;</td>
<td>Horace &quot;Cervius&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Horace</td>
<td>Davus</td>
<td>Horace Davus</td>
<td>Horace Davus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Horace</td>
<td>Fundanius</td>
<td>Horace Fundanius</td>
<td>Horace Fundanius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Elisions in True Dialogue, Book Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Non-Fictive Dialogue Lines</th>
<th>Non-Fictive Dialogue Elisions</th>
<th>Elision Rate in Non-Fictive Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Horace</td>
<td>Trebatius</td>
<td>Horace Trebatius</td>
<td>Horace Trebatius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Horace</td>
<td>&quot;Ofellus&quot;</td>
<td>Horace &quot;Ofellus&quot;</td>
<td>Horace &quot;Ofellus&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Horace</td>
<td>Damasippus &quot;Stertinius&quot;</td>
<td>Horace Damasippus &quot;Stertinius&quot;</td>
<td>Horace Damasippus &quot;Stertinius&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Horace</td>
<td>Catus &quot;Gourmand&quot;</td>
<td>Horace Catus &quot;Gourmand&quot;</td>
<td>Horace Catus &quot;Gourmand&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Ulysses</td>
<td>Tiresias</td>
<td>Ulysses Tiresias</td>
<td>Ulysses Tiresias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Horace</td>
<td>&quot;Cervius&quot;</td>
<td>Horace &quot;Cervius&quot;</td>
<td>Horace &quot;Cervius&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Horace</td>
<td>Davus</td>
<td>Horace Davus</td>
<td>Horace Davus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Horace</td>
<td>Fundanius</td>
<td>Horace Fundanius</td>
<td>Horace Fundanius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Total</td>
<td>285.5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial observations are as follows. The average elision rate of Horace’s *Satires* as an entire corpus is approximately 40%.\(^{122}\) Horace’s own voice – in narration and in his imitation of others in fictive speech – barely deviates from this figure when studied as a whole. However, the elision rates for primary speakers in Book Two, including the deviation between Horace’s own voice in different poems, fluctuates greatly. Speakers with low elision rates (< within 10% of the average) include Trebatius, Catius, Tiresias, Fundanius, and Horace in 2.8. Speakers with high elision rates (> within 10% of the average) include Damasippus, Ulysses, and Horace in 2.3 and 2.4. Speakers with average elision rates (within 10% of the average) include Davus, and Horace in 2.1, 2.2, 2.6, and 2.7. The information presented in the tables above will be referenced in the analysis of individual excerpts.

\(^{122}\) 39.95 to be exact – see the figures in Nilsson 1952: 201 Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horace Total</th>
<th>Full Dialogue Lines</th>
<th>Full Dialogue Elisions</th>
<th>Full Dialogue Elision Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horace Trebatius</td>
<td>Horace Trebatius</td>
<td>Horace Trebatius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Horace Damasippus</td>
<td>Horace Damasippus</td>
<td>Horace Damasippus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>311</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Horace Catius</td>
<td>Horace Catius</td>
<td>Horace Catius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Ulysses Tiresias</td>
<td>Ulysses Tiresias</td>
<td>Ulysses Tiresias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>Horace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Horace Davus</td>
<td>Horace Davus</td>
<td>Horace Davus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Horace Fundanius</td>
<td>Horace Fundanius</td>
<td>Horace Fundanius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Total</td>
<td>363.5</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satzvers Tables

Table 9 is a reproduction of Table XXIII in Nilsson’s study of metrics in the works of Horace. These figures will be used to contextualise particular instances of Satzvers in the poems.

Table 9 Satzvers in Horace's Satires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Lines of Satzvers</th>
<th>% of total lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book One</strong></td>
<td><strong>146</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book Two</strong></td>
<td><strong>250</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>396</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satire 1.1

*Qui fit, Maecenas:* Horace begins his poetry in conversation, an abrupt start to speeches which wander in and out of dialogue, dead-ends, and false starts. Aspects of this style of poetry are evocative of dialogue; false starts, auto-repair, auto-intervention, overlapping speech, and forms of repetition.123 These phenomena often occur in snippets of speech from various ‘characters’ — the first poem featuring soldiers, traders, misers, dissenting unnamed interlocutors, and *quis deus* (presumably Jupiter himself). For what was originally advertised as a conversation with Maecenas, there is nevertheless an abundance of non-Horatian voices.124

Quantitative aspects of the poem are as follows. Speech other than Horace’s narration comprises approximately 15% of the poem and elides at a rate of 40% – noticeably higher than the satiric narration (28%).125 These somewhat slurring voices are characterised vividly through the deployment of particular stylistics, describing both the speaker and their dialogic relationship to others.

The first section features dialogue from three distinct characters. Of the cliched pairings (The Soldier and The Trader, The Farmer and The Lawyer) which Horace uses to discuss *mempsimoiria*, we are treated to direct speech from the first.126

‘*o fortunati mercatores*’ *gravis annis*

*miles ait, multo iam fractus membra labore.*

*contra mercator, nauem iactantibus Austris,*

‘*militia est potior. quid enim? concurritur: horae*’

*memento cita mors uenit aut victoria laeta.*’

123 Nykänen and Kovisto 2016: 7 highlight these features, which are discussed in the various articles within the same publication (*Literary Linguistics* 5.2).
124 Muecke 1990: 41 writes that Horace competes with other voices for attention.
125 Lines of interlocutory speech feature 7 elisions for ~17.5 lines. Lines of satiric narration contain 30 elisions for ~103.5 lines.
126 Gowers 2012: 64 on possible precedents for such pairings.
‘O happy traders!’ says the soldier,
Heavy with the weight of years, his body broken by much toil.
Contrary to this, with his ship tossed on southern gales, the trader:
‘Soldiering is better. What? There’s the clash, and in a moment
Comes swift death or joyous victory.’

Kiessling-Heinze notes that the spondaic o fortunati mercatores complements the tired figure of the soldier, contrasting with the energetic dactyls of the merchant in lines 7-8. Gowers highlights the martial-epic resonance of the trader’s line-ending uictoria laeta. This flourish contrasts with the more prosaic opening; milita est potior being composed with the most basic syntax, and then followed by the dialogically-charged quid enim, the answer to which enacts the paratactic enjambment using concurritur: horae to end line 7, from which the merchant indulges his military fantasy. Even in these brief glimpses of speech, Horace utilises metrics and syntax to vary the poetic tones of sermo. The melodramatic figure of the soldier is the tragic set-up to the joke executed with the merchant, whose basic rhetoric rapidly slips into epic military fetishism.

One might also read a ‘mismatch’ of speech. The vocative fortunati mercatores, instead of the exclamatory accusative, seems more suited to the epic, storm-tossed sailor than a displaced soldier. The inclusion of ‘O’ is telling; utilised in Horace’s satires either as interjection between established interlocutors (1.7.58, 2.1.60, 2.3.31, 2.3.265, 2.3.326, 2.5.5 [also somewhat optative], 2.5.59,) or with invocative/optative timbre (1.2.92, 1.9.11, 2.6.8, 10,

---

128 Gowers 2012: 65 noun followed by adjective, both with short endings.
129 His idea of militia seems influenced by poetry — see the poetic chiasmus (Gowers 2012: 65.) The soldier is proof against the merchant’s false dichotomy — he can hardly be said to be living in uictoria laeta.
130 The auster (southern) wind is associated with storms and bad weather.
If the soldier’s speech is clipped invocation, then the aforementioned contrast is emphasised. The merchant’s interjection-cum-rhapsody takes the place of any prayer or invocation regarding the dangerous conditions, which we have just seen in his satiric-philosophic counterpart. Expected speech and speaker are ‘swapped’. One of satire’s recurrent motifs is that of inversion. It seems that these small excerpts manifest this through linguistic minutiae and dialogic contrast.

Inversion is evidently present almost immediately after these extracts. After assuring the reader that he is about to reach his point, Horace launches into a lengthy hypothetical quotation of *quis deus*. This speaker is presumably Jupiter. The manner of speech is hardly ‘divine’:

---

*si quis deus ‘en ego’ dicat,*

‘*iam faciam, quod voltis: eris tu, qui modo miles,*

*mercator; tu, consultus modo, rusticus; hinc vos,*

*vos hinc mutatis discedite partibus: eia!*

*quid statis?’ – nolint.*

If some god were to say: ‘Behold! ‘Tis I, I will grant you what you wish. You, who were just now a soldier, shall be a trader; you, but now a lawyer, a farmer. Away you, away from here with your transformed roles. Come now! Why do you stay?’ – They would refuse.

15-19

Scholars note the resemblance to a Plautinian Jove, complete with vocabulary lifted straight from Roman Comedy — *hinc* and *eia*. The (presumably sarcastic) turn-initial exclamation

---

132 *Quid causae est, metio quin illis luppiter ambas*...
133 Gowers 2012: 67. By no means standard for gods – Quirinus in lines 1.10.34-35 is unscathed by Horace’s satire.
'en’ followed by an emphatic pronoun and simple syntax (subject-verb-object) opens the speech with a strong invocation of the comic-dialogic mode. This is perpetuated through the repetition of pronouns, referentiality (hinc), the parataxis spanning eris tu to vos hinc, and the use of the imperative discedite. Conversational phenomena are transcribed into hexameter to realise a clipped, interjective sermo. The inversion of expectations is achieved — Harrison, writing on divine discourse in the Aeneid, notes that the language of similar scenes in Virgil’s epic ‘are likely to be especially stylised, given that they feature the most elevated category of characters in the most elevated of poetic genres.’134 Although, as Harrison writes, Virgil is himself no stranger to weaving ‘typical features of colloquial speech’ into the speech of gods, one would be hard pressed to find divine dialogue in epic so riddled with comic-dialogic features as the passage above.

Yet to overlook what is especially poetic (‘stylistic’ in Harrison’s terms) would be to miss the additional nuances in speech and characterisation achieved by Horace. The three lines without speaker-transition (116-118) are Satzvers.135 This neoteric balancing of verse surrounds the more dialogic elements. Jupiter’s speech is, in parts, mimetic of sermo, but he also speaks with an underlying tone of gravity. Further evidence for tonal balance is present in the chiasmus at hinc vos, vos hinc.136 This poetic flourish, frequently found in epic, here joins two metrically identical lines, demonstrating poetic artifice.137

Such richness of characterisation is not found in every dialogic discursion. The introduction of the ‘miser’ at line 43 requires no more exegesis than is already available.138 An elided transition is present at line 56:

... et dicas ‘magno de flumine mallem

---

134 Harrison 2011: 266.
135 Nilsson 1952: 158. I argue that the self-contained nature of iam faciam quod voltis coupled with the intransitive verb + subject at eris tu, qui modo miles fits the definition for Satzvers. The other two full lines are unambiguously so.
136 Gowers 2012: 67 notes that the chiasmus portrays the inversion of roles
137 For chiasmus see Pearce 1999, Quint 2011, Thomas 2013.
138 Repetition of acervus at 44 and 51, heavy use of pronouns and possessives.
quam ex hoc fonticulo tantundem sumere’ eo fit,

55-56

The elision between *sumere eo fit* occurs at the end of the expected dactyl in the fifth foot — a hurried blurring of the hypothetical speech and the main narration, drawing the audience quickly away from Horace’s dialogic digression and (almost) back to the main point (*qui fit*?), before the satirist digresses again into watery metaphors and nostalgic imagery.\(^{139}\) The pithy double *Satzvers* which follows in lines 61-62 (one for Horace and one for *bona pars hominum*) begins a philosophical register that is immediately denied, once again, by a Horatian digression into the story of the Athenian miser, whose primary concern is stressed in his speech (*me, mihi, ipse*).\(^{140}\) These short characterisations (the self-contained *pars hominum*, the self-absorbed Athenian miser) shift the topic of the satire from contentment to money, another miser raises his voice:

\[\text{‘at si condoluit temptatum frigore corpus} \]
\[\text{aut alius casus lecto te affixit, habes qui} \]
\[\text{assideat, fomenta paret, medicum roget, ut te} \]
\[\text{suscitet ac reddat gnatis carisque propinquis.’} \]
\[\text{non uxor saluum te uult, non filius; omnes} \]
\[\text{uicini oderunt, noti, pueri atque puellae.} \]

‘But if your body is gripped by a cold or in pain, or some other mishap has fixed you to your bed, do you have someone to sit by you, to prepare lotions, to call a doctor, to revive you and restore you to your children

---

\(^{139}\) Gowers 2012: 74 on the Aufidus.

\(^{140}\) Lines 66-67.
and dear kinsmen?’ Your wife doesn’t want you better, neither does your son. All the neighbours hate you, as do your acquaintances, boys, and girls.

80-85

I agree with Gowers that lines 80-83 manifest a rhetorical interlocutor. Sentence-initial at is used throughout Horace as beginning a statement or question that is immediately adversative to the preceding lines. If we read these lines as a rhetorical question, the adversative element is weaker than many of the examples listed below (due to the fact that we’ve just had rhetorical questioning in lines 73 and 78), and any adversative element is far less immediate (a shift in subject is not made apparent until 1.5 lines after the initial at). However, if we read these lines as spoken by an interlocutor, the adversative element is stronger (change of speaker, direct interrogation), and responds to a question posed by Horace (nescis quo valeat nummus, quem praebeat usum? line 73).

We see artful use of elision and parataxis/asyndeton. The miser’s elision at lecto te affixit aurally manifests adhesion. Similarly, Horace’s elision at uicini oderunt manifests the proximity inherent in uicini and, with the second elision at pueri atque, the line is almost overflowing with how many people detest the miser.

The parataxis of tender care in line 82 is a syntactic realisation of the miser’s heightened emotions, seen also in what Gowers describes as his ‘rosy view’ of his relatives in carisque

---

141 Gowers 2012: 77.
142 The adversative at is preceded by Horace’s wish semper ego optarim pauperrimus esse bonorum, and thus seems to follow from there (but do you have the means to have someone etc.) rather than to situate itself in opposition to an unstated objection. Examining Book 1, this adversative element is seen in turn-initial uses of at in 1.1.44, 52, 1.2.18, 1.2.73, 1.3.32, 1.4.48, 1.5.60, 1.6.40, 1.9.71 1.10.20, 1.10.23, At used in continuation by the same speaker still retains adversative effect with respect to what immediately precedes: 1.1.59, 1.1.61, 1.1.66, 1.1.99, 1.2.49, 1.3.27, 1.3.33, 34, 1.3.51, 1.3.55, 1.4.19 speech, 1.4.67, 1.6.42, 1.6.87, 1.7.32, 1.9.6, 1.10.3, 1.10. The only other use of sentence/clause initial at which is not immediately adversative is 1.8.47 diffissa nate ficus: at iliae currere in urbem which still strikes as more adversative than S.B.’s reading of the extract discussed in the main text given the immediate shift of subject.
143 See Soubiran 1966: 615-620 for poetic effects of elision.
This is iterated in Horace’s parataxis/asyndeton (the only conjunction is *atque*), his heightened emotions seen also in the repetition of non). Yet Horace’s own view is hardly ‘rosy’. Horace parodies the miser by adopting his stylistics, inverting the mood and the message.

The stylistic proximity of the speakers complements the personal tone of this question-answer set (compared to the more impersonal debate in lines 41-56).

Horace’s mimicry is not comprehensive – asyndeton is used to deny the care which the miser imagined, and the vocabulary employed in his paratactic ripostes avoids the miser’s rosy lexicon. *Propinquius* is replaced with the more impersonal *uicini, amici* with *noti*, and *gnatis* is broken down into synecdoche. Horace deploys alternative nouns to illustrate his alternative vision of (the miser’s) family life – he inverts his interlocutor’s speech. Through recognising dialogic interaction and phenomena, we gain a deeper understanding of the stylistics employed, and see, again, the use of conversation to manifest the theme of inversion.

**Summary: 1.1**

Speech in 1.1 carries out an inversive poetic agenda. The interplay of interlocution between the soldier and the merchant hints at a topsy-turvy world where binary pairs envy each other’s lives, but the content of their speech is transposed to their opposite. Jupiter is presented in parody of himself, interjections and conversationally charged language detracting from artful chiasmus and prevalent *Satzvers*. The satirist himself takes the objection of his interlocutor and turns it on its head, mimicking their paratactic praise but substituting negative valuation for positive.

**Satire 1.2**

Horace’s diatribe on sex (and where to get it) is stuffed with a variety of quotations, dialogic interactions, and snippets of speech. This poem is generally considered to be more *colourful*

---

144 Gowers 2012: 78.
145 This can be seen also in the identical metrics used in lines 80 and 84 — spondee-heavy verse communicating the gravity of both sickness and familial hatred, respectively.
146 Sharland 2010: 104
than the programmatic predecessor — both in terms of narrative content and the Latin used.\textsuperscript{147} Obscenities (\textit{cunnus}, \textit{mutto}, \textit{futuo}) and hyper-physical exempla evoke Roman comedy and dialogic referentiality. Conversational ‘slurring’ is seen in the higher rate of elision in the poem (45.5\%).\textsuperscript{148} This is further emphasised when one distinguishes speech from satiric narration. Speech comprises ~10\% of the poem (~13 lines out of 134) but elides at a staggering rate of ~77\%.\textsuperscript{149} Furthermore, the elision rate of the satiric narration jumps from the modest ~28\% in 1.1 to ~43\%, complementing his forthright content.\textsuperscript{150}

While still in the throes of another false start (the theme shifts from greed to lust at line 28), Horace describes the avarice of the moneylender Fufidius.\textsuperscript{151} Reactions are as follows:

\begin{quote}
\begin{verse}
\textit{sub patribus duris tironum. ‘maxime’ quis non}
\textit{‘Iuppiter!’ exlamat, simul atque audivit? ‘at in se}
\textit{pro quaestu sumptum facit hic.’ vix credere possis}
\end{verse}
\end{quote}

17-19

The interjection at \textit{maxime} is startling. Hitherto, the opening of 1.2 (1-16) is 37.5\% \textit{Satzvers}. 1.2 has the highest rate of \textit{Satzvers} in Book 1, at 20.9\%.\textsuperscript{152} The fragmentation of the interjection (\textit{maxime}...\textit{Iuppiter}) and the narration (\textit{quis non}...\textit{exclamat}) is not only uncommon — interruption of a speech-turn by more than a single verb of speech occurs only in 3/34 instances where a turn is interrupted, but then resumed — but highly contrastive with the unusual concentration of unfragmented lines which precede it.\textsuperscript{153} Furthermore, both \textit{maxime} and

---

\textsuperscript{147} Curran 1970: 245; Gowers 2012: 87-89
\textsuperscript{148} Compared to the average (~40\%), especially compared to 1.1 (~30.6\%).
\textsuperscript{149} 10 elisions for ~13 lines of speech, not including the ~1.5 lines of Callimachean quotation. I include Cato’s maxim in the count as it classed as \textit{sententia} and given the verb \textit{inquit} compared to \textit{cantat} for Callimachus
\textsuperscript{150} 1.1 has 30 elisions for 103.5 lines of narration, whereas 1.2 has 51 for 119.
\textsuperscript{151} Hor. Sat. 1.2.12-17.
\textsuperscript{152} Nilsson 1952: 212 Tab. XXIII.
\textsuperscript{153} In this figure of 3/34, one other instance is in 1.2 (1.2.32 with Cato’s \textit{sententia}. I do not include 1.2.107 as I consider the quotation of Callimachus one turn (\textit{cantat}) and the additional commentary another (\textit{apponit}).
*Iuppiter* occupy metrically emphatic positions (after the bucolic diaeresis, beginning a new line). The jarring exclamation is then followed by a triple monosyllabic line-end which recommences interlocution, a union of sermonic style and function. The abrasive aspects of these turns contrast to the *Satzvers* prelude and manifest the aural impression of multiple interjectors, thereby accentuating the catch-all *quis non*.

The poem continues, the subjunctive takes the place of the indicative to conjure a less disruptive interrogator at line 23, the theme of sex is established, and Horace relays the advice of Cato:

*quidam notus homo cum exiret fornice, ‘macte*

*virtute esto’ inquit sententia dia Catonis:

*‘nam simul ac uenas inflavit taetra libido,*

*huc iuuenes aequum est descendere, non alienas*

*permolere uxorces.’ ‘nolim laudarier’ inquit*

*‘sic me’ mirator cunni Cupiennius albi.*

When some acquaintance was coming out from a brothel, ‘Blessed is thy virtue!’ speaks Cato’s divine maxim, ‘for as soon as foul passion has swelled the veins, better that young men come down here, and not plough other men’s wives.’ ‘I shouldn’t like to be praised for that’ says Cupiennius, fancier of white cunts.

---

154 See Gowers 2012: 23 on monosyllabic endings. Regarding the punctuation (beginning the second turn before or after *hic*), I agree with Gowers 2012 in the tradition of Bentley, and not with Kiessling-Heinze and other editors who place interpunction between *facit* and *hic*. Only one other speech-turn in Horace’s *Satires*, begins at the fourth foot (1.3.13) for reasons relating to Greek language (no other is marked in Gowers 2012 (Book 1), Kiessling-Heinze 1961 (Books 1 and 2), and Muecke 1993 (Book 2). Turns at the hephemimeral caesura are more common.
Horace ‘dials-up’ the Cato-ness for parodic effect. Kiessling-Heinze and Gowers both note the macho-military tone of the opening *macte virtute esto*.\(^{155}\) This virility is sustained through the use of frank, bodily imagery (*venas, inflavit, taetro*) and bawdy euphemism (*permolere*).\(^{156}\) Heavy elision expresses the ‘roughness’ of Stoic speech.\(^{157}\) The contrast between the ideologies of Cato and Cupiennius is somewhat reflected in their speech. Cato’s ‘back-slapping manner’ is countered with a pithy, distancing subjunctive + archaic infinitive, studiously avoiding the previous Stoic-slurring.\(^{158}\) The use of *laudarier* is telling. Karakasis, in his study on the language of Terence, notes this exact form as belonging to a group of archaic infinitives associated with elderly speakers, often in a grand or elevated register.\(^{159}\) This contrast — the eliding Stoic and the fancy Neoteric — plays out on a grander scale in the juxtaposition of Damasippus and Catius in Book 2.

The following excerpt reinforces the relationship between elision and Catonian morality. Horace takes aim at those who follow Cato’s recommendation to absurdity, spending recklessly on freedwomen and tarnishing their own reputation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\textit{hoc amat et laudat:} & \text{ ‘matronam nullam ego tango.’} \\
\textit{ut quondam Marsaeus, amator Originis ille,} & \\
\textit{qui patrium mimae donat fundumque laremque,} & \\
\textit{‘nil fuerit mi’ inquit ‘cum uxoribus umquam alienis.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{155}\) Kiessling-Heinze 1961: 30; Gowers 2012: 98. Note the similarity to Lucilius 208 (225).

\(^{156}\) ibid

\(^{157}\) For elision and Stoicism see Freudenburg 1999 on 2.3.

\(^{158}\) Gowers 2012: 99 notes that *laudarier* is metrically convenient — another advantage is that it avoids a similar elision to *esto inquit*. Dickey 2012: 743 notes that *velim* is used for requests to people one is less close (one would assume the same applies for its negative counterpart).

\(^{159}\) Karakasis 2005: 51, 99: ‘In most cases, the elevated language old people adopt has at the same time a distinct archaic or long-winded ring.’
Because of this, he loves and praises himself: ‘I touch no matron’ as when Marsaeus, that lover of Origo, who gave his home and estate to a mime, spoke ‘never may I have dealings with other men’s wives!’.

54-57

Gowers notes that Marsaeus recycles Cato’s vocabulary (alienas uxores) and the possible references to Cato in the line’s onomastics. The triple elision in line 57 is reminiscent of Cato’s clipped speech. Ideological proximity is manifested by stylistic similarity.

The poem progresses — a mutto interrogates its owner with a Horatian favourite quid uis tibi (an impolite interrogation), an epigram of Callimachus is paraphrased and imitated, and then we (finally) reach Horace’s own sexual preferences.

non ego: namque parabilem amo uenerem facilemque.

illam ‘post paulo’, ‘sed pluris’, ‘si exierit uir’

Gallis, hanc Philodemus ait...

119-121

The parataxis in line 120 compresses a series of interactions while simultaneously conveying the frank, unexpansive tone of the liaison. Indeed, it is seen to function similarly in the

161 On lines 68-71: Gowers 2012: 106 notes the other instances of quid uís. Ferri 2009: 24 notes that quid vis tibi is a less polite way to seek permission to speak — the mutto claims permission while simultaneously launching its interrogation.
162 Unadorned speech seen also in the monosyllabic line ending uir.
original epigram of Philodemus, and Hutchinson has cogently argued for analogy with parataxis of ‘short snippets of speech’ in Theocritus 16.19-21.\textsuperscript{163}

**Summary: 1.2**

The fragmented, jarring, and compressed speech found in 1.2 complements the abrasive imagery and provocative themes. This poem shows variegated use of vocabulary and stylistics to represent contrastive ideologies, through which Horace picks his ‘middle way’.\textsuperscript{164}

**Satire 1.3**

One might read 1.3 as the mirror-image of its predecessor. Horace’s gaze remains on the (often disfigured) body, yet the theme is now one of positive thinking and amicability.\textsuperscript{165} A high elision-rate and low amount of *Satzvers* generates a more relaxed, enjambed style.\textsuperscript{166}

First, a short quotation from Tigellius in the opening should be examined, as it is the only instance in the *Satires* where a turn of speech begins on the fourth foot.

\begin{verbatim}
usque ad mala citaret ‘io Bacchae’ modo summa
uoce, modo hac, resonat quae chordis quattuor ima.
nil aequale homini fuit illi: saepe uelut qui
currebat fugiens hostem, persaepe uelut qui
Iunonis sacra ferret ; habebat saepe ducentos,
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{163} Sider 1997: 199-200; Hutchinson 2013: 288.
\textsuperscript{164} A phrase borrowed from Kemp 2010: 67.
\textsuperscript{165} The gaze is even that of the lover blinded by lust at 1.3.38-40.
\textsuperscript{166} General rate of elision is 47.9%, being 50% for speech and 48% for narration. The *Satzvers* rate is 9.9% (below the average of 14.2 for Book 1).
saepe decem seruos; modo reges atque tetrarchas,
omnia magna loquens, modo ‘sit mihi mensa tripes et
concha salis puri et toga, quae defendere frigus
quamuis crassa queat.’ deciens centena dedisses…

Up to the fruit course he would chant ‘Io Bacchae!’, now with the highest voice, and now with a deep voice that resonates with the four strings. There was nothing consistent in that man: often he ran as one fleeing the enemy, more often he would walk as someone carrying Juno’s offerings: he would often have two hundred slaves, often ten: now he would talk of kings and tetrarchs, bigging it up, and now ‘let me have a three-legged table, a shell of clean salt and a toga which could protect against the cold, however coarse.’ Suppose you gave him a million…

Repetition may explain this odd metrical choice. The repetition of *modo*, *uelut* and *saepe* throughout compress the various *exempla* of Tigellius’ behaviour, allowing the satirist to swiftly alternate between the two extremes. The repetition of these words *in the same metrical position* (*saepe uelut qui...(per)saepe uelut qui, modo reges...modo ‘sit’*) stress the iterative quality of Tigellius’ inconstancy. Iterative structures constrain Tigellius’ speech into its position within the verse, and heavy use of metrical and lexical repetition may explain the statistically odd turn position of ‘*sit mihi*’.

Afterwards, Horace appears to offer himself up to critical examination; another false start, as he rapidly changes subject and recalls an episode involving the Lucilian Maenius and hitherto unknown Novius:

...nunc aliquis dicat mihi ‘quid tu?’
nullane habes uitia? immo alia et fortasse minora.

Maenius absentem Nouium cum carperet, 'heus tu'

quidam ait 'ignoras te an ut ignotum dare nobis

uerba putas?' 'egomet mi ignosco' Maenius inquit.

Now someone might say to me ‘what about you? Do you not have any faults?’ Yes, but different ones, and perhaps lesser. When Maenius was picked on Novius behind his back ‘hey you!’ someone said ‘do you not know yourself, or do you think you can deceive us as if we don’t know you?’ ‘I’m forgiving to myself.’ says Maenius

19-23

7 elisions in 5 lines is beyond Lucilian, and the elision over interpunction at *uitia immo* is particularly egregious. This heavy slurring amongst and between speakers packs each line with more dialogue than should be possible for a poet who supposedly favours polish over quantity. The dialogue is thick, aggressive, and repetitive — *quid tu, heus tu* — emphatic pronouns singling out the targets of this satiric volley. The iterative nature of these two speech-turns reveals another thematic motif of the poems.

Gowers argues that ‘Maenius plays surrogate satirist: his justification is that self-knowledge and self-forgiveness license the upbraiding of others’. This can be pushed further; Maenius isn’t just a surrogate, he’s a shield. The interrogators themselves are mirror-images:

167 Harkness 1905: 108. It should also be noted that elided forms of *uitium* are concentrated in 1.3 – perhaps giving aural manifestation to Horace’s poetic hesitancy to discuss the topic. Elided forms are: 1.2.24, 1.3.1, 1.3.20, 1.3.28, 1.3.35, 1.3.39, 1.3.76, 2.2.69, 2.2.78, 2.3.92, 2.3.307. Non-elided forms are found in 1.3.344, 1.3.68, 1.3.70, 1.4.101, 1.4.106, 1.4.129, 1.4.131, 1.4.140, 1.6.65, 1.6.85, 2.2.21, 2.2.54, 2.3.213, 2.4.76, 2.6.7, 2.7.6, 2.7.19, 2.7.42, 2.8.50,

168 Freudenburg 1992: 201 — indicated by Horace in 1.4.17-18, and in his critique of Lucilius in 1.10.55-61.


170 ibid
the substitution of *quidam* for *aliquis*, *heus tu* for *quid tu* (occupying the same metrical position, the sixth foot emphasising their interjection), their mutual enjambment of speech — the similarity is uncanny. Identical speech — identical threats. Compare the satirists’ responses. Both answers end at regular intervals (end of the line, bucolic diaeresis), contrasting with the interrogators’ enjambment, and are encased in an end-stopped line. However, Maenius’ self-affirmation (*egomet mi*) replaces Horace’s garbled and ‘complacent’ *immo alia et*, etc. Horace interrupts his conjured interlocutor, slurs (nervously?) through a half-answer, and then lets another satirist give (Horace’s?) answer while Horace disappears until line 63, where he can discuss his personal failings from behind the shield of Maecenas. This allows Horace to avoid direct interrogation, and a different method is used almost immediately afterwards.

The micro-lecture which follows asks: why not forgive others like you forgive yourself? Horace is back (*rursus*) in interrogation — his presence noticeable in *lippus*, and realised in 28: *inquirant vitia ut tua rursus et illi*. The alternation of Horace as judge and judged (*rursus*) is seen below:

\[
\text{‘iracundior est paulo, minus aptus acutis} \\
\text{naribus horum hominum: rideri possit eo quod} \\
\text{rusticius tonso toga defluit et male laxus} \\
\text{in pede calceus haeret’ at est bonus, ut melior uir} \\
\text{non alius quisquam, at tibi amicus, at ingenium ingens} \\
\text{inculto latet hoc sub corpore.}
\]

171 Complacent lifted from ibid.
172 Gowers 2012: 132-133 on Maecenas as a form of defence. Note the similar elision at 2.3.307, where Damasippus interrupts Horace in discussion of *uitia*, beginning an assault from which Horace attempts to escape.
‘He is a little choleric, ill-suited to the lifted noses of today’s society. He might be ridiculed, because of his bumpkin hair-cut, his trailing toga, and his loose shoe which barely sticks to his foot.’ But he’s a good man, as there’s no one better; but he’s a friend to you, but a great soul lies hidden beneath his uncultivated body.

29-32

I read iracundior to haeret as an interlocutor.\textsuperscript{174} Tua rursus directs our attention to inversion of targets — satirist to satirised. Indeed, Horace himself seems to be the topic of the speech-turn, his description composed of comic-cynic stereotypes.\textsuperscript{175} The repetitive and defiant at betrays his emotions, as does the hyperbolic and elliptic clause at ut melior uir, and the forceful elision at ingenium ingens which stretches the sound of ‘such a great spirit’ — a far-cry from his previous alia et fortasse minora. Considering that similar emotional outbursts follow ‘true’ critiques of Horace in Book Two, it seems likely that a similar joke is made here.\textsuperscript{176} Strong dialogic interaction is seen also in the extra-emphatic te ipsum concute which immediately follows.\textsuperscript{177} Horace’s emotional reaction and dialogic interaction support reading a rhetorical interlocutor, rather than a self-addressed rhetorical description.\textsuperscript{178}

\textbf{Summary: 1.3}

In a satire whose themes are hypocrisy and self-knowledge, it is no surprise that Horace engages in some self-satirisation.\textsuperscript{179} Literary themes and agendas — satiric proxies, self-satirisation — are represented through satire’s quintessentially \textit{sermonic} modalities and stylistics.

\textsuperscript{175} Gowers 2012: 127. The delayed gratification of realising that it is indeed Horace who is being described is humorous. Cf. Ep.1.1.
\textsuperscript{176} The endings of 2.3 and 2.7.
\textsuperscript{177} Horace uses the language of the Stoics against them in concute.
\textsuperscript{179} Mazurek 1997: 11; Habinik 2005: 188; Gowers 2012: 120.
Satire 1.4

This programmatic poem sees the satirist fighting (and fleeing) to establish himself in a literary tradition.180 Linking the diatribic (1.1-1.3) to the pseudo-biographic (1.5, 1.6), this poem features rhetorical interlocutors and speech from Horace’s own father. Horace claims to reduce the garrulus sermo of his satiric father-figure Lucilius to a more refined expression — fittingly, the elision rate is a low 30.1%, with little variation between narration and quotation.181 However, this does not imply less conversation — almost 20% of the poem is speech, the highest figure in Book 1 save (obviously) 1.9.182 Horace might claim to be perpaucloquentis, yet he proves unable to prevent the interjection of challengers and detractors, before he himself recounts the maxims of his father and indeed his own meditations. The satirist protest too much?

A few lines can be discussed without lengthy exegesis. Horace’s auto-correction at lines 12-13 (piger scribendi ferre laborem | scribendi recte) when critiquing Lucilius’ wordy and unrefined style must be a joke at Horace’s expense.183 Crispinus’ eagerness, manifest through repetition (accipe...accipe/accipiam...) and enjambed asyndeton (locus, hora, custodes) is balanced with the polite si vis — a far more reserved challenge than the Old Comic tradition, from a Lucilian figure without even the slightest elision. A missed opportunity for characterisation, or an early warning sign that Lucilian libertas is under constraint? Horace’s non-interaction with the challenge is mirrored in his responses to interjectors at 34-38 and 48-52.184 I say interjectors, as neither figure engages the satirist directly.185 That is, until line 78:

180 Gowers 2012: 148-149.
181 Narration eliding at 30% (34/114) and speech at 32% (9/27.5).
182 See Table 2.
183 Nykänen and Kovisto 2016: 7 on repair.
184 Agedum paucacaccipecontra is a red herring, with Horace avoiding (fuge) the issue and returning to his comic genealogy. The third-person references to Horace, and Horace’s refusal to address the charge directly, leads me to suggest that accipe should be read as addressed to Maecenas — whose presence is implied throughout and invoked directly in lines such as 103-105: liberius si | dixera quid, si forte iocosius hoc mihi iuris | cum uenia dabis.
185 Longe fuge is obviously not primarily addressed to the satirist (though provides a nice second reading considering Horace’s evasive manoeuvres), and the second section of speech features no second-person interaction.
….. 'laedere gaudes’

inquit ‘et hoc studio prauus facis.’ Unde petitum

hoc in me iacis ? est auctor quis denique eorum

uixi cum quibus ?

‘You rejoice in your attacks’ he says ‘and you do this with perverse zeal.’ From where have you found what you throw at me? Is the author someone I’ve lived with?

78-81

This is not a piece of third-person gossip which Horace can hand-wave, nor is it an inquiry regarding the realism of Roman comedy. Someone engages Horace directly in the second-person. *Laedere gaudes* occupies the finale of the line, a turn-initial position mirrored by the most important part of Horace’s retort — where did you get this from? A fine example of Horace’s paranoia, of ‘The Threat of Speech’ as Schlegel’s book documents, achieved through rhetorical interjection.

Gowers notes the elisions in lines 96-100. As the poem progresses, Horace arrives somewhere he can admit that he is potentially *liberius, forte iocosius* — qualities he is quick to assure us (and Maecenas) are, in fact, useful, and given to him by *pater optimus*. The father’s idiolect, with its echoes of Roman comedy, have received ample discussion. I add the following. Karakasis identifies aspects of Demea’s idiolect in *Adelphoe* which feature in Horace’s portrayal of his father —outdoors-y vocabulary (*nabis sine cortice*), and financial

---

187 It should no longer surprise us that a phrase like *ut fugerem* preludes another Horatian escape, this time crouching behind the speech of his loveable Terentian father.
188 See Gowers 2012: 176.
imagery (*Baius inops, patriam rem*). His elision rate is a touch higher than the average within the poem (~50%), perhaps a nod to his rustic demeanour. In the longest snippet of paternal speech, we find a curious sonic phenomenon:

... *sapiens, uitatu quidque petitu*

sit melius, causas reddit tibi; mi satis est, si

traditum ab antiquis morem servare tuamque,

dum custodis eges, uitam famamque tueri

incolumem possum; simul ac durauerit aetas

membra animumque tuum, nabis sine cortice.’

‘A philosopher will give you reasons for why it’s better to avoid or seek this or that – it’s enough for me, if I can preserve the custom handed down from our fathers and, as long as you need a guardian, I can keep your life and reputation safe. As soon as age will have hardened your body and your mind, you will swim without the cork.’

115-120

Similar consonance can be seen elsewhere in his speech, but it is especially prolific here. Onomatopoeic functions of consonance and assonance in Latin have been noted elsewhere.


190 7 elisions (including the elided interruption *ille avidos* at line 126), out of roughly ~14 lines. Note the prodelision at 114 (*non bella est*)– with Terence in mind, one cannot help but think of Syrus’ ridicule of Demea at *Ad. 424-6 hoc salsumst, hoc adustumst, hoc lautomst...* (noted by Gowers 2012: 176).

191 *magnum documentum ne patriam rem* 110, *rumore malo cum* 125. Note that Soubiran 1966: 71 argues that elided -m remains recognisable through synaloepha.

I propose that the consonance of *m* conveys a sense of sluggishness, the onomatopoeia of *murmur*. This reading is supported by two papers which identify similar consonance elsewhere in Latin. A slow and rumbling idiolect would suit the dated paternal figure. Further analysis is difficult, though I note here that the consonance of ‘m’ appears in several satiric vignettes pertaining to ‘old’ wisdom and/or grumblings.

The final section of speech in the poem is Horace’s own distillation and modernisation of his father’s advice:

...*neque enim, cum lectulus aut me*

*porticus exceptit, desum mihi: ‘rectius hoc est:*

*hoc faciens vivam melius: sic dulcis amicis*

*ocurram: hoc quidam non belle: numquid ego illi*

*imprudens olim faciam simile? ‘haec ego mecum*

*compressis agito labris;...*

Nor, when the couch or the colonnade welcome me, am I absent minded: ‘This is the better course; doing this, I would be happier: thus shall I delight the friends I meet: that was bad conduct of him: would I ever do something as thoughtless as that?’ Thus I debate with myself with sealed lips...

133-138

Andr. 265. Karakasis 2005: 115 notes that Chaerea, of Terence’s *Eunuchus*, has a particular affinity for alliteration and assonance.


194 Pers. 3.77-85, Juv. 16.30-34.
We see, again, the consonance of m-sounds with mumbling speech, showing Horace’s distillation of his father’s advice. Here, parataxis achieves two effects. First, it delivers his inner admonitions with lively vigour, reinforced by the use of agito. Second, it manifests temporal compression — allowing for a larger set of actions and events than would otherwise be achievable in such a short space of lines. Dialogue allows for the simultaneous presentation of a perspective (Horace’s) and events perceived (hoc quidam non belle), and parataxis is deliberate omission of the expected syntactic (and, contextually, temporal) separation, these lines capture both the emphatic tone of his musings and the iterative nature of his meditation. A union of form and function.

Summary: 1.4

Dialogue embodies the themes of escape and threatening speech. Horace weaves his way through rumours and critiques before being finally pinned down by an interlocutor on the most forthright of anti-satirist charges — laedere gaudes. The idiolect of Horace’s father features comic throwbacks and rumbling consonance, and the dialogic phenomena in Horace’s internal-speech conveys temporal compression and amicitial remonstration — a type of sermo that is perhaps under threat (compressis labris).

Satire 1.5

This poem has been read as a Horatian ‘update’ to Lucilius’ verbose and elision-heavy ‘Journey to Brundisium’. Contrast with his satiric forebear is emphasised in the reduced rate of elision throughout the piece. There is scant dialogue to analyse — 1.5 features the least amount of speech relative to its length, save 1.8 which is devoid of dialogue. Line 12 features paratactic compression similar to 1.2.120 and 1.4.133-38. The use of compact grammatical complexity,

---

195 *Compressis labris.*
196 Reckford 1999: 542; Freudenburg 2001: 51; Cucchiarelli 2002: 851. The high *Satzvers* rate of 20.2% may also be interpreted as a Neoteric ‘update’.
197 26.9%.
198 ~4.5 lines of speech for 104 total lines (~4%).
199 For more discussion see Gowers 2012: 190.
the absence of any elision, and the Homeric prelude to the battle of wit lend a parodically comic-elevated tone to the affair.\textsuperscript{200}

**Satire 1.6**

1.6 charts Horace’s literal journey to Rome and metaphorical journey to become a *cliens* of Maecenas. The elision rate is a standard 36.6%, and the poem contains little dialogue. A key tension in the poem — established pedigree versus ‘new men’ — is condensed into a brief interrogation in line 29 and lines 38-44. Parataxis is used at line 29 to convey agitation and temporal compression (marked explicitly with *continuo*).\textsuperscript{201} This line of questioning is expanded in lines 38-44:

\begin{quote}
‘tune, Syri, Damae aut Dionysi filius, audes
deicere de saxo ciues aut tradere Cadmo?\’
‘at Nouius collega gradu post me sedet uno;
namque est ille, pater quod erat meus.’ ‘hoc tibi Paullus
et Mesalla uideris? at hic, si plastra ducenta
concurrantque foro tria funera magna, sonabit,
cornua, quod uincatque tubas: saltem tenet hoc nos.’
\end{quote}

‘Do you, a son of Syrus, Dama, Dionysus, dare to throw citizens from the rock or give them to Cadmus?’ ‘But my colleague Novius sits one row behind me, for he is only what my father was.’ ‘Because of this do you see yourself as a Paulus or Messala? That Novius, if two hundred

\textsuperscript{200} For grammatical complexity and elevated tone see Bonifazi et.al. 2016 3.5.127, Karakasis 2005: 93. For stylistic contrast between the scenes, see Thomas 2010.

\textsuperscript{201} *audit continuo*: ‘quis homo hic est?’ ‘quo patre natus?’
carts and three hundred great funerals come crashing into the forum, will should so loud that he conquers the horns and trumpets – by this at least he has his hold on us.’

Turn-initial *tune* and a string of demeaning genitives are forceful. The prodelision of *est* characterises the interrogee as straightforward and perhaps a little rustic. Horace himself is an avid user of such prodelision in his satiric narration – reading his characteristic verbal-poetic tic here reinforces the analogy between the recent election of the freedman’s son to the senate and the recent acceptance of Horace into Maecenas’ circle.

**Satire 1.9**

1.7 has scant dialogue which needs no further exegesis, and 1.8 features no dialogue at all. We come at last to ‘Horace and the Pest’ — the most conversational poem of Book 1. John Henderson’s 1993 article investigates the conversational elements of the poem and calls for further pragmatics-based investigation. I take up Henderson’s challenge and support his reading of the poem.

Henderson argued against a reading which contrasts a protagonist-Horace and an antagonist-interlocutor, instead suggesting a reading in which we see the two speakers as mirror-images — the ‘pest’ is ‘Horace’s evil twin’, as Feeney writes. Henderson also

---

202 *tune, Syri, Damae, aut Dionysi filius, audes...*  
203 Contrastive with *audes* — standing in for *audaces*, vocabulary associated with Optimates (Gowers 2012: 230 citing Kaster 1997: 16n). Prodelision is used for parody in Terence’s *Adelphoe* (rendering the speaker old-fashioned/forthright) and, as I have argued, is used to similar effect at 1.4.114. Morwood et.al. 2011: 19 notes that prodelision conveys a sense of straightforward, unpoetic speech — perhaps explaining its frequency in Horace’s *Satires*. A similar phenomenon is seen in Greek — prodelision is more common in Greek comedy than tragedy (Platnauer 1960: 140).
204 1.7.33-35 Pronoun emphasis, vocatives, parenthetical statement (*mihi crede*).
205 Feeney 2011: 85; Gowers 2012: 294 both note the ambiguity. Speech makes up ~56% of the poem, with the total elision rate at 47%. Note the particularly sermonic monosyllabic elisions at lines 6 *cum assestaretur* and 60 *dum agit*.
206 Henderson 1993; Feeney 2011: 87. One can read this article as an extension of the criticisms of Horace put forth by Zetzel in 1980 — for a summary thereof see Gowers 2012: 281.
emphasises the primarily monologic nature of the poem — a distinction between 1.9 and the dialogues of Book 2 which I strongly reinforce. Exegesis of conversation must, therefore, be enacted in relation both to the synchronic sermo existing between Horace and the ‘pest’, as well as the communication of this sermo through Horace’s own narration.

I agree with the line-attributions suggested by Gowers, and according to that schema the elision rates per speaker break down as follows. The pest occupies ~19.5 lines and elides 7 times in speech, with 2 further elisions bridging turn-ends, giving an overall elision rate of ~46%. ‘Horace’, as a dialogic partner to the pest and not the narrator, takes up 20.5 lines of speech (including his muttered ‘O te Bolani…’ at line 11-12 and ‘felices! nunc ego resto…at 28-30) and elides 11 times, with 2 further elisions at the end of a speech-turn, with an overall elision rate of 63%. Aristius’ Fuscus, in his scant ~3 lines, elides 3 times, giving a rate of 100%. The quoted oracle in lines 31-34 features a single elision, and the adversarius’ ‘licet antestari’ at line 76 is cut off by a proceeding ego from the narrator. Horace ‘the narrator’ takes up ~30 lines, and elides 11 times, 1 of which is at a junction between speakers, giving ~40%. This overview indicates the following. First, elision is more common in the conversation than the narration — again demonstrating a link between lively sermo and elision. Second, elisions at the junctions between speakers occurs more often in this poem than any other in Book 1. In light of these two observations, we see that 1.9 is a poem where speech is characterised by slurred words, and the separation of is often distorted — manifesting, as Henderson and I argue, the blurring of the boundaries between speakers’ identities.

Henderson and Gowers have both noted the use of repetition in and between speakers. To their observations I add the following: end-stopped question and answer in lines 4 and 5, stichomythic 2-word speech in lines 7-8, repetition of cupi- in 5 and 14, triple repetition of nil at 15, 16, and 19, and the repeated prodelision of est at 45 and 49. Vivid sermo and interlocutorial likeness is manifest through repetition and mimicry.

207 Henderson 1993: 78; ‘1.9 is funda-mentally [sic] a solo performance by its narrator, whose double mediation ventriloquizes both his characters and his own narration.’ 87: ‘The point for the citizen, the preciousness, of dialogue (fully listening dialogue), can be glimpsed through the thick modal screen of this sermo…’
208 6 times in 78 lines = 7.6%.
More complex forms of repetition highlight the tension between the speakers, emphasising alternately their conceptual proximity and distance. Horace’s use of *inteream si* and *dispeream ni* at metrically identical positions in lines 38 and 47 encase the pest’s use of *quid faciam’ inquit* and *non faciam’ ille* in lines 40 and 41. Horace is characterised in his verbs of escape, the interlocutor by his verbs of action – yet both speak in similar metrical cadence. In discussion of their similarities, scholars have pointed out the repetition of the opening scene near the finale – the pest’s interjection into Horace’s ambulation is mirrored by Horace’s onto Aristius Fuscus. Yet there remain a few key differences.

Analysis with regards to politeness theory reveals further nuances, for which Ferri’s study on politeness in Latin Comedy offers some relevant observations. The pest begins with *quid agis, dulcissime rerum* – initiating a politeness interaction which signals a request. *noris nos* could function in the same vein as *scin quid* – to shift the subject of conversation, in this case back towards the request. Horace’s reply immediately attempts to close this interaction before the request is reached, the *cupis* highlighting that the satirist knows what’s coming. *numquid uis* indicates not only that the pest is hanging around, but that Horace is attempting to shift the topic away from the implied request. The pest then employs positive politeness strategies — appealing to his relationship with Horace, rather than downplaying his intrusion on Horace’s day. An elided interruption in the following demonstrates Horace’s frustration with the hammed-up niceties:

...‘magnum narras, uix credibile.’ ‘atqui

*sic habet.’...  

52-53

\[210\] Ferri 2009: 21.  
\[211\] Ibid.  
\[212\] Ferri 2009: 24.  
\[213\] Ibid.  
\[214\] *Si me amas* line 38, *haberes magnum adiutorem...*45-47.
The pest’s compliment is a form of positive politeness – attempting to amplify the satirist’s social value and thereby ingratiate himself. Positive politeness is seen most often between social equals – does the pest drag Horace down to his level, raise himself to Horace’s, or are they genuinely ‘too close for comfort’? Elision cuts off the attempted compliment, forcing Horace’s adversative atqui into the final foot, creating a strong sense of sermonic enjambment and giving aural expression to Horace’s mounting impatience.

Horace’s own politeness to Fuscus is more complex. Despite noting that Fuscus is carus mihi, Horace deploys no politeness, going so far as to bluntly deny any shared value of religio. Context provides the explanation. Horace is forced to be indirect, to gesture, to imply thanks to the presence of his interlocutor. His dialogic interactions are shaped by the immediate conversational context, and his (constant) striving to escape.

Summary: 1.9

Horace and his interlocutor are presented as mirror-images. Both interlocutors are portrayed as recycling the other’s speech, repeating both individual lexical units and metrical rhythms. Their contrastive politeness strategies demonstrate the satirist’s concern for flight and indirectness, emphasised through contrast with the affiliative complements of the pest.

Satire 1.10, Concluding Book One

A last-minute addition to Book One, 1.10 centres on another Horatian defence of satire — this time regarding style, rather than content. Appropriately, Horace’s use of elision is somewhat more restrained here, a below average rate of 30.4%. The only dialogue are the interjections at

---

216 Also see Henderson 1991 on the choreography of their gestures.
217 Dufallo 2000: 590.
lines 20 and 23-24, both featuring an adversative turn-initial *at*, to which Horace responds with second-person interaction. The poem ends with an out-of-frame imperative to, presumably, Horace’s slave. This dispels the myth of Horace’s conversation with Maecenas, and indeed any of his dialogic interactions. Our attention is forced on the fabricated (literally) nature of the text — self-satirisation to the second degree, as not only is Horace the satirist revealed to be an act, but the very *libellum* (to take the word in its most literal sense) we hold is referred to as nothing more than a collection of last-minute recitations. The final layer of the dialogic babushka doll is revealed — a conversation between Horace and his scribe has encased Horace’s conversation with Maecenas, which itself encases Horace’s back-and-forths with rhetorical interlocutors.

This subordination of conversation, as I have argued, by no means implies a suppression of conversational phenomena. Such phenomena are not only present in Horace’s satiric monologues, but function in tandem with poetic stylistics to generate meaning, themes, and satiric motifs. The use of rhetorical interlocutors is, therefore, a meaningful instantiation of *sermo* as an extra-poetic concept.

**Book Two**

Horace’s satiric sequel is composed of eight poems, six of which are in direct dialogue and two of which feature lengthy quotations from an absent interlocutor. The implementation of dialogue as the primary poetic structure allows for a deeper exploration of idiolect, conversational phenomena, and dialogic interaction. Several themes of Book One are developed further, including hand-me-down philosophy, poetic criticism, threatening speech, inversion of norms, and the fugitive satirist. Exegesis uncovers the idiosyncrasies of several speakers, nuances of interaction and implied emotional state, and thematic architecture founded upon dialogic parallels and disparities.

---

219 2.2 and 2.6 featuring Ofellus and Cervius respectively.
220 Seen in 1.3.126-133, 1.4.48-52 and 1.10.20-21, 23-24, 1.4.79-82, 1.1.4-8, and 1.3.20-22 respectively.
Satire 2.1

The programmatic poem of the satiric sequel, 2.1 is a legal consultation with Trebatius and introduces us to Horace’s new direct-dialogue mode of poetry. It also rehashes several of his literary and legal concerns from Book One. The ‘novel’ use of direct dialogue, as well as Trebatius’ legal idiolect, have already been discussed. However, the dialogic richness of a few interactions remains to be analysed.

This new dialogic mode allows for direct interaction between the satiric speaker and a sustained participant. An essential form of engagement between speakers, real and literary, is clarification, an act which creates a shared meta-analysis of the conversation itself, and which is naturally found in ‘real’ dialogue. The use of clarification in Latin dialogic texts has been identified by Müller and Reinhardt. The first proper instance of clarifying dialogue is seen in 2.1:

\[quid faciam præscribe. 'quiescas.' ne faciam, inquis\]
\[omnino versus? 'aio.' peream male, si non...\]

5-6

A minor observation, but one which demonstrates that the novel implementation of quasi-Platonic dialogue is accompanied by mimesis of *sermo*. After discussing the history of satiric *licentia* Horace returns to the central problem of the dialogue, namely the legal ramifications of his writing. His eagerness to wring permission from Trebatius is conveyed by an elided interruption:

\[\]

\[221 \text{ Clauss 1985: 198; Tatum 1998: 697; Jones 2009: 69.}\]
\[222 \text{ Müller 1996: 46; Reinhardt 2010: 222. Quiescas also contributing to Trebatius' legal idiolect — Freudenburg 2021: 52.}\]
si mala condition in quem quis carmina ius est
iudiciumque’ ‘esto si quis mala sed bona si quis

82-83

The elision at *iudiciumque esto* blurs the end of Trebatius’ advice with the start of Horace’s final line of questioning. Freudenburg notes that the interruptive *esto* is, itself, imitative of ‘the clipped, formulaic language of the twelve tables.’ This mimicking elision thus conveys both the sonic impression of overlap between speakers, and the repetition of Trebatius’ legal idiolect by Horace. A sense of interjection is also generated from the position of this transition. The second foot is used less frequently for changing speaker and therefore reads as somewhat more abrupt. Horace’s echo of Trebatius *si quis* is reminiscent of repetitions from Terentian comedy. Roman Müller, in his study of dialogue in the works of Terence, writes the following:

‘Dies geschieht durch Aufgreifen eines Redeelements, das provoziert hat, durch Oppositionsfragen oder ironische Aufforderungen…’ Müller 1997: 62

Horace’s rapid-fire ‘if someone, if someone, if someone’ is a textbook example of Müller’s *Oppositionsfragen*, which itself is classified under *Abnahme* (interruptions). This reading is supported by Tannen, who notes that the repetition of a word, phrase, or longer syntactic unit tends to accompany faster pace of conversation and turn-taking.

---

223 Freudenburg 2021: 78.
224 Riggsby 1991: 328-330 notes that elision is likely not a solely poetic device.
226 Müller 1997: 60.
Reading interruption is meaningful for the text. Bonifazi et al. in their discussion of Greek theatre argue that syntax which is ‘jerky’, characterised by repetition of particles or phrases and a lack of syntactic anticipation, communicates ‘agitation’, ‘alarm’, ‘intense emotion’, ‘despair’ and/or ‘emotional climax’.\textsuperscript{228} I propose that this interpretation of Greek theatrical interactions is applicable also to Horace’s hexameter dialogues. Where Bonifazi et al. relied primarily on Greek particles, I argue for reading emotional states from the use of interruption, broken syntax, and repetition.

An agitated Horace is read from the context of the exchange. Horace seeks Trebatius’ advice, yet for every recommendation from the jurist not to write satire, Horace has an excuse. As the poem progresses, Horace forces Trebatius to accept that Horace will continue writing satire, and when Trebatius shifts from recommendation to warning, Horace presses on. The dialogue reaches its apex when Trebatius, the jurist, finally discusses the law and \textit{mala carmina}, and Horace is quick to respond. The \textit{si quis mala} that provoked Horace’s interruption and \textit{Oppositionsfrage} is met with two passionate counter-objections: Horace is not just ‘someone’, but a friend of Caesar, and his poems will henceforth be ‘good’.\textsuperscript{229} Horace is impatient to get going with Book 2, and impatient to let Trebatius, and the reader, know about his newfound socio-poetic credentials. The recognition of this small speech-overlap, the aforementioned elision, allows us to appreciate better Horace’s (over?)eager tone and general disregard for Trebatius’ extra-legal warnings.\textsuperscript{230}

This programmatic sequel features yet another redux of Horace’s relationship to his adopted generic father. In his defence of both Lucilius’ \textit{licentia} and his own socio-literary status, Horace slips into the elision-heavy idiolect of his daring predecessor. I omit translation, as it is the \textit{pronunciation} of his monologue, rather than the content of his speech, which is relevant:

\begin{quote}
... \textit{`o puer, ut sis}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{228} Bonifazi et.al. 2016: 5.3.2. \\
\textsuperscript{229} Tatum 1998: 698; Oliensis 1998: 43. \\
\textsuperscript{230} Eagerness also reflected in Horace’s repetition of \textit{si quis} (2.1.83, 84) in his final bid for Trebatius’ blessing.
vitalis metuo et maiorum nequis amicus
frigore te feriat.’ quid ? cum est Lucilius ausus
primus in hunc operis conponere carmina morem,
detrahēre et pellem, nitidus qua quisque per ora
cederet, introrsum turpis, num Laelius et qui
duxit ab oppressa meritum Carthagine nomen
ingenio offensi aut laeso doluere Metello
famosisque Lupo cooperto versibus? Atqui
primores populi arripuit populumque tributum,
scilicet unī aequus virtūtī atque eius amicis.
quin ubi se a volgo et scaena in secreta remorant
virtus Scipiadae et mitis sapientia Laeli,
nugari cum illo et discincti ludere donec
decoqueretur olus solit. quidquid sum ego, quamvis
infra Lucili censum ingeniumque, tamen me
cum magnis vixisse invita fatebitur usque
invidia et fragili quaerens inlidere dentem
offendet solido: nisi quid tu, docte Trebati,
dissentis’...
60-79
These ~20 lines contain more than half of the total elisions in the poem. The harsh monosyllabic elision preceding the appearance of Lucilius incepts the small cascade of elisions which develop into an avalanche by lines 70 and 71, both featuring a rare triple elision. Imitation of Lucilius is demonstrated not only in the quantity of elision, but even in their quality. The emphatic elisions at *cum illo* and *sum ego* are themselves mirror-images of the two satirists (*illo* = Lucilius, *ego* = Horace). Horace sacrifices euphony to demonstrate the continuity and contiguity between himself and Lucilius. This extract demonstrates modulation of the satirist’s idiolect for poetic effect — a phenomenon to be seen again and again throughout Book Two.

One final note: 2.1 features some echoes of 1.9 which are difficult to ignore. The line-final *ne faciam inquis* (5) is reminiscent of the pest’s *quid faciam inquit* (1.9.40) and *non faciam ille* (1.9.41), especially given that these are the sole elisions of *faci*— which occur in Horace’s satiric corpus, and their identical metrical positions. *Haud mihi dero* at line 17 is an exact repetition of the pest’s own at 1.9.56. *Peream male si non* at line 6 recalls Horace’s *inteream si* (1.9.38) and the pest’s *dispeream, ni* (1.9.47). These lexical repetitions are complemented by thematic parallels. How one approaches a powerful patron is discussed in 1.9.53-60 and 2.1.17-20. Horace claims to follow (*sequor*) Lucilius, as the pest follows (*persequar*) Horace. Both poems end with a *deus/princeps ex machina* through which Horace escapes/will escape from legal embroilment. These correspondences, in light of the Lucilian elision adopted in 2.1, perhaps lend weight to Ferriss-Hill’s argument that the pest in 1.9 is a Lucilian presence. Horace’s absorption of Lucilius is unquestionably evident in his satiric writing. His love-hate relationship with his predecessor is present in the tension between Lucilian style and content and Horace’s own Callimachean aesthetics. The adoption of Lucilius’ slurring in 2.1 demonstrates not only the unity of speech-style to content and theme, but also the latent Lucilian

231 2.1 contains 30 elisions, this passage contains 18.
233 The use of *sodalibus* in line 30 may echo *me sodes* at 1.9.41, given that it occurs only once in Book One and twice in Book Two (2.5.101).
234 Lines 2.1.34 and 1.9.16 respectively.
235 Ferriss-Hill 2011.
presence in Horace as an author and interlocutor. The parallels in speech between Horace and pest-Lucilius in 1.9 are re-presented in 2.1. Although Horace may have sought to separate himself and escape from Lucilius through his narrated journey in 1.9, the direct dialogue of 2.1 demonstrates that Horace’s poetic digestion of his predecessor is complete and irreversible.

Summary: 2.1

Trebatius’ legal idiolect is complemented, or juxtaposed, by Horace’s aesthetic interpretations of individual words and elision-heavy monologue. The marked use of elision in discussion of Lucilius is arguably mimesis of his predecessor, consequently demonstrating Horace’s absorption of Lucilian satire. This, in conjunction with numerous parallels to 1.9, generates a structural, intra-textual link between the two poems.

Satire 2.2

‘Dinner chez Horace’ is the setting for this poem. As 2.2 contains little dialogue to analyse, I provide only a few observations with regards to stylistic divergence at line 116. Stylistics distinguish Horace’s interpretation of Ofellus’ philosophy from Horace’s quotation of Ofellus. Horace’s nec meus hic sermo est at line 2 is betrayed by dicam in line 8 — a contradiction which encapsulates the larger literary paradox of the dialogic nature of Book Two. It’s not Horace’s speech, but Horace is going to speak it. The use of narrantem in line 116 emphasises Horace’s shift to direct quotation, and the stylistics change. Ofellus has a higher rate of elision and Satzvers/end-stopping compared to Horace’s paraphrase. Elision is associated with the speech of Stoics, and Satzvers with philosophical maxims and didacticism — apt

237 See Freudenburg 1999 on nimis acer, see Tatum 1998: 694 on mala carmina.
238 Whose speech do we trust? Horace the Speaker? Horace the Satirist? Horace the Author? See Freudenburg 2021: 80 for a discussion of such questions.
239 Shifts in philosophical content are noted by Sharland 2010: 200-212.
240 Ofellus has an elision rate of 60%, whereas Horace elides at 36%. Of the 24 instances of Satzvers in the poem, 7 are realised in the quotation of Ofellus, yielding rates of ~15% for Horace (17/115) and 35% (7/20) for Ofellus. In addition, a further 3 lines of Ofellus’ speech are end-stopped, bringing his rate of end-stopped speech to 50%. Horace’s speech is often enjambed, most noticeably at lines 94-115, immediately preceding the quotation.
characteristics for the character of Ofellus. The aesthetic divergence is a stylistic complement to Horace’s awry understanding/re-presentation of Ofellus’ values. Lest we think the straightforward farmer, and not the satirist, recommends eating rancid boar, Horace’s urbane sermo is juxtaposed against Ofellus’ rustic treatise.

**Satire 2.3**

Horace’s rather one-sided conversation with Damasippus is dialogically rich. The interactions between the two principal speakers, particularly in the poem’s finale, contain a wealth of sermonic nuances which alter the meaning and interpretation of the text.

Freudenburg’s 1999 paper on 2.3 and 2.4 has already discussed the use of elision and Satzvers. He notes the high rate of elision and Satzvers in the speech of Damasippus/Stertinius. I further analyse these phenomena. As Table 3 demonstrates, Stertinius has an extremely high elision rate (~90%) when presenting rhetorical/fictive conversation. In non-fictive speech, Stertinius and Damasippus both elide at around the ~60% mark, a figure considerably higher than Horace’s average across the two books. In 2.3, Horace himself elides at 53%. This, coupled with his relatively high rate of Satzvers (40%, 6 instances out of ~15 lines of speech), indicates that Horace too is speaking in a Stoic philosophical mode.

The poem’s opening uses conversational referentiality to establish setting and context. As Muecke notes, the opening vividly presents Damasippus ‘bursting in on Horace in his rural retreat’. Speakers reference their shared physical environment — ipsis Saturnalibus gives the date, huc fugisti implies a location of attempted refuge, and stipare conveys the ‘stuffed’ nature of Horace’s satiric works with the image of books piled on top of each other. The

---

241 See Freudenberg 1996 on Elision, Satzvers, and philosophical doctrine in Horace.
242 Freudenberg 1999: 199.
243 For discussion of Horace’s ‘mock-Socratic’ tone see Jones 2009: 68.
244 Muecke 131: 1993.
245 Lines 1-12: see also the use of paries and the description of Horace’s calamus. Kiesslinge-Heinze 1963: 219 has already noted how the combination of comic poets and Plato (’...konte der römische Leser nicht den verschollenen Komiker, sondern nur den Philosophen verstehen’) encapsulates Horace’s new form of dialogic satire.
creation of a dialogic space entices the reader to consider speech, gestures and movement — phenomena important also for the poem’s finale.246

The diatribe of Stertinius is a masterclass in combining conversational phenomena with hexameter poetry. Consider the following extract:

...Est genus unum

stultitiae nihilum metuenda timentis, ut ignis,
ut rupis fluviosque in campo obstare queratur :
alterum et huic varum et nihilo sapentius ignis
per medios fluviosque ruentis. clamet amica,
mater honesta, soror cum cognatis, pater, uxor
‘hic fossa est ingens, hic rupes maxima: serva!’

One class of fools are afraid when there is nothing to fear, complaining that fires, that rocks and rivers lie in their way in an open field. Another class, different, but not more wise,
rushes through fires and floods, though a girlfriend,
honest mother, sister, father, wife, kindred cry out
‘Here’s a great ditch, here a great cliff, watch out!’

53-59

246 McHoul 1987: 95 on gaze and gesture – the creation of setting through speech rather than narration translates the deictic aspects of 1.9 (distorquens oculos etc.) into mimetic aspects (most clearly executed at 2.7.116 unde mihi lapidem...ocius hinc te).
This small excerpt is emblematic of Stertinius’ rough, yet deliberately wrought, sermon. Repetition is overt in *ut ignis...ut rupis, ignis...ignis, fluviosque...fluviosque, alter(um e)t...var(um e)t* — and emphasises that *stultitia* is not a one-time mistake.\(^{247}\) *Sermo* is manifest in the asyndetic nominatives in lines 57 to 58, engendering a sense of urgency, the pay-off for which is the line-ending *serva!*\(^{248}\) The *satzvers* in line 59 concentrates the repetitious and asyndetic preamble into a clearly delineated outburst. This affects a strong transition from the previous vignette to the new *exemplum*, which is the philosophical stereotype of a drunk/sleeping fool.

Aggregation of conversational phenomena follows. Line 97 features the double-elision *sapiens(ne e)ti(am e)*, creating an elided interruption preceded by an asyndetic string and followed by repetition of *et...et*.\(^{249}\) Such aggregation is intensified in the dialogue between the doctor and his patient at lines 151-157:

> ‘ni tua custodis, avidus iam haec auferet heres.’
> ‘men vivo?’ ‘ut vivas igitur vigila. hoc age.’ ‘quid vis?’
> ‘deficient inopem venae te, ni cibus atque
> ingens accedit stomacho fultura ruenti.
> tu cessas? agedum, sume hoc tisanarium oryzae.’
> ‘quanti emptae ?’ ‘parvo.’ ‘quanti ergo ?’ ‘octussibus.’ ‘eheu,
> quid refert morbo an furtis pereamque rapinis?’

\(^{247}\) Repetition in line 59 being not only present in *hic...hic* but in the deeper syntactic structure: *hic noun copula adjective, hic noun adjective* and indeed the metrical structure — both halves occupying 2.5 feet each and separated by the strong masculine caesura.

\(^{248}\) Note Kiessling-Heinze 1963: 226 on *mater* and *amica* — I agree that the latter is *ein unmögliches Epitheton* and is best read as a substantive in the asyndetic structure of line 58. Freudenburg 2021: 123 notes that *serua* only appears elsewhere in comedy.

\(^{249}\) *clarus erit, fortis, iustus. sapiensne?’ etiam, et rex | et quidquid volet...*
‘Unless you guard what is yours, your greedy heir will now be off with it!’ ‘While I’m alive’ ‘And to remain so, wake up! Come now!’ ‘What do you want?’ ‘Your veins will fail you unless you give food and strong support to your sinking stomach. You hold back? Come on, take this bit of rice.’ ‘What’s the cost?’ ‘A trifle.’ ‘But how much’ ‘Eight pence’ ‘Alas, what matters if I die by sickness or by robbery!’

Repetition establishes close interaction between speech-turns — *vivo...vivas* — and emphasises the primary concern of each speaker — *quanti...quanti* responding to *age...agedum*. The doctor’s impatience is communicated through repetition and imperatives, and the metrics of his turns. Elided interruptions at *viv(o u)t* and *erg(o o)ctussibus* clip the speech of the reticent invalid, manifesting the doctor’s imposition. The high elision rate effects rapid exchange, seen also in *hoc age*. Horace translates animated *sermo* to hexameter poetry.

As in 53-59, this dialogue forms part of an iterative poetic structure. The stichomythic exchange is immediately followed by a similar one between Stertinius and a rhetorical interlocutor:

‘*Quisnam igitur sanus?’ qui non stultus. ‘quid avarus?’*

*stultus et insanus. ‘quid, siquis non sit avarus,*

*continuo sanus ?’ minime. ‘cur Stoice ?’ dicam.

158-160

---

250 Note also the consonance of vi– in line 152.
251 Freudenburg 2021: 138-139.
252 8 elisions in 7 lines. See Muecke 1993: 148 on idiomatic *hoc age*. 
I add apostrophes to emphasise dialogue. The stylistics of the previous conversation are repeated. Iteration is obvious — (in)sanus, avarus, stultus — and the multiple-turns-per-line is re-instated. Such parallels function to strengthen the relevance of the allegory, casting Stertinius as the (brash) doctor and his audience/interlocutor as the invalid.

Regarding the deathbed admonition of Servius Oppidius at 171-181, I note only the peculiar elision in line 180:

\[ iurando \textit{obstringam ambo: uter aedilis fueritve} \]

The elision is conspicuous. In the previous 9 lines (all of Servius’ speech up until this point) there is only one other elision, being a fairly smooth \textit{donar(e et)}. The spondaic line (save for the regular 5\textsuperscript{th} foot dactyl) perhaps manifests the overly-serious imposition. I propose that these elisions, all of which are at syllables long by poetic position (\textit{iurando} and \textit{ambo} being doubly so), create the effect of effort or strain, similar to cases discussed by Soubiran in his work on elision. This reading complements the metrical construction of the line, the tone of the vocabulary employed, and the content (this being the crux of Servius’ speech, as his paternal Stoicism is that which Stertinius admires).

\textit{Sermo} is emphasised in the anachronistic consultation between Stertinius and Agamemnon, lines 187-208. Close interaction between the two speakers is seen in their repetition of rex…regum, consulere…consule, insanus…insanus, tuo…meo, furiose…friusus. Both

253 Kiessling-Heinze 1961: 239 features them only around cur \textit{Stoice}. I add the others for three reasons. First, the pairing of \textit{cur and dicam} — this construction is seen in the opening of 2.2.7-8 where it is preceded by the vocative \textit{boni} and functions as dialogue. The second is the vocative \textit{Stoice} — this is used in line 300 by Horace to address Damasippus in a parallel context to the dialogue above, where Horace asks Damasippus to explain his (Horace’s) madness (the use of \textit{insanire} and \textit{sanus} in line 302 also mirroring the extract above). The third is its parallel relationship with the previous dialogue — re-iterating synchronic repetition and short interrogations. I remain unconvinced by Muecke’s (1993: 149) suggestion that it doesn’t have to be rhetorical dialogue due to a monologic use of vocatives in Arrian.

254 There are no elisions in the rest of the speech, and the whole piece is one of the few uses of dialogue without a high elision rate.


256 Soubiran 1966: 617.
speakers elide heavily (and both feature at least one line with three elisions), manifesting Stertinius’ Stoic idiolect and giving a ‘rough’ edge to the pseudo-serious conversation.

Stertinius’ use of a patronymic and maxime regum, negative politeness in nil ultra quaeo plebeius, overt seeking of permission (licebit) and the established phrase di tibi dent establishes his dialogic deference. This preliminary charade is, however, quickly dropped – turn initial tu at line 199 is followed by the vocative improbe in 200, a complete reversal on the politeness strategy and one which precipitates an increase in Stertinius’ elision as he becomes more and more agitated. This agitation results in a communication breakdown — Stertinius becomes abrasive (nempe tuo furiose), and then disengages from the dialogue, continuing to address Agamemnon but in the fashion of a diatribe rather than a dialogue.

The (mis)use of politeness strategies and the disengagement from conversation are thematic for Horace’s satires. Di tibi dent is iterative of Horace’s own di te…donent at lines 16-17, establishing a pseudo-polite stance which is demonstrated elsewhere after Damasippus’ monologue. I will show that Horace and Stertinius use similar politeness – focusing on redressive formulae, permission seeking, and self-deprecation.

Repetition, heavy elisions, and pronoun emphasis are present in the speech of the pimp and the young man in lines 231-232 and 234-238 respectively. Parataxis is used to convey a heightened emotional state in the lover’s internal dialogue in lines 262-264:

... ‘nec nunc, cum me vocet ultro,

accedam? an potius mediter finire dolores?

exclusit; revocat; redeam? non, si obsecret.’...
The parataxis in line 264 is enclosed and complemented by the clause-initial repetition of negative particles (*nec, non*). This excerpt, mimetic of the comedic dialogic mode, is juxtaposed with the interlocution of the servant — *non paulo sapientior* — whose lecture is conspicuously un-paratactic:

... ‘o ere, quae res

\[ \text{nec modum habet neque consilium, ratione modoque} \]

\[ \text{tractari non volt. In amore haec sunt mala, bellum,} \]

\[ \text{pax rursum: haec si quis tempestatis prope ritu} \]

\[ \text{mobilia et caeca fluitantia sorte laboret} \]

\[ \text{reddere certa sibi, nihil plus explicet ac si} \]

\[ \text{insanire paret certa ratione modoque.} \]

‘O master, a thing that contains neither method nor sense wants not to be handled with reason and measure. In love are these evils, war, then peace again. If one were to try and handle with fixed rule these things, which are fickle as the weather and always moving by blind chance, he would no more set them right than if he attempted to go mad by reason and measure’

265-271

The turn begins abruptly, with the only true hiatus in Horace’s satires (*‘o ere’*). This hyper-pronunciation is followed by meticulous use of conjunctions and extended clausal relationships are present throughout, in contrast to both the lover and indeed the use of conversational parataxis throughout Horace’s works. This reinforces the comparison and the contrast — the
lover, criticised for their ambivalence, vacillates in both speech and behaviour – and the servant, praised for their wisdom, waxes philosophy in a precise and fashioned diction.

Similarly, the petitions of the freedman and the mother are juxtaposed in their delivery. The prayer of the freedman is presented as follows:

\[
\textit{lautis mane senex manibus currebat et ‘unum}
\]
\[
\textit{(quid tam magnum?’ addens) ‘unum me surpite Morti:}
\]
\[
\textit{dis etenim facile est’ orabat ;}
\]

282-284

Turn initial \textit{unum} at the end of line 282 forces a heavy sense of enjambment. This is followed by a parenthetical statement and the resumption of the now-broken syntax (\textit{unum}) – all phenomena seen in the mimesis of \textit{sermo}.\textsuperscript{263} This contrasts with the opening line of the mother’s imprecation; a \textit{Satzvers} formulaic-invocation of the deity:\textsuperscript{264}

\[
\textit{‘Iuppiter, ingentis qui das adimisque dolores’}
\]

288

Juxtaposition of these disparate prayer-idolects allows Stertinius to demonstrate the ubiquity of madness using paired \textit{exempla}, in a manner suspiciously similar to that of Horace himself.\textsuperscript{265} Scant lines remain in Stertinius’ diatribe after this discursion, and thus Damasippus finally brings the ~250 line lecture of Mr. Snore to a close.

\textsuperscript{263} Note also the syncopated form \textit{surpite} Freudenburg 2021: 164.
\textsuperscript{264} See Muecke 1993: 163 for discussion on this.
\textsuperscript{265} See Hor. \textit{Sat.} 1.1
In doing so, we are transported back to the principal speakers, whose final set of exchanges prove to be some of the most dialogically important.

*Stoic, post damnum sic vendas omnia pluris,*

*qua me stultitia, quoniam non est genus unum,*

*insanire putas? ego nam videor mihi sanus.*

‘quid? caput abscissum manibus cum portat Agaue gnati infelicis. sibi tum furiosa videtur?’

*stultum me fateor (liceat concedere veris)*

*atque etiam insanum; tantum hoc edissere, quo me aegrotare putes animi vitio.’ ‘accipe. Primum*

Stoic, may you sell everything for a profit after your loss! In what sort of folly, for there is not only one kind, do you think my madness manifests itself? For I seem sane to myself. ‘What? When Agave carries the decapitated head of her unlucky son, does she seem mad to herself?’ ‘I admit my folly (may I yield to the truth) and my madness too. Only this unfold, what mental failing do you think I suffer fro–’ ‘Right, first…

300-307

Politeness strategies are deployed to parodic effect. Horace’s ‘politeness’ is similar to Stertinius’ in the episode with Agamemnon. *Stoic* mirrors *Atrida, sic vendas omnia pluris* mirrors *di tibi dent* (wishes of good will), *liceat concedere veris – mox respondere licebit* (seeking permission to continue), *stultum me fateor – nil ultra quaero plebeius* (self-deprecation). Both utilisations of such politeness are, of course, ironic, considering Stertinius’ rapid disposal thereof in favour of diatribic lecturing, and Horace in favour of an attempt to silence his interlocutor. Horace’s
delivery, however, combines politeness tactics with syntactic build-up, paroding Socratic-philosophical style.\textsuperscript{266} The metrics employed also contribute to the philosophical tone — the marked use of end-stopping in lines 300-303, and the subsequent coincidence of speech-turns with new lines.

Initially, Damasippus ignores Horace’s question (\textit{qua me stultitia}) and focusses on the end of his turn (\textit{ego nam videor}). In response, Horace’s second attempt is delivered with more force. Elision, avoided in lines 300-303, re-appears at \textit{atqu(e e)tiam...tant(um ho)c}. Syntactic complexity is replaced with a direct imperative (\textit{edissero}) — Horace’s Socratic composure begins to tremble.\textsuperscript{267} Damasippus interrupts — seen in the harsh elision at \textit{viti(o a)ccipe}.\textsuperscript{268} This elision weakens the natural pause at the bucolic diaeresis and the division between speakers, and breaks the end-stopped pattern of speech-turns incepting at new lines. The use of \textit{accipe} after a direct question is a strong signal of transition, and mirrors Stertinius’ use of the word at the beginning of the quoted monologue.\textsuperscript{269} Horace’s mention of \textit{vitium}, a term inextricably linked to Stoic moral philosophy, seems to trigger Damasippus’ interruption-cum-character assassination.\textsuperscript{270}

The closing exchanges of the dialogue resolve Horace’s ironic politeness, Damasippus’ monologic tendencies, and several thematic motifs. The poem ends with the following:

\begin{quote}
\textit{non dico horrendam rabiem'}, iam desine 'cultum maiorem censu,' teneas, Damasippe, tuis te. 'mille puellarum, puerorum mille furores.' \\
\textit{O maior tandem parcas insane minori.}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{266} Note the artfully alliterative sub-clause (\textit{qua me stultitia quoniam non est genus}) within the main clause — see Bonifazi et.al. 2016: 3.5.1.27.
\textsuperscript{267} See Muecke 1993: 164 on \textit{edissero}. Freudenburg 2021: 168 notes that \textit{edissero} generates a mock deferential tone.
\textsuperscript{268} Freudenburg 1999: 201 on elisions where the elided vowel is preceded by another vowel.
\textsuperscript{269} 2.3.46. There may be comedic effect in recycling \textit{accipe}, terrifying the satiric audience with the threat of another 250 lines of Stoic ramblings.
\textsuperscript{270} Muecke 1993: 164 notes the moral tone of \textit{vitio}. 

‘not to mention your terrible anger’ ‘Stop now’ ‘your rank beyond your means.’ ‘Keep to yourself, Damasippus!’ ‘your passions for a thousand girls, a thousand boys.’ ‘O greater madman, spare the lesser!’

323-326

As Kiessling-Heinze notes, this exchange shows that Horace’s patience has finally broken. Müller notes that Horace’s interjection *iam desine* shows direct provocation. Of particular interest to this analysis is Damasippus’ reaction, or rather, the lack thereof. This is the only exchange in the corpus where one speaker is interrupted by another but continues speaking with uninterrupted syntax. *cultum maiorem censu* must be either another object of *non dico* or the object of a similar verb implied but muffled by Horace’s interruption. In either case, a sense of overlap is generated syntactically — Horace and Damasippus are now speaking over rather than with each other. The chiasmus and alliteration of *mille puellarum puerorum mille* pulls us swiftly through the line to *furores*, mirroring the position (line-end) and syntax of *cultum*, and confirming that Damasippus is no longer in conversation with anyone other than himself. Horace’s closing quip is delivered in the dialogic-*Satzvers* style employed throughout the poem, reinforcing (and turning against his adherent) the central tenet of Stertinius’ lecture (everyone is mad to some degree) and re-iterating Horace’s own self-image (suffering from lesser *vitia*).

**Summary: 2.3**

The high rates of both elision and *Satzvers* generate the Stoic-Philosophical tone of 2.3. Stertinius is the main proponent of this, yet both Damasippus and Horace also conform to this stylistic agenda — perhaps Horace mimics Stertinius beyond politeness. Analysis of politeness strategies employed throughout demonstrate thematic iterations and relationships between

—

271 Kiessling-Heinze 1961: 263.
273 We see again the use of repetition in speaker transitions *mille mille*, and possibly in the alliteration of *teneas Damasippe tuis te*.
274 See Brown and Yule 1983: 15 for broken syntax in speech.
interlocutors, and recognition of elided interruptions deepens our understanding of the dialogic interactions, interlocutorial characterisations, and the unification of poetic stylistics with Horace’s conception of *sermo*.

**Satire 2.4**

Horace’s dialogue with Catius reiterates and reinforces the relationship between *Satzvers* and philosophic monologue seen in 2.3, but here we find the lowest elision rate in the collection.\(^{275}\) What little elision is found in the poem is mostly Horace’s.\(^{276}\) Horace elides at an astonishing rate of 72% – a high figure, especially compared to Catius’ 15%. All of Catius’ elisions occur in his quotation of the lecture – rendering him the only primary speaker never to elide outside of quotation. Catius’ idiolect characterises him as a Neoteric.\(^{277}\) The Neoteric agenda of quality, not quantity, is seen in the poem’s length and composition. 2.4 is considerably shorter than 2.3, and markedly less dialogic. The lecture which Catius relays features no form of *sermo*.

The only dialogic interactions are, therefore, those between Horace and Catius. The relevant excerpts are as follows:

```
Unde et quo Catius? ‘non est mihi tempus aventi
ponere signa novis praeceptis, qualia vincent
Pythagoran Anytique reum doctumque Platona.’
peccatum fateor, cum te sic tempore laevo
interpellarim, sed des veniam bonus, oro.
```

---

\(^{275}\) Nilsson 1962: 212 Table XXIII.

\(^{276}\) Freudenburg 1999.

\(^{277}\) Made manifest in *res tenuis tenui sermone peractas*. For Neoteric poetry and lack of elision, see Karakasis 2011: 176.
Politeness strategies communicate both Horace’s ‘ironic’ deference, and the amicitia between the two speakers. Horace is deferential with regards to Catius’ philosophical education. Positive politeness is present when Horace invokes his friendship with Catius – per amicitiam divosque rogatus. Although Horace claims to seek a ‘middle way’ between Stoicism and Epicureanism, Catius and Fundanius seem to be the only ‘friends’ in Book Two, and both are featured in poems which parody Epicureanism. This questionable allegiance is perhaps in parody of the Epicurean pre-occupation with friendship itself.

Satire 2.5

The consultation between Tiresias and Ulysses forms an anachronistic Homeric interlude. Remarkable neither for overall elision or Satzvers, Ulysses elides at around 66%, and Tiresias

---

278 Negative: Horace is apologetic — peccatum fateor line 4, asks for forgiveness — des veniam bonus, oro line 5. Positive: Horace compliments Catius – mirus utroque line 7.
279 Line 88.
280 For Horace’s middle way, see Showerman 1911. Both Catius and Fundanius receive positive politeness from Horace.
281 For Epicurean friendship in Horace see Freudenburg 2001: 65; Welch 2008: 70; Yona 2015: 244.
282 See Roberts 1984: 431-433 on general outline and Tiresias’ place as one of Book 2’s doctores inepti.
at 26%. One explanation for this may be the content of Tiresias’ speech. Much of his advice pertains to contemporary Roman society and interpersonal interactions — a low elision rate may affect the style of contemporary (perhaps Neoteric) poets, and thus presents an inverted parody of the aged seer. Ulysses heightened elision rate may convey a heightened emotional state — an effect that is generated elsewhere in his speech through other means.

The preliminary speech-turns contain a wealth of relevant phenomena deserving of exegesis:

\[\begin{align*}
\textit{Hoc quoque, Tiresia, praeter narrata petenti} \\
\textit{responde, quibus amissas reparare queam res} \\
\textit{artibus atque modis. quid rides ?} \ ‘iamne doloso \\
\textit{non satis est Ithacam revehi patriosque penatis} \\
\textit{aspicere} ‘O nulli quicquam mentite, vides ut...}
\end{align*}\]

This too, Tiresias, answer me beyond what you have already said. By what means or arts might I recover my lost wealth? Why are you laughing?’ ‘Is it not enough for a wily one such as yourself to return to Ithaca and gaze upon your household go-’ ‘O you who never lie, you see how…

1-5

\[\begin{align*}
283 \text{ Overall Satzvers rate is 20%. Of the 22 instances, only 2 belong to Ulysses. The overall elision rate is 30%. Of the 33 instances, 4 belong to Ulysses, 28 belong to Tiresias, and 1 is found between speakers (to be discussed).} \\
284 \text{Tiresias opens by discussing food and dining, topics dealt with by non-Horatian speakers who elide infrequently (Catius, Fundanius).}
\end{align*}\]
The elision at *adspicere* *O* is one of only two transitions to occur in the first half of the second foot, and the sense of interruption, perhaps agitation, is intensified through the use of the ‘passionate and grandiose’ *O*.\(^{285}\) This interjection bears resemblances to the use of elision in 2.3 and uses of *O* in Terence’s comedy.\(^{286}\) The coincidence of interruptions with other conversational phenomena such as exclamatory language, repetition, and imperatives is mimetic of the conversational mode. This mode is thus superimposed on supposedly ‘archaic/epic’ conversations.

Tiresias’ lecture features numerous conversational phenomena. Vocatives at *Quinte* and *Publi* (32), paratactic statement, pronoun emphasis (*tibi...tua...te...tu* 33-36), repetition at *ut...ut...ut* in line 43. These playful constructions contrast with the *Satzvers* exchange in lines 56-61:

\begin{quote}
*captatorque dabit risus Nasica Corano.*
‘*num furis an prudens ludis me obscura canendo ?*’
‘*O Laertiade, quidquid dicam aut erit aut non :*
*divinare etenim magnus mihi donat Apollo.*’
‘*quid tamen ista velit sibi fabula, si licet, ede.*’
\end{quote}

Nasca the fortune-hunter gives laughter to Coranus.’
‘Are you mad, or do you make fun of me with obscure oracle?’
‘O son of Laertes, whatever I say will or will not be:
For prophecy is the great gift Apollo gave me.’
‘But what indeed does this story mean, tell me, if you may’

\(^{285}\) Muecke 1993: 181.
\(^{286}\) Müller 1997: 61.
As Tiresias switches to mythological allegory (a common didactic technique), the various speech turns are given in perfect Satzvers, expanding the mystic tone of the parodic prophecy in line 58. Referentiality is instantiated through the request for clarification — Ulysses asks not what the story is, but rather what it means in its dialogic context (their sermo). Horace turns the fable into a meaning-seeking interaction between speakers, rather than mere exposition of the fable itself. Such nuances bring clarity and realism to an often surreal and ‘stuffed’ work of poetry.

Satire 2.6

Horace’s country-side soliloquy contains average rates of both elision and Satzvers. The low elision rate of Cervius may initially strike as surprising, given the high rate of elision associated with Ofellus, who functions similarly to Cervius in 2.2. Furthermore, the Vergilian-epic elements of Cervius’ story would also lend themselves to a higher elision rate, if Horace is indeed parodying the Aeneid. One possible explanation for this may be that Horace uses divergent elision rates to emphasise the distinction between speakers (similar to 2.2).

The opening lines of 2.6 features fictive speech in the form of a hypothetical prayer. The use of both elision and spondaic lines creates a fitting tone for the parodic request:

   si veneror stultus nihil horum 'O si angulus ille
   proximus accedat, qui nunc denormat agellum!

---

288 For surrealism and satire see Miller 2012: 319.
289 20.5% Satzvers, 41.9% elision.
290 24% in his own speech, 33% in fictive speech, 26% total.
291 Vergil’s average elision rate in the Aeneid is 45% according to Duhigg 1982: 79. For mock-epic elements, see Muecke 1993: 208-212.
292 Horace eliding at roughly double the rate of Cervius. Horace’s higher-than-average elision rate gives his rustic musing appropriate aural expression, ‘talking the talk’ of a simple man but, as argued by Davus in 2.7, failing to ‘walk the walk’
If I never pray such stupid things as: ‘O if there might be something added to that corner which now spoils my farm! O that fate might show me a pot of money, like that man who, enriched by Hercules’ favour, bought and ploughed the land he once worked on as hired labour!’

Lines 9-12 are predominantly spondaic, lending a pseudo-serious tone to the comedic requests. Heavy use of elision within the prayer expands his request by ‘stuffing’ it with unnecessary trifles — the elisions at long syllables are especially evocative. The conjured petition is so bloated that Horace barely finishes his pre-amble before it erupts, eliding in at horum ‘O. This long-winded and elision-heavy rustic imprecation is soon juxtaposed against the stichomythic interactions which take place in the city.

Horace’s conversations in Rome are presented in the following lines:

...Romae sponsorem me rapis: ‘eia,

ne prior officio quisquam respondeat, urge.’

sive aquilo radit terras seu bruma nivalem

---

293 Muecke 1993: 197 classifies this use of ‘O’ as ‘emotional’.
interiore diem gyro trahit, ire necesse est.
postmodo quod mi obsit clare certumque locuto
luctandum in turba et facienda iniuria tardis.
‘quid tibi vis, insane?’ et ‘quam rem agis ?inprobus urquet
iratis precibus : ‘tu pulses omne quod obstat,
ad Maecenatem memori si mente recurras.’

At Rome you take me as a sponsor: ‘Hurry, lest someone heed the call before you, get a move on!’ Whether the north wind sweeps the earth or winter drags the day in smaller circle, I must go. Later when I have said clearly what is in my way, I must struggle in the crowd and fight with the stragglers. ‘What do you want, madman?’ and “What are you doing?” a ruffian accosts me with angry curses: ‘You strike anything that stands in your way, if you’re running back to Maecenas thinking only of him.’

23-31

Urgue...urguet reinforces Horace’s jostling image of his daily life; the words literally vying for space in the line through elision. Comic tone encloses the mock-epic weather report in lines 25-26. The spondaic line 28 realises the crowded turba and the sluggish tardis through three separate elisions, all of which occur on long syllables. The two elisions in line 29 heighten the agitated tone conveyed with the less-than-polite quid tibi vis and the not-at-all-polite insane. The passage is highly mimetic of sermo, and conjures not only a vivid and descriptive soundscape, but also acts as a node of intratextuality within Horace’s satiric corpus. An interrupted journey to Maecenas is evocative of Book One, specifically 1.9, a resonance found

295 Eia and monosyllabic, prodelided line-ending est.
also in *sponsorem*.

The aggressive interrogation and the use of *insane* is reminiscent of Horace’s conversation with Damasippus, and the critique of Horace’s quasi-parasitic behaviour in his relationship with Maecenas foreshadows his conversation with Davus. Compared to Horace’s escape artistry in Book One, his relative inability to escape his critics and detractors in Book Two reads as thematic, a motif which the dialogue above condenses and expresses.

Having escaped the demanding sojourn through the foot-traffic of Rome, Horace is again beset by speech, this time representing *aliena negotia*.

\[
\text{per caput et circa saliunt latus 'ante secundam}
\]
\[
\text{Roscius orabat sibi adesses ad puteal cras.'}
\]
\[
\text{'de re communi scribae magna atque nova te}
\]
\[
\text{orabant hodie meminisses, Quinte, reverti.'}
\]
\[
\text{'inprimat his, cura, Maecenas signa tabellis.'}
\]
\[
\text{dixeris, 'experiar': 'si vis, potes' addit et instat}
\]

They dance around my head: ‘Roscius asks that you be present tomorrow at the well-head before 7’ ‘Your colleagues ask that you return today on some recent matter of great importance to everyone’ ‘Make sure that Maecenas signs these papers’ if you say ‘I’ll try’ ‘You can, if you will’ he adds and insists.

34-39

---

296 Muecke 1993: 200 on obligation and friendship as a *sponsor* – analogous to the relationship the ‘pest’ was attempting to force Horace into.

297 Lines 34-39.
Transitions at the bucolic diaeresis and at new lines render the requests self-contained and separate. They progress from relatively indirect and impersonal to direct and particular — *ante secundam...puteal cras* and *de re...reverti* are both forms of indirect communication; stating a request from a third party, rather than asking directly for a set of actions.\(^{298}\) Note also the unusual collocation of monosyllabic line-endings in *cras* and *te*; further use of metrics to express iteration and ‘un-poetic’ speech.\(^{299}\) The use of *Quinte*, however, begins the precipitous slide into less-formal, familiar language.\(^{300}\) Indirect requests are then replaced by the imperative *cura*, and Horace’s tension (reluctance?) surrounding matters concerning Maecenas is emphasised in the stichomythic exchanges of line 39, the imposition made clear through the use of *in stat*. The second mention of Maecenas in dialogue is, again, left unaddressed by Horace, and the tension unresolved. Rather, Horace reverts to the self-effacing and metrically measured *nugas* which he shares with Maecenas — an escape from the official into the mundane and trifling.\(^{301}\) This escape is extended, as Horace recounts the interrogations he is subjected to due to his membership of Maecenas’ inner circle:

\[
\textit{quicunque obvius est me consultit: ‘o bone (nam te}
\]

\[
\textit{scire, deos quoniam propius contingis, oportet),}
\]

\[
\textit{numquid de Dacis audisti?’ ‘nil equidem’ ‘ut tu}
\]

\[
\textit{semper eris derisor.’ ‘at omnes di exigitent me}
\]

\[
\textit{si quicquam.’ – ‘quid ? militibus promissa Triquetra}
\]

\[
\textit{praedia Caesar an est Itala tellure daturus?’}
\]

Whoever I run into consults me: ‘My good sir (you must know, as you are so close to the gods), have you heard anything about the Dacians?’

---

\(^{298}\) Leech 2014: 11, 89, see also Brown and Levinson 1987: 130.

\(^{299}\) Iteration also seen in *orabat...orabant...*

\(^{300}\) See Muecke 1993: 201.

\(^{301}\) Lines 44-45.
Rome is portrayed as a city populated with threatening speech. The ever anonymous and omnipresent (si)quis/quicumque of Book One is refracted into his urban interlocutors, who are themselves reflections of such critics as Damasippus and Davus. Even the formal (written?) requests which Horace meditates upon begin to take on the air of forceful commands, and the only safe conversations are those ‘apolitical’ trifles shared with Maecenas, in secret.

Regarding the famous parable, one sees that the city mouse engages his rustic counterpart with positive politeness (amice...comes...bone) and dialogic energy (parenthetical statement mihi crede, repetition vivere...vivunt...vive...vive...). His repetition of te...tu...me is mirrored by...

---

302 The parenthetical compliment in line 52 pays homage to Horace’s social value, rather than attempts to minimise imposition.
304 For the context of these questions see Muecke 1993: 203-204.
the rustic’s *mihi...me*: iteration of pronouns to direct our gaze towards the ‘protagonist’, in similar fashion to Horace in lines 51-6, strengthening the already obvious analogy.

Summary 2.6

The focus on Maecenas (via Horace’s social credit) is just one of several connections existing between Book One and 2.6. Anonymous interrogators, from whom Horace consistently escapes, gives ‘physical’ embodiment to the various interjectors of Book One. Indeed, one can read 2.6 as an encapsulation of Horace’s first *sermo* — a conversation with Maecenas in which only Horace speaks; a temporal, spatial, and social autobiography that offers very little concrete information; a milieu of interlocutors, hypothetical speech, quotations, allegories — it is little wonder that modern readers enamoured with Book One read 2.6 as the jewel of Book Two. Speech — both rhetorical and hypothetical — is constructed with care to both the mimesis of particular mood and politeness, and the interplay of interlocutors with other speakers in the satiric sequel.

Satire 2.7

Another *Saturnalia*, another attack on Horace. Whereas Damasippus provided a direct quotation of Stertinius’ lecture, and Catius of his teacher’s *praecpta*, the text makes clear that Davus is not relaying Stoic philosophy by rote. The type-cast comic slave is portrayed as a σπερμολόγος, one who collects philosophy second and even third-hand. The lecture within lines 46-115 is clearly Davus’ own attempt to apply whatever Crispinus’ doorman taught him to his master, Horace. Evans’ remark that Davus ‘adopts the language of his master’ holds true with reference to both satirical content and pronunciation, eliding close to the average rate

---

307 Griffin 1997: 54 on the festival.
The proximity of the servant and the master is emphasised explicitly in Davus’ speech, and implicitly through stylistics.

The opening exchange is a masterful unity of poetic stylistics and dialogic interaction:

‘Iamdudum ausculto et cupiens tibi dicere servus pausa reformido.’ ‘Davusne?’ ‘ita, Davus, amicum mancipium domino et frugi quod sit satis, hoc est, ut vitale putes.’ ‘age, libertate decembri, quando ita maiores voluerunt, utere: narra.’

‘For some time now I have been listening, and though wishing to speak to you, as your servant I hesitate.’ ‘Is that Davus?’ ‘Indeed, Davus, a bondsman loyal to his master, and honest enough that you don’t think I’m too good to live.’ ‘Come, use the liberty of december, as our ancestors wanted: speak.’

The concentration of conversational phenomena gives a vivid impression of dialogue. Referentiality (‘Is that Davus?’), repetition (Davus!), turn-initial dialogic markers (ita, age), and imperatives (age, utere, narra) focus our attention on the interaction between speakers and the subsequent characterisation. Davus uses negative politeness — phrasing his request indirectly, giving deference to Horace (domino), and minimizing his imposition (pauca). The

---

310 Evans 1978: 310; for Davus’ use of Horace’s own satiric content see Jones 2009: 70; Sharland 2010: 264-300.
implementation of these strategies is harmonised with their metrical delivery. The first line begins with a double spondee and features two long elisions (iamdudum ausculto et) — manifesting the long duration for which Davus has been listening and the trepidation with which he approaches. His transition to rapid dactyls to finish the lines slows at reformido — he hesitates, and waits for permission to continue.\textsuperscript{312} The smooth transition affected by the hephemimeral caesura introduces Horace’s measured reply (spondaic Davus), which is quickly interrupted by Davus (davusne ita). The interjection picks up the rapid beats of the line, as Davus hastens to excuse himself further. The negative politeness is soon demonstrated in the subsequent monologue to be a façade, another iteration of faux-politesse in Book Two. The elided interjection condenses Davus’ interruption of Horace’s life (and Satires?), and preludes his personal invective. Horace’s threefold use of imperatives and lack of any reciprocal politeness displays his perception of their relative status, a perception which Davus attempts to invert.

After Davus’ initial discourse in the vein of 1.1, Horace asks Davus to explain himself:

\begin{quote}
‘non dices hodie quorsum haec tam putida tendant,

furcifer?’ ‘ad te, inquam.’ ‘quo pacto, pessime?’ ‘laudas…
\end{quote}

21-22

The new-line transition denies any sense of interjection – Horace has afforded Davus the luxury of finishing that portion of his lecture. Muecke has already noted the elements intertextual with Roman comedy – intensifying use of \textit{hodie}, the presence of \textit{furcifer}, emphatic \textit{inquam}.\textsuperscript{313} Note also that both vocatives are in the stichomythic line, showing aggregation of dialogic

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{312} Haynes 1989 notes the deictic and mimetic functions of metre in non-classical poetry. See also Barrios-Lech 2016: 224 on slaves hesitating to speak first in Roman comedy (Plaut. \textit{Epid.} 261, \textit{Rud.} 111-2).

\textsuperscript{313} Muecke 1993: 217.
\end{flushright}
phenomena. This interaction is another example of clarification, manifesting attention on the part of the speakers, rather than simply presenting two idealogues.

Davus’ imitation of Horace in lines 34-35 features elements of comic language with a heavy sense of enjambment (line final *ecquis*). This parodic idiolect (an accurate one, given the explicit use of comic language in Horace’s previous speech turn) is contrastive with the style of speech Davus gives to Mulvius:

... ‘*et enim fateor me*’ *dixerit ille*

‘*duci ventre levem, nasum nidore supinor,*

*inbecillus, iners, siquid vis adde popino.*

*tu cum sis quod ego et fortassis nequior, ultro*

*insectere velut melior verbisque decoris*

*obvolvas vitium ?’

‘Indeed I admit’ he would say ‘that I am led by my stomach, that I curl back my nose at the scent of cooking, weak, lazy, and if you’d like, a scrounger. Seeing as you are like me, or perhaps even worse, would you chastise me as if a better man, and hide your vice with pretty words?’

37-42

Measured syntax indicates calm speech. The pseudo-polite use of *fateor*, used also by Horace in 2.3.305 and 2.4.4, embellishes the intricate confession. The structure of line 38 is decidedly sophistic – the chiasmus of verb-ablative-accusative, accusative-ablative-verb matching the

near-perfect metrical chiasmus. The use of *siquid vis* before the imperative diminishes its force, and the subjunctive softens the accusation to a restrained question. The only elision in Mulvius’ speech is the regular elision of *et*, and thus, in conjunction with the observations above, Mulvius’ idiolect appears to be one of refined sophistication, a manifestation of the *scurra’s blanditia*.

The final interactions between Davus and Horace mirror the finale of 2.3:

*frustra: nam comes atra premit sequiturque fugacem.*

‘unde mihi lapidem?’ ‘quorsum est opus?’ ‘unde sagittas?’

‘aut insanit homo aut versus facit.’ ‘ocius hinc te

*ni rapis, accedes opera agro nona Sabino.*’

In vain, for the dark consort dogs and follows your flight.’ ‘Where is a rock.’ ‘What for?’ ‘Where arrows?’ ‘Either the man has gone mad, or is verse-making.’ ‘Unless you take off fast, you’ll make the ninth labourer on my Sabine farm.’

115-118

Davus ends his lecture with a series of personal attacks on Horace, who then seeks to shut-down the conversation – here, the threat of physical violence is linked to Davus’ servile status. Syntactic interruption and/or overt repetition is present in Horace’s *unde…unde*, mirroring the syntactic fragmentation of Damasippus’ speech in 2.3. Note that *ocius* features in Davus’ own mimicry of Horace, perhaps lending credence to his imitation. The rapid changes of speaker animate the dialogue, and elliptical syntax mimics agitation. The breakdown of conversation,

---

315 Spondee-dactyl-spondee, caesura, spondee-dactyl-anceps.
316 Muecke 1993: 226.
just as in 2.3, is manifest through the poetic whiplash of philosophical monologue to dialogic shouting-match.

**Summary: 2.7**

Elision and *Satzvers* in 2.7 are potentially used to emphasise the proximity of the two primary interlocutors. Proximity – perhaps imitation – is also seen in mutual use of comic dialogue. This poem also features an instantiation of the ‘sophisticated mode’ of talking, attributed to the socialite Mulvius. Elided interruption, syntactic fragmentation, and manipulation of metrics aid in the mimesis of various types of communication, ranging from politesse to threats of violence.

**Satire 2.8**

The last of Horace’s Satires is statistically significant for its extremely low rate of *Satzvers* (9.5%) and elision (24.2%). In consideration of the poem’s narrative content (a social dinner *chez* Nasidienus), these numbers immediately strike one as fitting. Heavy enjambment and an aversion to slurring produce poetry which is *sermonic* in rhythm, but smooth in utterance.

The first lines introduce the reader to the measured conversation between Horace and Fundanius:

\[
Ut \text{ Nasidieni iuvit te cena beati?} \\
\text{nam mihi convivam quaerenti dictus here illic} \\
\text{de medio potare die.} \text{ ‘sic, ut mihi numquam} \\
\text{in vita fuerit melius.’ ‘dic, si grave non est,} \\
\text{quae prima iratum ventrem placaverit esca.’}
\]

Did you enjoy dining with Nasidienus? For as I was seeking to dine with you yesterday, you were said to be there from midday.’ ‘Quite so,
never in my life have I dined better.’ ‘Tell me, if its not too much, what the first dishes were to please your angry stomach.’

1-5

Amicitia between Horace and Fundanius is expressed through the use of an ut-question, as well as a mixture of both positive and negative politeness. Proximity is communicated metrically: line 3 and 4 are metrically identical, both feature speaker-transitions at the hephemimeral caesura, and both begin speech-turns with two monosyllables. Fundanius, another member of Maecenas’ circle and one who takes on the mantle of satirist in 2.8, mirrors Horace through their initial exchanges.

Though his re-telling of the ill-fated dinner party to Horace, Fundanius exploits the host Nasidienus for comedic effect. The collocation of a bumbling host too eager to please and guest literati liable to wax pseudo-philosophical produces juxtaposition of styles of speech. Even in the few lines of dialogue afforded to us via Fundanius, Nasidienus’ (over?) excitement (or, considering the guest-list, anxiety) is communicated aptly:

\[ Hic erus: ‘Albanum, Maecenas, sive Falernum te magis appositis delectat, habemus utrumque.’ \]

16-17

---

317 See Kiesling-Heinze 1961: 335 for the question. Positive politeness present in attending to interest/gossip, small talk, exaggeration (numquam melius), jokes (iratum ventrem — see Muecke 1993: 230 for epic parody. Negative politeness in si grave non est. Similar politeness strategies are repeated in lines 18-19: agreement, exaggeration, and intensification of interest all being positive politeness. Not also the similar phrasing of Horace’s pulchre fuerit tibi to Fundanius’ mihi...fuerit melius.

318 Jones 2009: 75 reads the poem with Nasidienus as the ‘primary’ target and the other dinner-guests as ‘secondary’, whereas Baker 1988: 214 (working from observations made by Rudd 1966, who later rejected this interpretation) reads the inverse. Gowers 2003: 169 sees Nasidienus as a surrogate for Horace. All readings suggest that everyone involved is satirised to some degree.
The ‘jerky’ syntax communicates Nasidienus’ nervous state through the marked absence of syntactic anticipation. A similar tone is conveyed during Nasidienus’ description of the lamprey:

...sub hoc erus, ‘haec gravida’ inquit
‘capta est, deterior post partum carne futura.
his mixtum ius est: oleo, quod prima Venafri
pressit cella; garo de sucis piscis Hiberi;
vino quinquenni, verum citra mare nato,
dum coquitur (cocto Chium sic convenit, ut non
hoc magis ullum aliud); pipere albo, non sine aceto,
quod Methymnaeaeam vitio mutaverit uvam.
erucas viridis, inulas ego primus amaras
monstravi incoquere; illutos Curtillus echinos,
ut melius muria quod testa marina remittat.’

This was caught before spawning; if taken later its flesh would have been poorer. The ingredients of the sauce are these: oil from Venafrum of the first pressing, roe from the juices of the Spanish mackerel, wine five years old, but produced this side of the sea, poured in while it is on the boil — after boiling, Chian suits better than anything else — white pepper, and vinegar made from the fermenting of the Lesbian vintage. I was the first to point out that one should boil in the sauce green rockets

319 Bonifazi et al. 2016: 5.3.2.44.
and bitter elecampane; Curtillus would use sea-urchins, unwashed, inasmuch as the yield of the sea-shellfish itself is better than a briny pickle.

44-53

The paratactic ‘list’ structure of the description of the sauce is the most obvious stylistic twist to this extract, though it is by no means the only indicator of a more flurried (or, less studied) form of speech. ‘Jerky syntax’ can be seen in two distinct features. The first is the parenthetical statement (cocto...aliud). As Schneider writes: ‘Most linguists agree that the parenthesis is a communicative strategy whose motivation is connected with an additional piece of information. The introduction of an additional piece of information causes a disruption [in the expected sequence of clauses and sentences].’ Such disruption is present in the extract above; the culinary construction of the sauce communicated by the grammatical structure of repetition in garo...vino...pipere albo is broken off as Nasidienus provides meta-commentary on his dialogue of degustation. This parenthetical aside – proximate in linguistic theory to auto-repair – mirrors and develops Nasidenius’ previous dialogic addition (‘or Falernum, if that’s your taste!’), and emphatically undercuts the (pre-prepared?) organised spiel on his exquisite sauce. The second feature (aside from the rampant parataxis) is that of the ‘loose’ association of the relative clause (quod testa marina remittat) to the clause-initial illutos. As Kiessling-Heinze notes, ‘[illutos] enthaltenen verbalen Aussage gilt, und daher die Form des Neutrums angenommen hat; lose schließt sich daran der Relativsatz quod...remittat.’ The artistic interplay of poetic devices and conversational phenomena produces a remarkably specific tone — flustered eagerness detracting from an overwrought monologue.

This tone contrasts with the speech employed by Nasidienus’ guests. Nomentanus is afforded only one line – scant material for comparison, though worth noting that it is framed

320 Schneider 2015: 295.
323 This complicates the reading of Berg (1995: 150) who reads a similar style in Catius’ unnamed gourmand. Similar in content, but divergent in delivery.
and delivered as philosophical aphorism. Balatro, on the other hand, is given a longer discourse:

‘haec est condicio vivendi’ aiebat ‘eoque responsura tuo numquam est par fama labori.
tene, ut ego accipiar laute, torquerier omni sollicitudine districtum, ne panis adustus,
ne male conditium ius apponatur, ut omnes praecincti recte pueri comptique ministrant!
adde hos praetera casus, aulaea ruant si,
ut modo; si patina pede lapsus frangat agaso.

sed convivatoris, uti ducis, ingenium res adversae nudare solent, celare secundae.’

‘These are the terms of life, and therefore the mead of fame will never equal your labour. To think that, in order that I may have lavish entertainment, you are to be racked and tortured with every anxiety, lest the bread be burned, lest the sauce be served ill-seasoned, that all your slaved may be properly attired and neat for waiting! Then, too, these risks besides – the canopy falling, as it did just now, or a numskull stumbling and breaking a dish! But one who entertains is like a general: mishaps oft reveal his genius, smooth going hides it.’

---

324 2.8.60-63: ...ni sapiens sic Nomentanus amicum | tolelret: ‘heu, Fortuna, quis est crudelior in nos | te deus? ut semper gaudes illudere rebus | humanis!’
Dialogue is emphasised through pronouns and imperatives relevant to the interlocutory partners. Yet here there is no *aggregation* of conversational phenomena. Whereas Nasidienus’ use of relative/subordinate clauses always followed the main clause temporally, Balatro speaks with a flourish at his inversion of this expected speech-pattern in line 67 (*tene, ut ego accipiar laute, torquerier...*).\textsuperscript{325} Balatro also makes use of a large syntactic/poetic structure (*ut...ne...ne...ut*), similar to Nasidienus three-fold sauce explanation, yet manages to execute his without self-interruption. The flowery use of subjunctives, the archaic-poetic infinitive in *torquerier*, and the smooth syntax characterise the speech as meticulously wrought and delivered, and contrastive with the rambling of Nasidienus.

**Summary 2.8**

A low elision and *Satzvers* rate characterize this dialogue as well-pronounced and un-philosophical. Nasidienus’ idiolect is a somewhat bumbling replication of the Epicurean didact in 2.4, save for some hesitations and self-interpolations. His manner of speech is contrastive with one of his more philosophical guests. Politeness strategies communicate the closeness of Horace and Fundanius.

**Chapter Conclusion**

The preceding analysis of dialogue in Horace yields several conclusions. I list first those which are predominantly textual and linguistic, before proceeding to those which are literary and interpretative. Poetic speech is often constructed as mimetic of ‘real’ conversation. This is achieved through the inclusion of what has been referred to as conversational phenomena, and through intertextuality with other dialogic texts such as Roman Comedy. Second, this mimetic

---

\textsuperscript{325} Bonifazi et al. 2016 notes that ‘syntactic build-up’ (the precession of a subordinate clause before a main clause) communicates the opposite effect of jerky-syntax (agitation) — one of measured speech. This is often used in Greek to parody philosophic and Socratic style — a similar parody can easily be read here, given the content (not to mention the description of Balatro as *suspendens omnia naso* at line 64).
aspect of speech is interwoven with hexametric stylistics and thus produces aural characterisation of speech-turns and speakers. This is demonstrated through manipulation of phenomena such as elision, end-stopping, Satzvers, and various turn-initial positions. Third, Horace varies his use of both conversational phenomena and poetic stylistics in order to produce various idiolects (or ‘micro-idiolects’) amongst the non-Horatian speakers of his Sermones.

Elision is generally increased in Horace’s constructions of speech, as opposed to narration. This difference is, however, negligible. High elision rates are generally associated with emotionally agitated speech and speakers, Stoic doctrines, ‘rusticity’ and Lucilian satire. Low elision rates are generally associated with Neoteric poetry, Epicurean philosophy, and ‘urbanity’. Manipulation of elision appears to be the most overt stylistic variation in Horace’s creation of idiolects.

Satzvers and, to a lesser degree, end-stopping, are generally associated with philosophical doctrine, maxims, and the general ‘didactic’ mode. This stylistic also forces the coincidence of speech-turns with new lines, allowing for smooth transitions between speakers. The opposite stylistic – enjambment – is associated not only with the sermonic aspect of Satiric poetry, but indeed with animated dialogic interaction.

Parataxis, asyndeton, parenthetical statements, comedic vocabulary and unfinished clauses/sentences are often seen in speech-turns which feature high elision rates and other sermonic conversational phenomena, and whose context prompts us to imagine emotionally charged interactions.

The use of multiple subordinate clauses, subjunctives as opposed to imperatives, and ‘elevated’ vocabulary is generally present in speech turns associated with low elision rates, affecting careful pronunciation of measured speech.

These stylistic tendencies themselves distillations of another deeper dichotomy within Horace’s ‘Conversations’: threatening and non-threatening speech. As has been demonstrated, aggregation of conversational phenomena and metrical disruptions tends to accompany direct and often challenging speech, whereas conversations regarding less explicitly personal topics

---

326 41% vs. 37% in Book One, 40% vs. 41% in Book Two, 41% vs. 38% total.
such as fine dining and the *nugae* which Horace shares with Maecenas are spoken with a refined and somewhat un-satiric (if we consider the hallmarks of satiric poetry to be its sermonic aspects) style. Conversation is predominantly intrusive, dangerous, disruptive – and when it isn’t, it is barely conversation at all.\textsuperscript{327}

\textsuperscript{327} One is reminded again of Maecenas’ abject silence.
Chapter Three: Aulus Persius Flaccus

Introduction

‘Quis populi sermo est?’ ‘secrete loquimur’ ‘vis dicam?’ ‘quid dein loquere?’ ‘si fas dicere’
‘cui verba?’ ‘dic hoc’ ‘da verba’ ‘dic clare’ ‘quaere’ ‘responde’

The fragments above serve as an introduction to Persius’ often disjointed, frenetic, and shadowy discourse. This chapter will explore the full range of conversation in the works of Persius, their relation to the broader concept of Latin sermo, the interplay of conversational phenomena and hexameter poetics, and the function of ‘conversation’ in the realisation of Persius’ poetic themes and motifs.

Text and Speakers

Speaker distribution in the works of Persius is considerably more complicated than in the works of Horace or Juvenal. Complications arise due to factors particular to Persius’ style, including fluctuations between first, second, and third-person verbs, difficulties in identifying congruent arguments (if such arguments even exist), and a tendency to shift between dialogic structures. Indeed, this final factor appears to be an instantiation of a wider agenda; a vigorous attack on the distinctions between monologic and dialogic structures, most clearly articulated in Persius’ bold statement about the fictionality of his interlocutor at 1.44. This perceived rejection of dialogic clarity has induced several commentators to refuse outright any attempts to allocate speakers. While the ‘unwelcome authority’ of modern punctuation may suppress a deliberate obfuscation which defies literary positivism, this does not therefore imply that attempts to parse speaker-interactions within the satires are conducted in vain. It is beyond question that the simulation of dialogue — the interaction of two or more speech-turns — is present in Persius’ Satires. Even if one were to posit the use of interlocutors as psychological

328 The most famous example being the attribution of lines in the third poem.
329 quisquis es, o modo quem ex adverso dicere feci,
self-interrogation, the interaction of various speech-turns remains an inherent feature of the language used. If, as Roche ponders, the text contains the possibilities for multiple divergent readings and interpretations regarding speakers, it is nonetheless inscribed ‘with the illusion of performed speech and its varying dynamics’.

Unfortunately, who-says-what is merely one of many differences among editions of Persius. I find Kißel’s 1990 edition of Persius to be the most rigorously defended with regards to syntactic and lexical emendations and speaker-distribution. This edition is used in conjunction with Jenkinson’s 1980 text and commentary, Harvey’s 1981 commentary, and Braund’s 2004 Loeb to explore the varied approaches of Persius’ most recent editors. I note where I diverge from Kißel.

**Elision and Satzvers**

The manipulation of elision and enjambment allows for variation in poetic tone. Table 10 shows the rates of elision and Satzvers in Persius’ hexametric satires. The elision rates for each poem are taken from Kenney’s study, rounded to the nearest whole. As there is no study on Persius’ metrics comparable to that of Nilsson for Horace, I have undertaken an analysis of Satzvers in the text as supplied by Kißel.
The rate of elision is slightly higher than that of Horace (~40%) and varies considerably between poems. As I will argue that there are no interlocutors comparable to the figures of Horace’s second book of satires (Trebatius, Damasippus, Davus etc.), I do not provide a table with elision rates per character. Rather, these will be noted as each speaker is analysed. Persius’ rate of Satzvers varies less than Horace’s. These figures will be used to contextualise instances of enjambment and Satzvers in satiric dialogue.

**Prologue**

Although this study focuses on hexameter satire, it would be remiss not to briefly discuss the so-called ‘prologue’ and its relationship to Persius’ sermo. Lines 8-9 are of particular interest:

\[
\text{quis expedivit psittaco suum ‘chaere’}
\]
\[
\text{picamque docuit nostra verba conari?}
\]

Questions of language are foregrounded. Persius establishes an us/them dynamic, manifest in the juxtaposition between the (exotic) parrot’s chaere and the magpie’s nostra verba.\(^{334}\) Yet, as

---

\(^{334}\) *Nostra verba* echoing both Latin itself and ‘our poetry’, perhaps *satura* itself; see Ramage 1974: 116. See Tzounakas 2008: 104 on the parrot.
McNelis observes, the prologue as a whole shows extensive adaptation of Greek poetry, in particular Hipponax.\textsuperscript{335} Persius derides imitation and mimicry and flaunts his xenophobia, in a passage which is itself mimetic of Hellenistic choliambics. A dual position — one of several which Persius will adopt.\textsuperscript{336} The synthesis of literary imitation and critique, the tension between emulation and escape from his influences, and the artificiality of speech, are all motifs which are present in Persius’ hexametric use of conversation.

**Satire One**

Persius’ first satire looks quantitatively sermonic. The general elision rate is the second highest of the corpus, and the rate of *Satzvers* the second lowest. This general tone will be shown to enclose several conversational interactions.

‘*O curas hominum! o quantum est in rebus inane!*’

‘*quis legat haec? ’ min tu istud ais? nemo hercule. ’ ‘nemo?’

‘*vel duo vel nemo. ’ turpe et miserabile. ’ ‘quare?*

1-3

Persius’ satire begins *in sermo*.\textsuperscript{337} The opening introduces and epitomises several stylistic features of his poetry — mimesis, allusion, dislocation, and aggression. Emphatic pronouns, stichomythic exchanges, the high elision rate, and lexical repetition show emphatic aggregation of conversational stylistics. Repetition is used to create chiasmus between the speakers, the axis of which lies at the end of line 2; question – *nemo, nemo* – question.\textsuperscript{338} This chiasmus creates a

\textsuperscript{335} McNelis 2012: 250.

\textsuperscript{336} Indeed, he is by his own description *semipaganus* — see Tzounakas 2006: 112, Roche 2012: 194.

\textsuperscript{337} See Collinge 1967 on alternative apostrophes.

\textsuperscript{338} Lines 2 and 3 are also almost metrically identical (differing only in the 4th foot), both begin and end with a new-speech turn, both utilise the sixth foot for a single-word question, and the speakers are afforded the same number of beats per line (Persius = 3.5, Interlocutor = 2.5)
sense of balance between the two interlocutors which is quickly tipped as Persius initiates his monologic *apologia*, and which is ultimately destroyed through admitting he ‘made the whole thing up’ at line 44. However, in its immediate context, the balancing chiasmus also emphasises its crux – the word *nemo*. Persius’ ‘conversation with nobody’ (confirmed in line 44) introduces both the poet’s professed social isolation, as well as the self-reflexive use of dialogue to enact satire.\(^{339}\)

In the footsteps of Horace (and followed by Juvenal), satire is launched with a question.\(^{340}\) *Qui fit Maecenas* began the Apulian’s one-sided conversation with his patron, characterised by anecdotes and conversational *mugae*, where interjecting voices were met mostly with non-confrontation and evasion. This politics of politesse is upended – the central *sermo* of the introductory poem is aggressive from its inception.\(^{341}\) The allusion to/repetition of either Lucilius or Lucretius in the first line is jarring, given Persius’ ‘attack’ on birds of mimicry in the prologue. *Quis leget haec* is therefore a multi-layered aggressive interrogation, attacking the original author of the quotation, the genre(s) which Persius is attempting to engage, Persius’ own works as *loci* for such pithy remarks, and Persius’ satires as poetry themselves (*haec*).\(^{342}\) Horace’s *qui fit* focuses our attention on not only the ‘state of the world’ which Horace discusses, but also on Horace’s autobiographical position as a satirist and confidante. Persius’ *quis leget haec* pre-empts and attempts to undermine Persius’ justification for continuing Horace’s generic *sermo*. Conversation is used to isolate the satirist from his inception, and *sermo* is presented as openly antagonistic.

The opening lines are also exemplary Persius’ motifs of ‘spontaneity’, dialogic instability, isolation, and meta-poetic commentary. *min tu istud ais* is the first iteration of an affected spontaneity.\(^{343}\) Surprise, and interrogation to clarify speaker and addressee, are by no means novel in satire — Horace’s *Davusne?* in 2.7 serves a similar dialogic function. However, the

\(^{339}\) Osgood 2012: 1-4 on isolation.

\(^{340}\) See Lee and Barr 1987: 67 on the rhetorical question as a stock feature.


\(^{343}\) Roche 2012: 211 on Persius and ‘spontaneity’. See also Ferriss-Hill 2015: 158.
absence of referentiality in Persius’ example demonstrates divergent poetic function. Davus’ introduction to 2.7 ‘paints a picture’ — physical actions, temporality, relationships between the speakers, and perhaps even implied physical descriptions. The aspects of dialogue which lend themselves to dramatic mimesis are jarringly absent in Persius’ introduction. The dialogic function is comparable, but the context is void — there is no stage. The isolation of these speech-turns from any implied physicality necessarily fixes our attention on the content of their speech. In doing so, we find that the incorporeality of these disembodied voices is further emphasized.

‘Nobody!’ ‘Nobody?’ ‘Well two, or nobody.’ Persius’ retort effectively communicates his programmatic rejection of popularity and provides meta-poetic commentary on his sermo. The duality of speakers/readers is first delineated with the emphatic tu...min..., is rendered equal to the repeated and insistent nemo. The dialogue is self-defeating — the speech-turns question the existence of their very source. Such exchanges contribute to the sense of dialogic instability in Persius’ satires — the difficulty in identifying speakers, the constant switches between monologue and dialogue, the Protean nature of the second-person address. This meta-poetic denial of the reality of sermo is a mere prelude to the bold confession of fictionality at line 44.

This opening dialogue introduces us to the vigorous interrogation to which Persius’ sermones subject his vision of Rome, and to Persius’ self-awareness — of satire’s false polyphony and the necessity of a readership. Vel duo vel nemo is tautological. Either the poem is being read and thus engaged by both reader and author (as present in his work), or the metaphor of the buried book (hic tamen infodiam) becomes reality. Reading Persius is an experience far removed from eavesdropping on Horace’s conversation with Maecenas. Reading Persius is more akin to eavesdropping on Persius’ conversation with Persius.

---

344 Are we to imagine a Menippean Davus from the theatre?
345 For this rejection, see Reckford 1962: 501; Ramage 1979: 138; Tzounakas 2006: 115.
346 Saccone 2009: 150 notes the use of autophagy (self-defeating arguments) in Persius’ interlocutors. This is perhaps an early instantiation thereof.
348 Witke 1962: 156 ‘Persius weaves the audience into himself by engulfing them.’
The monologue from lines 3-23 is responded to by who we must imagine to be the same interlocutor from earlier. The attribution of lines to speakers is disputed — the text provided is marked according to my reading, with justifications forthcoming.

‘quo didicisse, nisi hoc fermentum et quae semel intus
innata est rupto iecore exierit caprificus?
en pallor seniumque!’ o mores, usque adeone
scire tuum nihil est nisi te scire hoc sciat alter?
‘at pulchrum est digito monstrari et dicier ‘hic est’.
ten cirratorum centum dictata fuisse
pro nihilo pendes?’ ecce inter pocula quae sunt

‘Whats the point in learning, if not that this fermentation, and that which has taken root inside, should burst forth from a ruptured liver, a fig tree! Behold our pallor and old-age!’ O Mores! Is learning worth so little to you unless someone else knows that you know? ‘But its lovely to be pointed out and hear “its him!” Is it worth nothing to you to be the dictation for a hundred curly-haired schoolboys?’ Behold, they seek amongst their drinking…

24-30

The attribution of lines 24-25 to an interlocutor is mostly uncontroversial, and editors agree that lines 28-30 (at...pendes) belong to the interlocutor. 349 Persius’ preoccupation with

349 Kißel 1990: 150 notes that the senium is particularly negative and would be strange in the mouth of the interlocutor. However, Persius often has his interlocutors self-incriminate.
repetitious/iterative structures and Horatian intertextuality is on display. Both speech-turns of the interlocutor begin on a new line and are broken off by Persius at the primary caesura – a union of form and function, as both turns from the interlocutor serve the same dialogic function. Persius’ interruptive exclamation (seniumque ’o more) is followed by a three-fold repetition of scio. The disdain of the typically erudite satirist is communicated by impatience and reiteration, weaponizing his interlocutor’s nisi clause and turning it back against them. Notable also is the high rate of elision in this passage – 9 elisions for 7 lines, appropriate for the graphic ‘bursting’ metaphor and Perseus’ aggravated response.

This shift from second-person dialogue to third-person reported speech in line 43 anticipates Persius’ demolition of any stable dialogic framework in line 44. Whoever you are, who I’ve just invented — the wry manipulation of the satiric ‘fourth wall’ is extended to line 55.

et ‘verum,’ inquis, ‘amo, verum mihi dicite de me.’

qui pote? vis dicam? nugaris, cum tibi, calve,

pinguis aqualiculus propenso sesquipede extet.

55-57

Inquis — never a necessary addition for an interlocutor — reminds us of Persius’ professed artificiality. De me is thus really de quovis or indeed de nemine, extending the use of the confessed straw man of line 44, modelled now on Plautian introspection and described with absurd exaggeration. The comic-absurd characterisation and re-iteration of fictionality emphasise one of Persius’ thematic tenets — nobody (well, maybe one or two) wants the truth about themselves. Persius himself must invent and respond to the plea. The exchange is

---

350 Further repetition is seen in the use of prodelision, turn-initial monosyllables.
351 A rate of 128%, far higher than the poem’s rate of 63% and Persius’ average of 48.5%.
353 Ut nemo in sese temptat descendere, nemo! Pers. 4.23.
visibly conversational — the repetition of verum, the focus on the speaker (mihi, me), question-chains, and the use of the vocative. The shift from abstract philosophical sparring to personal description and insult is coupled with a transformation of the role of the interlocutor. Line 55 can hardly be argued to be an example of ex adverso dicere — rather, Persius transmutes his debate-partner to a figure with corporeal form, a grotesque representative of ‘wealthy poetasters’. This use of inquis to reconstitute his interlocutor from satiric debater to corporeal figure is repeated near the end of the poem.

I read lines 63-68 as follows:

\[\text{quis populi sermo est? quis enim nisi carmina molli}
\text{nunc demum numero fluere, ut per leve severos}
\text{effundat iunctura unquis? } 'scit tendere versum}
\text{non secus ac si oculo rubricam derigat uno.}
\text{sive opus in mores, in luxum, in prandia regum}
\text{dicere, res grandes nostro dat Musa poetae.'}

What say the people? What else unless that poetry finally flows with a soft rhythm, so that strict nails glide over smooth joins. ‘He can set a verse as if drawing a chalk-line with one eye closed. Whether speaking

---

354 Of interest is amo verum. Harvey 1981: 32 notes the similar construction in Plautus where it is the true object of amo, and the passage at Martial vii.76 where it is used as a politeness strategy (dic amabo). It seems reasonable to suggest an alternative reading of line 55 in which verum is repeated for emphasis, rather than as two distinct grammatical objects. Consider Horace Sat. 2.3.282-283 ...et ‘unum’ \(\text{(quid tam magnum?}\) addends) ‘unum me surpite morti’. Forms of amo, like quid tam magnum, can be used as a politeness strategy (as it is in the example from Martial — see also Hor. Sat. 1.9.30. This alternative reading would imply further use of conversational phenomena in Persius’ satiric dialogue, and further exaggerate his use of a strawman (begging to be critiqued). The scene in Persius is reminiscent of Plautus Men. 146-148 (‘tell me I’m a clever man!), though with expected satiric inversion.

355 A phrase borrowed from Harvey 1981: 32.
against customs, luxury, or the banquets of kings, the Muse provides
grand subjects to our poet.’

63-68

My reading conforms to that supplied by Kißel. However, both Jenkins and Braund read quis populi sermo est as an interjection from the interlocutor. Harvey contends that this quotation is unlikely to come from an interlocutor, arguing that having three voices (the interlocutor, Persius, and the sermo populi which follows at scit) in a short span of time would be ‘confusing and unlikely, and in any case an interlocutor is hardly necessary to introduce the theme.’ I disagree with Harvey’s first objection, but agree with his attribution. The presence of three voices/speakers in a short span of lines is not only a common occurrence in satire but is in fact present earlier in this very poem. The key, however, lies in enim. Harvey writes that ‘enim is often found in the answer to a question’. But do lines 63-65 answer the question quis populi sermo est, or elaborate upon it? Variants of turn-initial qu- + enim are found in satire functioning more often to extend or emphasise a series of (rhetorical) questions, rather than to engage in question-answer pairs in discourse. This argument, founded on both the ‘form’ of the turn in question (post-positive enim in a question) and analogous uses of this form in other satiric poets, supports Harvey’s attribution of quis populi sermo est to the satiric narrator.

356 Indicated by their use of apostrophes and the formatting of their English translations.
358 Consider Horace Sat 1.9 — Horace (narrating), ‘the pest’, and the remembered Horace. Lines 1-2; the quotation of Lucilius/Lucretius in the first line (first voice/speaker), and then the back and forth between the interlocutor and Persius. For the question of Lucilius/Lucretius, see Zetzel 1977 and Harvey 1981: 13-14. See also the multiple speakers at Pers. 5.124-128, 132-134
359 Harvey 1984: 63.
360 See the (as read by scholars) rhetorical uses of quid enim at Hor. Sat. 1.1.7, 2.132. Uses of qu- enim which extend question chains similar to the example from Persius include Hor. Sat. 2.3.124, 166; Juv. 1.48, 1.89, 6.179, 196, 7.158. Examples of turn-initial qu- + enim which have been read as rhetorical questions rather than interlocutors include Juv 2.8, 2.65, 3.208, 4.101, 5.164, 6.300, 7.199, 8.30, 8.221, 9.110, 10.4, 10.302, 10.321, 11.2, 38, 13.98, 13.234, 15.140. Examples which don’t follow this trend are Hor. Sat. 2.3.201.
I agree with the use of apostrophes beginning at *scit tendere* in line 65 to indicate the shift from the satiric narrator to the *sermo populi* itself.\textsuperscript{361} I therefore include it as a speech-turn. The stylistics of this ‘snippet’ suit its praise of non-sermonic poetry – beginning at the primary caesura, strong syntactical coincidence with the beginning of new lines, aversion to monosyllabic line-ending, rhetorical tricolon, and poetic metonymy (*rubricam*).\textsuperscript{362} The contrast between the topics (*mores, luxum, prandia regum*) and the ‘high-literary’ register invoked through the stylistics mentioned and the use of *res grandes* reflects the contrast between the concept of *populi sermo* and the critical taste it professes. Persius’ parody of the *populus* through imitation mirrors his use of fictive dialogue in line 55 — just as he ventriloquises his interlocutor into demanding the truth, so too does he have the *vox populi* demand satiric poetry, albeit not quite in Persius’ style.

Persius’ use of dialogue to explore and justify his position on genre and stylistics is continued, the conversation swinging wildly from one extreme (‘effeminate’ smoothness) to the other – archaic revivalism.\textsuperscript{363} After Persius’ imitation of contemporary poetical clichés, the reader is treated to a notoriously difficult passage on archaic tragedians and their newfound popularity:

\begin{quote}
...‘euge poeta!

\textit{est nunc Brisaei quem venosus liber Acci,}

\textit{sunt quos Pacuviusque et verrucosa moretur}

\textit{Antiopa aerumnis cor lucificabile fulta.’}

\textit{hos pueris monitus patres infundere lippos}

\textit{cum videas…}
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{361} Harvey 1981: 35 notes that the cryptic use of *scit* indicates that the description which follows sounds like a snippet of a longer conversation. This punctuation is also seen in Jenkins 1980: 16. No such punctuation is present in Braund’s Loeb.

\textsuperscript{362} See Harvey 1981: 35 on *rubricam*, and the use of *res grandes*.

\textsuperscript{363} On effeminacy and new poetry as perceived by Persius see Miller 2010: 236, Kenney 2012: 120.
\end{footnotes}
‘Bravo poet! Now here is one who pores over the veiny tome of Brisaein Accius, and some who linger over Pacuvius and warty Antiope, her melancholy heart besieged by troubles.’ When you see bleary-eyed fathers pouring such admonitions into their sons…

75-78

Tzounakas notes the difficulties in interpreting this passage. I agree with Tzounakas’ overall reading of the passage with regards to Persius’ poetic agenda — the satirist seeks to distance himself from both effeminate neoteric stylistics and tragic archaic revivalism. However, I disagree with regards to the dialogic minutiae – minutiae which are meaningful for reading the passage in its sermonic context. Tzounakas adopts Clausen’s punctuation and prints a question mark after fulta. This stems from reading the passage as an interlocutor who ‘wonders if, in their day, there is anyone who may be drawn by the harsh style of archaic tragedy’. This interpretation has a few problems. Clausen attributes the speech to the patres — which would mean it is the pueri, rather than Persius, who are the primary addressees of this speech-turn. It seems unlikely that the fathers would be asking their sons — the interactions which lead to a sartago loquendi are explicitly ‘poured in admonitions’, rather than Socratic-ironic questioning. A further problem is that Tzounakas reads the speech-turn as critical of the tragic-archaic style due to the presence of uenosus, uerrucosa, and Brisaei. Harvey’s objection is strong — Persius often, as we have seen, writes his interlocutors as self-ridiculing figures. I argue for a reading which attributes these lines to the patres, without a question mark, functioning as ludicrous straw men.

364 Tzounakas 2008.
365 Tzounakas 2008: 93 — the question-mark is also featured by Braun and Jenkinson.
366 Ibid
This leaves only the pithy *euge poeta* to be assigned. Harvey and Kißel read this as an ironic quip from Persius — Jenkinson includes it in the father’s speech-turn.\(^{369}\) I agree with the latter. Tzounakas’s article, though never discussing the quotation in question, makes several intra-textual connections which support this attribution. Tzounakas demonstrates the connections between archaic-Roman tragedy, Greek *topos* and language, and Bacchic inebriation.\(^{370}\) One such connection is that between Accius and Attius’ *Iliad* — a text described as *ebria ueratro*.\(^{371}\) I believe this connection can be strengthened further:

\[
\text{sed recti finemque extremumque esse recuso}
\]

\[
\text{‘euge’ tuum et ‘belle’. nam ‘belle’ hoc excute totum:}
\]

\[
\text{quid non intus habet? non hic est Ilias Atti...}
\]

1.49-51

The Greek exclamation in used in praise of an inebriated Greek (and Latin) work. *euge* and *belle*, *Ilias* and Atti— surely these are examples of Persius’ abhorred *sartago loquendi*. Furthermore, consider the drunken use of *euge* in Persius 5:

\[
\text{....dum Chrysidis udas}
\]

\[
\text{ebrius ante fores extincta cum face canto ?}
\]

\[
\text{‘euge puer, sapias...}
\]

5.165-167

---

\(^{369}\) Kißel 1990: 207-209 argue that there is no rhetorical speech, and that *euge...fulta* belongs entirely to Persius, primarily due to issues which are dismantled in Tzounakas 2008. Kißel finds difficulty in seeing a predictive rather than reactive *euge*, but we see predictive force in 1.49. We don’t require the object of praise directly before, as the snippet of speech is delivered *in media res* — see the use of *scit* at line 65.

\(^{370}\) Perhaps the *patres* are also *lippi vappa*.

\(^{371}\) Lines 50-51; Tzounakas 2008: 99-100.
Given the evidence, it seems probable that *euge* is specifically used as an intoxicated exclamation in Persius’ poetry. It is used to prefigure praise for the Attius’ *Iliad*, ‘drunk with hellebore’, as a drunken exclamation in praise for the Greek-ish archaic tragedy of Pacuvius and Accius. Are the *patres* intoxicated? The use of *lippus* is telling. A nexus of inebriation, moral/intellectual failures, and ‘bleary eyes’ is found in Persius’ poetry and beyond – perhaps distilled from Stoic philosophy.\(^{372}\) The function of *euge* in the poems, and the use of *lippus*, thus induce me to include *euge* *poeta* in the *patres*’ speech-turn.

An interlocutor gives Persius the usual anti-satire warning at line 107 to *littera* at line 110.\(^{373}\) Persius’ fierce retort at line 111 recycles the language used by his interlocutor(s) thus far in praise of poor poetry. *nil moror. euge omnes, omnes bene, mirae eritis res* — heavy use of conversational phenomena conveys spontaneity and aggression (*petulanti splene*).\(^{374}\) Persius responds to the threat of physical exclusion by manifesting it in parodic analogy:

\[
\begin{align*}
\textit{hoc iuvat? ‘hic,’ inquis, ‘veto quisquam faxit oletum,} \\
\textit{pinge duos anguis : pueri, sacer est locus, extra} \\
\textit{meiite.’ discedo?}
\end{align*}
\]

112-114

Apostrophes enclosing *hic*…*meiite* in lines 112-114 (excepting *inquis*) are straightforward – Braund and Kißel’s omission around *pinge duos anguis* confuses the sense of imperative authority vested in the interlocutor and Persius’ faux-innocent *discedo*.\(^{375}\) Harvey writes that

\(^{372}\) At 2.72, *lippus* is used in description of a gastronome known for moral debauchery (Harvey 1981: 75). At 5.77 it is combined with the ablative *vappa* for the devious Dama. Martial 4.78 also connects *lippus* with both inebriation and a lack of wisdom. Horace famously self-describes as *lippus* in *Sat* 1.5 (see Gowers 1993) and is often accused of being *ebrius* (2.3, 2.7).


\(^{374}\) Parataxis, exclamations, repetition. *Euge, bene*, and use of *res* for people (seen also in Horace *Sat* 1.9.4)

\(^{375}\) Note also turn-initial positions at the second foot.
‘somewhat disconcertingly, P. himself appears in the analogy, heeding the warning given to
boys to urinate elsewhere’. Yet this self-insertion should not strike one as particularly
unsettling given the similar use of inquis at line 55. This verb is used again here to introduce a
scenario where Persius’ interlocutor has taken (temporary) physical form — shifting from the
vague ex adverso dicere to a character in one of Persius’ sermonic sketches. Persius’ dialogic
involvement in line 56 (vis dicam?) is mirrored here (discedo?), as is the use of conversational
phenomena to enrich the parodic scenario. The simple syntax employed stands in stark
contrast to Persius’ usual complexity. The parataxis from pinge to meiite, the use of the
vocative pueri, and the clear annunciation (no elision) give a custodial, authoritative tone to
custos poetarum. This is further demonstrated through intertextuality with religious
formulae. Karakasis notes that the syntagm of ite procul appears chiefly as a parody of ritual
diction. The archaism faxit (and the possible archaism oletum) further emphasises ‘authority’
and contrast with the presumably juvenile pueri. Exclusion and isolation is again explored
through dialogic interactions. Persius reduces his interlocutor’s warning to an absurd poetic
prohibition from Rome itself. The poet exploits intertextuality and linguistic phenomena to
generate the parodic idiolect of those who would seek to bar him from satire.

Summary: Satire 1

Dialogue is a vital aspect of Persius’ first poem. Persius’ interrogation at the hands of the
shadowy second-person provides occasion and due cause for aggressive defence. This pre-
emptive strike against potential critics of Persius’ satiric endeavours is re-iterated and
invigorated in the instances where the interlocutor is given ‘corporeal’ form. These scenes –
marked by inquis — feature both satirist and interlocutor engaging in conversational
referentiality — at the expense of the interlocutor. This iterated function of inquis reveals a

376 Harvey 1981: 49.
378 For the pueri as satirists see Harvey 1981: 49; Keane 2002: 225
379 Karakasis 2011: 226. The use of discedo immediately after ‘erotic expulsion’ (Karakasis’ words) is perhaps
evocative of the common satiric trope of the excluded lover — a love/hate relationship with Rome, perhaps.
380 Harvey 1981: 49.
thread of logic underpinning the (seemingly) unruly deconstruction of satiric *sermo* itself. This deconstruction is completed at line 44.

The nuances of dialogic modalities are exploited for the poet’s programmatic apology. That Persius eschews a wider readership has been received completely into modern scholarship; that he figures himself as simultaneously *eschewed* seems to have merited little commentary. Miller’s 2010 article ‘Persius, Irony, and Truth’ highlights the thematic use of ‘truth’ throughout the satires as a tool with which to correct society – an idea no doubt inherited from Reckford’s 1962 reflections on the ‘surgical’ nature of Persius’ Stoicism.381 The dialogic interactions above demonstrate that Persius envisions his style of *sermo* as satiric wish fulfillment — granting the (pretended?) poetic (*in mores* etc) and philosophical (*verum*) desires of the people, and consequently alienating himself through doing so.

**Satire Two**

Persius’ second poem hardly diverges from the first in terms of elision and *Satzvers*. In terms of modality, however, they are strikingly different. Consider the opening line:

*hunc, Macrine, diem numera meliore lapillo…*

Generic whiplash is felt as Persius shifts from the unstable and antagonistic *sermo* of his first poem to the pseudo-epistolic structure initiated above. Opening a poem with a name-drop and a one-sided conversation is, of course, reminiscent of Horace’s *qui fit Maecenas* — an echo made stronger by the obvious allusions to Horace’s poetry in the lines which follow. This epistolic construction, too, will prove subject to the dialogic instability of Persius’ satires. As we shall see, not only is Macrinus’ position as the second-person recipient replaced with the

381 Miller 2010: 234; Reckford 1962: 482.
usual straw men, but the relevance of Macrinus and the implied epistle quickly vanish into obscurity.

The true nature of the poem is revealed with speech in line 8:

‘mens bona, fama, fides’ haec clare et ut audiat hospes;
illa sibi introrsum et sub lingua murmurat ‘o si
ebulliat patruus, praecarum funus’ et ‘o si
sub rastro crepet argenti mihi seria dextro
Hercule! pupillumve utinam, quem proximus heres
inpello, expungam; nam et est scabiosus et acri
bile tumet. Nerio iam tertia conditur uxor.’

‘A sound mind, a good reputation, credit.’ He asks for these things clearly so that a visitor may hear. Yet quietly to himself he mutters ‘O if only Uncle would croak – such a funeral! If only a jar of gold, by Hercules, would clink under my hoe! Or that I might get rid of my ward, whose inheritance I’m next in line for; for he’s mangy and swollen with sharp bile. Nerius has buried three wives already!’

8-16

Prayers delivered aperto and those which one sub lingua murmurat are juxtaposed in both medium and message. The paratactic list of abstract desires mens…fides, reminiscent of oaths and prayers, is initiated with a new line and ended at the primary caesura, coinciding with
natural metrical pauses within its pithy Satzvers delivery. This ‘clean’ delivery, indicated by metrical pauses, the lack of harsh elision, and the trisyllable-disyllable line-ending (audiat hospes), manifest the clarity implied in clare. The prayer which follows is rather different. Every line is enjambed, half of the lines include at least one monosyllable in the final two feet, the prayer is littered with exclamations (o, praeclarum funus, Hercule), repeated conjunctions (et...et...) and sensory imagery (ebulliat...crepet...scabiosus et acri bile tumet). Poetic stylistics and conversational phenomena are used for contrast and characterisation.

This poem is full of references to Horace’s poetry, and this passage is particularly mimetic of Persius’ predecessor. Harvey notes that the second prayer is modelled on Horace Satires 2.6.10-13, seen in the repetition of o si, the use of hercule, and the reference to the pot of gold. Yet the allusions run deeper still. Harvey notes that the use of clare mirrors that of Epistles 1.16.59 — but writes nothing more on the subject. The following extract from said epistle reveals that it is not merely the repetition of a single word, but indeed the reconstruction of an entire scene:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vir bonus, omne forum quem spectat et omne tribunal} \\
\text{quandocumque deos vel porco vel bove placat,} \\
\text{‘Line pater!’ clare, clare cum dixit, ‘Apollo!’} \\
\text{labra movet metuens audiri: ‘pulchra Laverna,} \\
\text{da mihi fallere, da iusto sanctoque videri,} \\
\text{noctem peccatis et fraudibus obice nubem.’}
\end{align*}
\]

---

383 For conjunctions see Reinhardt 2010: 222. For sensory imagery see Chahoud 2010: 48, Keane 2012: 91. Harvey 1981: 60 writes the following on praeclarum funus: “Satzapposition”: the phrase stands in apposition to the preceding sentence.’ However, given the heavy use of exclamations elsewhere in this passage, it seems more likely to me that this is an accusative of exclamation of the divitias miseris! (Hor. 2.8.18) variety. The extended use of O supports this — see Allen and Greenough 1903: 397a.
384 Harvey 1981: 60.
The good man, whom every forum and every tribunal looks upon, whenever he placates the gods with a pig or an ox, ‘O father Janus’ clearly, clearly after he has spoken ‘Apollo!’ moves his lips afraid to be heard ‘O fair Laverna, grant me the power to deceive, grant that I seem just and pious, cover my sins and frauds with the cloud of night.’

Hor. Ep. 1.16.57-62

The similarities are evident. Note the use of metre. Both extracts confine the prayer delivered *clare* to a single line and enjamb the prayer delivered *murmure*. The differences in style align with the general stylistics of the two poets — Persius’ adaptation is far more rigorous in its marriage of form and content. This re-presentation of adapted Horatian content is continued beyond the prayers themselves — compare the sarcastic advice given by Persius in lines 15-16 (below) with extracts from Horace’s poetry:

*hanc sancte ut poscas, Tiberino in gurgite mergis*

*mane caput bis terque et noctem flumine purgas.*

Pers. 2.15-16

*...ter uncti*

*transnanto Tiberim, somno quibus est opus alto.*

Hor. Sat. 2.1.7-8

‘frigida si puerum quartana reliquerit, illo

*mane die, quo tu indicis ieiunia, nudus*

*in Tiberi stabit.*’
Hor. Sat. 2.3.290-293

The ludicrous practices referenced by Horace (through Trebatius and an anxia mater) are revised by Persius to produce scathing sarcasm. Intertextuality binds Persius to the generic tradition of critiquing both superstition and inappropriate prayer. Horace and Persius utilise direct speech to execute this critique, producing mimetic parodies of the practices in question. Persius’ mimesis of sermo implies a continued interest and connection to the outside world – his attempted isolation is, naturally, not complete. However, his representations of ‘real life’ speech (the extract above and 1.112-114) is heavily mediated through the poetry of others – poetry one might enjoy in solitude.

The mediation of speech via Horace is continued after a short interrogative interlude in lines 17-22, where we see aggregation of conversational phenomena as Persius completes his transformation from pen-pal to inquisitor:385

heus age, responde (minimum est quod scire laboro)
de Iove quid sentis ? estne ut praeponere cures
hunc – ‘cuinam ?’ cuinam ? vis Staio? an scilicet haeres ?
quis potior iudex puerisve quis aptior orbis ?
hoc igitur quo tu Iovis aurem inpellere temptas
dic agedum Staio. ‘pro Iuppiter, o bone,’ clamet,
‘Iuppiter!’ at sese non clamet Iuppiter ipse?

385 I disagree with Harvey 1981: 62 that the second cuinam is spoken by Persius. Although repetition of individual words for emphasis is common throughout Persius, interrogative repetition seems to function differently — see the use of nemo nemo in the first poem. See also Kißel 1990: 310-311.
Come now, tell me (it’s a small thing I wish to know) what are your thoughts on god? Is it that you prefer to rank him above ‘whom?’ whom? Perhaps Staius? You hesitate, of course. Who is a better judge, a more apt guardian? This thing you want to pull the ear of god with – go on and tell to Staius! ‘By god, o my’ he might cry, ‘god!’ and wouldn’t god cry out ‘god!’ himself?

2.17-24

Juxtaposition and instability are present — Persius moves in and out of registers as swiftly as he opens and closes dialogic structures. The forceful imperatives introduced with heus give way for minimising negative politeness in the second half of the line, effecting strong dialogic juxtaposition. The pendulum swings back as the enjambed chain of progressively elliptical and forceful questions is followed by the artistry of line 20; the precise phrasal repetition generates a sardonic quasi-legal rhetoric. The vigorous use of conflicting stylistics is emblematic of Persius — yet immediately afterwards we are transported (again) back to the poetry of Horace. Compare lines 23-24 with:

... ‘maxime’ quis non

‘Iuppiter!’ exclamat, simul atque audivit?

Hor. Sat. 1.2.17-19

The mimetic dialogue of Horace’s satire is invoked once more. The Horatian ‘horror’ upon hearing about the prodigal spending of a certain official is reconstituted as Staius’ response to

---


387 See Reckford 2009: 59.
the prayer intended for Jupiter. Repetition and fragmented phrasing function identically in both extracts — abrasive and repetitive exclamations for emotional effect.

Persius reiterates Horace’s language of prayer, taking aim at the same forms of divine supplication. The two poets mock those which ask for material wealth, or those which are counteracted by the devotee themselves. Indeed, the only prayer in Persius’ second poem which is decidedly *not* Horatian is that of the *avia aut metuens divum matertera*. After describing (rather graphically) the anointment of a child by his god-fearing relative, Persius notes her prayer as:

‘*hunc optet generum rex et regina, puellae*

*hunc rapiant; quidquid calcaverit hic, rosa fiat.*’

2.37-38

Note how the stylistics diverge from the ‘agitated’ prayer at lines 9-16. While both extracts share aspects of prayer-language: exact repetition (*hunc…hunc*), the use of the subjunctive – the extract above is delivered with no elision. Of particular interest is the absence of Horatian allusion and the content of the prayer itself. Harvey writes the following regarding the prayer and Persius’ reaction:

‘The brutal conclusion stems from the idea that people, with the best of intentions, pray that what is undesirable be granted by the gods to their loved ones…It is at this single point in the poem that there appears, and then only by implication, the famous theme of the vanity of Human Wishes, the belief that prayers when granted bring unforeseen grief.’


388 Pers. 2.31.
This is an attractive argument which places Persius 2 as a bridge between Horace 1.1 (people are never satisfied with having their wishes fulfilled) and Juvenal 10 (people are often harmed by having their wishes fulfilled). Furthermore, Harvey’s observation but a few pages prior invites an additional reading which captures more fully both the wider poetic context and the variations in dialogic stylistics:

‘In 17-30, P. censures the irreverent view that the gods may be mocked or bribed. Now he deals with the other extreme, the degeneration of excessive religious awe into superstition…’


‘Excessive superition’ is expressed predominantly in the graphic description of apotropaic rituals, but also in the language of the prayer itself. Her request is couched in terms suggesting a particularly whimsical naivete. Rex et regina is evocative of ‘fairy tales’, as is quidquid calcaverit hic, rosa fiat. The use of rapiant has provoked considerable discussion amongst scholars. Both Harvey and Tzounakas cite Conington and Haupt in interpreting the verb literally, though Harvey glosses their reading as ‘carry off’ whereas Tzounakas writes that it ‘points to rape’. The layered meaning of the term (less ‘ambiguous’ as Harvey writes) is generated by the double framework through which we read it — as a prayer from the old woman, and as an episode presented by Persius. The tension between intention and effect is already expressed prior to the quotation itself — Tzounakas notes that the description of her rituals both captures genuine superstitious beliefs (intention) and ridicules them through a

389 Harvey 1981: 66 on rex et regina, 67 on rosa fiat. To reinforce Harvey’s observation, see also the description of Venus at Apul. Met. 4.31: plantisque roseis vibrantium fluctum summo rode calcato.
390 Harvey 1981: 66; Tzounakas 2016: 44.
series of double-entendres (effect). Persius mocks this form of prayer not for its moral alignment, but for its methodology and possibly disastrous consequences.

The satirist intercedes before the wish becomes reality – framing his response as a quasi-judicial rhetorical intervention:

\[ \text{ast ego nutrici non mando vota. negato,} \]
\[ \text{Juppiter, haec illi, quamvis te albata rogarit} \]
\[ 39-40 \]

The archaic-legal \textit{ast} and the judicial future imperative \textit{negato} colour Persius’ response: irrational supplication is met with official instruction. Attention to stylistics demonstrates that the depiction of one interlocutor, manifest in their speech itself, exists not only to reflect aspects of the interlocutor’s character but also to inform the satirist’s response. Persius’ interweaving of varied speech-patterns informs our reading of speaker and satirist, speech and narration.

The parodies of prayer and the allusions to Horace continue in the penultimate exempla:

\[ \text{rem struere exoptas caeso bove Mercuriumque} \]
\[ \text{accersis fibra: ‘da fortunare Penatis,} \]
\[ \text{da pecus et gregibus fetum.’ quo, pessime, pacto} \]
\[ \text{tot tibi cum in flamma iunicum omenta liquescant?} \]
\[ \text{Et tamen hic extis et opimo vincere ferto} \]
\[ \text{intendit : ‘iam crescit ager, iam crescit ovile} \]

\[ 393 \text{ Tzounakas 2016: 43-44.} \]
You hope to pile up property by slaying an ox and invoking Mercury with its innards: ‘Grant fortune to my Penates, grant that my flocks prosper and young to my flocks.’ How so, scoundrel, when so much fat of your flocks is melting in flames? And still he tries to get his way with entrails and fat offering-cakes: ‘now my land increases, now my sheep multiply, now it’s happening, now now’ until deluded and despairing a single coin sighs at the bottom of his coffer.

44-51

Turn-initial repetition is the most prominent aspect of these prayers, and its iterations here are perhaps the most emphatic in the poem. The stylistics of prayer in Persius show remarkable unity in this aspect. As per the earlier examples, the spectre of Horace pervades these lines, reinforcing the intertextuality already discussed. However, this particular evocation of Horace has complex satiric implications. In the Horatian original, Horace mocks those who would prayer for material wealth (\textit{o si... etc}), and contrasts these vain wishes with his own:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Maia nate... (5)}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{...si quod adest gratum iuvat, hac prece te oro:}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{pingue pecus domino facias et cetera praeter}
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{See Kenney 2014 on line 894 in Lucretius Book 3 for \textit{iam iam} — communicating the imminence of a situation and the heightened state of emotion therewith.}
\footnote{The allusions are noted in Harvey 1981: 67-69; \textit{struere} (Hor. Sat. 1.1.35), \textit{da...da} (Hor. Ep. 1.16.61), \textit{da pecus} etc. (Hor. Sat. 2.6.14), \textit{quo pessime pacto} (Hor. Sat. 2.7.22), and potentially \textit{fundo...in imo} (Hor. Carm. 3.11.26-7).}
\end{footnotes}
An invocation of Mercury and mention of *pecus* (and other agricultural references) are common to both excerpts. A somewhat reductive (yet temporarily useful) summary of the tension is that this prayer is *presented* as ‘good’ by Horace and ‘bad’ by Persius. The intertextuality between the two poets as seen in the earlier *exempla* show a basic alignment of agenda — those who pray for material wealth, or who slip into ridiculous superstition, are mocked. According to this extract, even Horace is not spared Persius’ castigation. This is implicit not only in this small reference, but in Persius’ subsequent dialogic response.

Two aspects of the excerpt from Persius support a reading in which Horace is targeted. *Quo pessime pacto* is a slight reversal of Horace’s original word-order and a complete reversal of its original target. In satire 2.7, Horace uses the phrase in response to Davus’ revelation that his moralising diatribe is a critique of Horace himself. Davus’ main criticism is that Horace’s behaviour does not align with Horace’s professed philosophy — much of which is distilled in 2.6. This Horatian hypocrisy is (re)presented by Persius in lines 46-47. Furthermore, Davus’ quasi-Stoic posturing is mirrored by Persius’ overt adaptation of Cato’s (stoic *par excellence*) line *omentum in flamma pingue liquefaciens*. Davus’ Stoic-inspired assault on Horace is distilled and re-presented by Persius. Intra-textuality in Horace’s satires becomes intertextuality in Persius’ — Horace is presented via synecdoche, and lampooned.

The final piece of dialogue concerns the establishment of divine statues:

```
perducis facies. ‘nam fratres inter aenos,
somnia pituita qui purgatissima mittunt,
```

---

394 Horace Sat. 2.7.21-22 ‘non dices hodie, quorum haec tam putida tendant | furcifer ?’ ‘ad te, inquam’ *quo pacto, pessime* ‘laudas...’
395 Cat. 90.6 – see Harvey 1981: 68.
The double use of *Satzvers* combined with the heavy use of spondees gives a particularly solemn air to the instructions.\(^{396}\) I side with Braund (and against Jenkinson) in the inclusion of *nam* in the speech-turn.\(^{397}\) Jenkinson’s reading would initiate the speech-turn on the fourth-foot — a phenomenon not seen elsewhere in Persius’ satires and seen only once in Horace due to the use of Greek accentuation.\(^{398}\) The use of natural pauses (main caesurae, line ends) to begin and end ‘un-sermonic’ speech further evinces Persius’ attention to dialogic detail.

**Summary: Satire 2**

As Tzounakas notes, ‘an accumulation of contrasts serves to bind the satire into a cohesive whole…’.\(^{399}\) Where Tzounakas focused on the philosophical juxtaposition between the objects of the prayers themselves, this analysis has demonstrated the use of contrasting stylistics and ‘registers’ of prayer which serve to further emphasise the comparisons drawn. Persius represents prayer predominantly through the imitation of its iterative aspects — repetition is seen in every instance of prayer in the poem; both turn-initial (*osi…da…hunc…iam…*), and in the use of asyndeton of disyllabic words (*mens bona, fama, fides*). The interplay of metrical pauses, enjambment, and end-stopping is also used for poetic effect — contrasting measured supplication with agitated desire. This is also seen in the religious exclamations — presented in fragmented interjections to intensify their disruptive quality.

Horace is exploited in this poem, both as a lens through which Persius scrutinises his subject and as an implicit target. This is affected predominantly through mimicry. Persius

\(^{396}\) The only dactyls (aside from the regular 5th foot) being *inter aenos and somnia*.


\(^{398}\) See my discussion on Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.7.

\(^{399}\) Tzounakas 2006: 54.
models the requests of several of his interlocutors on those featured in Horace’s poetry, strengthening the generic link established overtly in the first poem. This allegiance by analogy, however, is inverted at lines 44-51, where mimetic dialogic interactions are used to position Persius as a stoic interrogator (a less problematic Davus?) and Horace (or at least, someone recycling his language) as a fool. Persius acknowledges and pays homage to his predecessor before striking out and away. Persius’ poetic tension between imitation and aggression is manifest.

**Satire 3**

Note: I refer to the narrator as N., the ‘lazy student/Persius’ as ‘P.’, and the comes/lecturer/Stoic as S.

This poem retains almost exactly the *Satzvers* rate from the previous poem, but presents a marked aversion to elision. In light of the relationship between Stoic philosophy and ‘rugged’ stylistics in Horace, this development can be interpreted in a number of different ways. Persius’ poetry is predominantly Stoic in its philosophical content. Compared to Horace’s representations of Epicurean and Stoic monologue, Persius shows a paucity of extended stylistic variation. Elision may not be needed to characterise particularly Stoic speakers, as it is all roughly Stoic anyway. However, one notes that according to the schema argued for below, the lines attributed to ‘P.’ show an elision rate of 50% – slightly higher than the total average across his works, and significantly higher than the average for the Stoic lecturer (~26%). Indeed, the elision rate of S. is low not only in comparison to the average rate, but especially in comparison to Damasippus, his Horatian counterpart, who is the main speaker in the poem on which this satire is modelled. These comparisons, while interesting, can only be examined in full after an analysis of the content of the poem itself.

400 Pers. 1.116-118.
401 Cowherd 1994: III.
402 Indeed, the satiric narrator (Persius) often has a higher elision rate than most other speakers.
403 Harvey 1981: 77. The number of harsh elisions — those where an elided vowel is preceded by another vowel, or which occur on the principal caesura — is also particularly low. The only examples are *sed stupet hic*
Persius’ third satire is notorious for its difficulties in speaker attribution—particularly in the opening lines. I will argue for a reading of the poem which is informed by dialogic analysis—attempting not to provide the interpretation of Persius 3, but rather an interpretation. However, the result is not only an additional reading (IAM SATIS EST?)—the process of analysis itself reveals inherent features of the poem which have not received due commentary. Insight into these features contributes to a more thorough understanding of the poem and its relationship to the corpora of both Persius and Latin Satire.

The question of speakers in Persius’ third poem has attracted sustained and spirited debate. Housman’s 1913 article ‘Notes on Persius’ was the first article to treat the problem of speaker-attribution in Persius with philological vigour, and the readings therein have proved influential up to recent decades. In particular, his ‘psychological reading’ of the third poem garnered considerable attention across the 20th century and remains the metaphorical ‘elephant in the room’ for those seeking to analyse speech and speaker in Persius. Housman’s reading has subsequently been accepted, to various degrees, by Braund, Harvey, Kißel, and Jenkinson. I follow this tradition, albeit with some suggested modifications. This wealth of commentary, both in favour and rejection of a Housman-esque reading, therefore demands that I take into account and respond to a wider variety of interpretations than in my analyses of previous poems. I stress again that the reading I argue for is not mutually exclusive to the alternatives—simply one which emphasises the dialogic aspects.

The opening lines are perhaps the most controversial. I print them below with my punctuation:

\[
\text{nempe haec adsidue. iam clarum mane fenestras} \\
\text{intrat et angustas extendit lumine rimas.} \\
\text{stertimus, indomitum quod despumare Falernum}
\]

\[vito et fibris increvit opimum. This is surprising given Harvey’s observation in his introduction (p. 4) ‘...he [Persius] would have equated harsh Latin with a striving after moral or philosophical truth.’\]

\[404\] See the reception of this article in Smith 1969: 305, Reckford 2009: 78.
It’s always the same. Already the bright morning enters through the windows, extending the narrow shadows with light. We’re snoring enough to take the edge off the strong Falernian, while the shadow reaches the fifth line. ‘Well now, what are you doing? The mad dog star has already roasted the crops and the herd’s beneath the spreading elm.’ says a friend. ‘Truly? Really? Quickly, someone come here. Nobody?’ The green bile surges. I split, and you’d believe the Arcadian asses were braying. Now my book and the two-tone parchment smoothed of hairs
comes to hand, some paper and a knobbly pen. Then we whine that thick
liquid clings to the pen, but added water makes the black ink vanish, we
whine that the pen keeps doubling the diluted drops. ‘O wretched and
more wretched by the day, have we come to this? Bah, why not ask,
like a tender chick or a princeling, that your food be made into pap and
angrily refuse to let mummy sing you a lullaby. “How can I study with
such a pen?” What complaints! Why continue “But how can I study
with such a pen?” Why deceive yourself? What’s with these evasions!
You’re fooling around, mindlessly flowing away…

1-20

My punctuation aligns generally with that of modern commentators, with a few digressions. First, Braund implies no distinction between narration and ‘speech’ on the part of Persius – her edition features no apostrophe after nemon.⁴⁰⁵ I (alongside Jenkinson, Rudd, Plaza, and presumably Harvey) maintain and emphasise the distinction. An investigation into the absence of a single set of missing apostrophes leads to a deeper discussion of the narratological framework of the poem. The following paragraphs function both to justify the punctuation above, and to position this analysis in its post-Housman context.

The presence of unus ait comitum strongly suggests the presence of authorial mediation in the opening lines. The extent of this narration strikes one as intuitive — Rudd and Hooley are the only recent editors I am aware of who suggest that nempe haec adsidue is a speech belonging to the comes.⁴⁰⁶ Rudd’s argument — that attributing these words to the narrator ‘seems

⁴⁰⁵ Braund 2004: 75.
⁴⁰⁶ Rudd 1970: 287 writes ‘admittedly we should expect unus ait comitum to come immediately after the companion’s first words. Still, a writer like Persius might have postponed the explanatory comment.’ The argument that Persius would be liable to do so is effectively disarmed in Harvey 1981: 79 citing Pers. 4.1-2, 5.161-3 as exempla of Persius’ clarity regarding cryptic remarks. To these I would like to add 1.79, 2.8, 22 as instances where Persius uses a verb of speaking to immediately attribute a remark.
considerably weaker’ and dampens the connection to Horace Sat. 2.3 — ignores the crucial difference between the two poems — the function of the narrator in the introduction.407

Despite the rapid disappearance of the narrator in Persius 3 (and, as I will argue, the voice of ‘Persius’ the interlocutor), his initial presence plays a key role in the meta-poetics of the poem. The narration draws our attention to two crucial aspects of the poetic framing: the distance between the events/speakers and the reporter, and the relative ‘fictitiousness’ of the characters themselves. Distance is manifest through juxtaposed registers and the creation of meta-poetic irony. The narration is delivered in a predominantly bucolic register, whereas the speech (from both S. and P.) is characterised by heavy use of mimetic conversational features, including exclamations, parataxis, onomatopoeic language, and possibly sub-standard grammar.408 Juxtaposition of stylistics emphasises the narrator’s idle detachment from an otherwise high-energy confrontation. This detachment — what Plaza refers to as the ‘‘objective’ narrative mode’ — allows for the generation of implicit irony in lines 10-14.409 The description of P.’s struggle to write is, of course, tongue-in-cheek, considering that we hold the finished product.410 Plaza also notes that the poem emphasises the fictitiousness of the interlocutors through the presence of the narrator.411 While I agree that the interlocutors are presented as subordinate to the narrator, Plaza’s simultaneous acceptance of the ‘split-self’ reading problematises the use of the word ‘fictitious’.412 It is not that the event ‘isn’t real’ (what really happens in satire?), but rather that, from the perspective of the narrator, it is ‘completed’. The events, though described in the vivid present, have already happened — hence the detachment and our ability to read it. However, nempe haec adsiduae perhaps indicates that Persius’ self-interrogation is a routine phenomenon.

408 clarum mane — Virg. Georg. 3.325, arcadiae pecuaria — Varro R.R. 2.1.14, Virg. Georg. 3.64; see also marked use of bucolic caesurae in lines 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 11-14. Exclamations in en, o, a — weaker in verumne? Parataxis from verum…nemon? Onomatopoeic lallare. Possibly sub-standard grammar from in...dies ultra miser (see Harvey 1981: 82).
410 Functioning also to describe the process of splitting into different voices; Gowers 1994: 194-196.
412 See Plaza 2006: 223 for general agreement with Housman. Fictive relative to what? The narrator?
To return to Rudd’s point, *nempe haec adsidue* is apt for the narrator’s speech considering their fundamental function— to provide a perspective detached from the time and space described. A further piece of evidence which supports my (and others’) attribution stems from the use of first-person plural verbs by the narrator. Writing almost a century prior to this thesis, Tate noted that *stertimus* cannot be spoken by the subject it refers to, as one cannot snore and speak simultaneously.\(^4\) A straight-faced comment which has some curious implications. ‘We are snoring’ says N. — which we? The use of the ‘royal we’ can easily be dismissed due to the presence of *findor*. A reading which applies it to N. and P. seems strange — the narrator is, after all, talking to us now, and why the singular a mere few lines later? A reading in which the plural encompasses *all three speakers*, where the narrator identifying with both S and P, offers several advantages. It strengthens both the implied development of the narrator from both interlocutors and the implied connection between the two speakers, as well as aligning pleasantly with the other uses of the plural. I elaborate below.

Persius’ interplay of context and lexica often produces additional readings which are not mutually exclusive.\(^4\) *Querimus* functions primarily to communicate the complaints of the harangued. Yet it also echoes the grievances voiced by S. — both parties are undoubtedly querulous. This connection between S. and *querimus* is strengthened by the description of the ‘splitting-self’.

Scholars who accept (to a certain degree) Housman’s reading note that *findor* expresses the ‘split’ of the satirist into the two interlocutors, P. and S.\(^4\) The use of the singular is telling — it is the whole which is being divided — and the verb’s contextual nuances play into the emergence of Stoic *sermo*. *Turgescit vitrea bilis* introduces the idea of bifurcation; anger swells, and the self splits.\(^4\) But, as Plaza points out, the satiric precedent for *findor* communicates not only division but emergence.\(^4\) What ‘emerges’ from the split-self is anger. This is present in both speakers — P.’s *vitrea bila*, S.’s immediate upbraiding and use of *insana*, continued

\(^4\) Tate 1929: 57.
\(^4\) Jenkinson 1990: 667.
\(^4\) Harvey 1981: 80.
\(^4\) Plaza 2006: 228 citing Horace. *Sat. 1.8.47 diffissa nate* for the emergence of a loud sound.
throughout with repeated insults.\footnote{On insana see Plaza 2006: 224. Insults = miser.} The emergence of (angry) Stoic education from Persius’ mitosis fulfils one of the more graphic scenes in his earlier poems — a fig-tree of learning bursting forth from the liver.\footnote{Pers. 1.24-25} This anthropomorphistic bile is further described as the ‘braying of Arcadian asses’ — donkeys/mules being common satiric metaphors. The sound described in line 9 emanates from the action described by findor — the Stoic-Satirist (who, according to almost all interpretations suggested, is the main speaker of the poem) emerges with a roar. The sounds attributed either literally or figuratively to the interlocutors are disruptive (stertimus, rudere, querimur, querimur) and for the most part, bestial (save stertimus).\footnote{See Lewis and Short on rudo, queror II.} A reading in which we see the first-person plural verbs applied to both the S. and P. accords with the description of the ruptured self in lines 8-9, the emergence of an angry Stoic, and the speech-acts of the interlocutors themselves.

This use of first-person plurals by N. brings me to the use of venimus by an interlocutor. Jenkinson (later supported by Harvey) states that Housman is wrong in reading this plural in a similar vein to stertimus...querimur, arguing that venimus fails to cohere with the transition to the second-person singular immediately after.\footnote{The debate is presented in concise form in Harvey 1981: 78} I agree — where the previous plurals belong to the narrator (encompassing all speakers), this reads as the speech of S. However, there is one aspect of the speech which has been taken for granted, perhaps due to its simplicity: tense. venimus is perfect — S. uses the plural is used to indicate what they (S. and P.) have done together, and the singular is used to reprehend P. right now.\footnote{Reading a perfect rather than present answers the problem of inclusion noted by Harvey 1981: 79.} Regarding the attribution of O...venimus, Rudd is the only commentator who attributes this to P. rather than S. The justification offered is that ‘it is equally natural for Pf [P.] to say venimus’ and that ‘when the comes reprimands Pf he uses the second person singular.’\footnote{Rudd 1970: 287.} The first argument is hardly a substantial challenge to my own interpretation, and the second is not entirely in keeping with.
the text. The first-person plural *temptemus* is used to include P. near the end of the poem (regardless of whether one attributes it to S. or to P.)

The final point of contention regarding the lines above is the presence of *an…calamo*. It is either the response of P. or the anticipation thereof by S., rendering it rhetorical/hypothetical. I argue for the latter for the following reasons. S. is an auditory reactionary; he objects strongly to the aural indications of immorality — the snoring, the complaining — and much of his diatribe revolves around speech and sound. This is demonstrated most clearly in his representations of *querimur*. S. distorts P.’s complaints through mimetic transformation — the language of the study becomes the language of the nursery. It is this mimetic context of representation that leads me to attribute the half-line to S. P. grumbles about his pens (*querimur*), S. asks how they (pl.) have come to such a point, likens P.’s complaints to a child, then accosts him for trying to delude (himself). The use of *da verba* — and indeed other meta-commentary on speech — to mark imitated/hypothetical speech will be seen again in the fourth poem. Thus concludes my defence of the punctuation above.

I read the rest of the poem as the *comes’* monologue/diatribe. This is a somewhat more extreme reading than that of Braund and Harvey and diverges heavily from that of Jenkinson. The first point of controversy are lines 44-57:

\[
\text{saepe oculos, memini, tangebam parvus olivo,} \\
\text{grandia si nollem morituri verba Catonis} \\
\text{discere non sano multum laudanda magistro,}
\]

---

424 Line 113.
426 The onomatopoeia in lines 17-18, the ring of the jar at 22, the snoring (again) at 58, the cackling of *torosa iuventus* at 86-87 – not to mention the use of hypothetical speech throughout for invective (78-85, 88-89, 94-97).
427 Kenney 2012: 117 on *pappo, mamma, lallo*. Plaza 2016: 239 on the alliteration of *m* and *l* for ‘motherese’. One might wonder if the plaintive sound (*queror*) associated with animals might also be that of crying children?
428 *cui uerba* likely being an ellipsis of *cui das uerba* — Harvey 1981: 83.
quae pater adductis sudans audiret amicis.

iure; etenim id sumum, quid dexter senio ferret,

scire erat in voto, damnosa canicula quantum
raderet, angustae collo non fallier orcae,

neu quis callidior buxum torquere flagello.

haut tibi inexpertum curvos deprendere mores
quaeque docet sapiens bracatis inlita Medis

porticus, insomnis quibus et detonsa iuventus
invigilat siliquis et grandi pasta polenta.

et tibi quae Samios diduxit littera ramos

surgentem dextro monstravit limite callem

Often, I remember, I would rub my eyes with ointment when I was little if I didn’t want to learn the grand speech of dying Cato, which was praised excessively by my insane teacher, and which my father used to listen to sweating with the friends he brought along. Rightly so: that which I wanted most of all was to know what a lucky six would win and how much the losing dog would rake back, how not to be tricked by the narrow jar’s neck, and for no one to spin the boxwood better than me. But you’re hardly inexperienced in catching deviant morals or whatever the wise portico decorated with trousered Medes teaches, things which the tonsured and sleepless youth stay awake over, fed with large portions of porridge. And you have been shown the rising hill on the right path by the letter which divides its Samian branches…

44-57
I agree with Harvey and Braund that this passage belongs entirely to S. Jenkinson gives 44-47 and 52-56 to P. Regarding lines 44-47, arguments regarding the passage’s concordance with the *Vita* are of less significance than those which deal with the poem’s internal congruity. Jenkinson argues that 44-47, 52-55 belong to P. as they ‘contain material that is most naturally interpreted as hostile to the Stoa’. However, Harvey’s objection stands — Persius often has his interlocutors ‘accidentally’ commit self-effacement. Indeed, I agree with Plaza, who reads this entire passage as ‘self-irony’ at the mild expense of the *comes*.

There is little in the construction of the turns themselves that might determine attribution. The turn-initial phrases in question are *saepe oculos, memini..., iure; etenim id summum..., haut tibi inexpertum..., and et tibi quae Samios...* *iure* and *haut tibi* could function either as turn-initial markers or, as seems more likely, conversational elements of the diatribe. Moreover, the use of *et tibi* in particular seems to indicate a continuation of thought (thus linking *haut tibi* and *et tibi* to the same speaker) rather than a riposte. Finally, the metrical repetition of *tibi* after the first syllable of the line at several other instances throughout further indicates that both these paragraphs belong to S.

Thus, I propose that the repetition of *tibi* at lines 52 and 56 is emphatic from the Stoic. Without further elaboration from P., *iure...flagella* is most naturally understood (as noted above) as self-irony from the Stoic, rather than a one-off obscure interruption from P.

Harvey attributes lines 63-106 to P. Harvey is alone in this reading, and it is difficult to ascertain why he subscribes to it. *elleborum frustra* is hardly a powerful dialogic turn (unlike

---

429 See Witke 1984: 802 on issues squaring the *Vita Persii* with the poetry.
431 Harvey 1981: 92; consider the *patres* of 1.75-78.
432 Plaza 2016: 234. Harvey 1981: 92 writes that ‘P. often inserts humour or grotesque touches where they are least expected’ and thus maintains his position elucidated at page 433 Lines 44, 48, 52, and 56 respectively.
434 Compare with the repeated use of vocatives (*miser...miseri*) and imperatives (*discite...disce*).
435 *Et* at the beginning of a sentence/clause in speech is almost always immediate continuation of the previous speaker – see Hor. *Sat.* 1.9.5, 40; Juv. 6.146. Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.188 continues a speaker which began in the same line after an interruption, an impossibility here. *Et tibi* begins a continuation of thought from *haut tibi* – you are familiar with Stoic teachings and moral nit-picking, and you have been shown the forking paths.
436 25 *est tibi*, 111 *cor tibi*.
437 Harvey 1981: 95 provides no real argumentation for this attribution. It is possible that he finds support for this interpretation in the presence of Stoic philosophy: ‘...an acquaintance with Stoicism (52-5) tally with the account of P. in the *Vita.*’ (Page 77). However, if this is the only justification then it is easily dismissed – Stoic
those seen in the opening), and the contempt expressed in *o miser* at line 66 seems far more congruous with the *comes* than a diatribic response from P.⁴³⁸ The overtly didactic tone (*disce...discete...*), the passionate delivery (heavy repetition of *qu-* in parataxis from lines 67-71), and the inclusion of a few first-person plurals (*sumus, gignimur*) are more indicative of the continuation of the angry Stoic rather than a retort by a suddenly-diatribic P. As seen in Horace 2.3, the motif of the ‘angry lecturer’ seems thematically long-winded.⁴³⁹ A reading which incorporates the elements discussed above into a lengthy monologue strengthens both the recollection of Damasippus (the forerunner) and the anticipation of Socrates (the anachronistic follow-up).

The poem’s finale is read by all editors as an exchange between P. and S., though they disagree on who speaks what.⁴⁴⁰ The lines are as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
tange, miser, venas et pone in pectore dextram; \\
nil calet hic. summosque pedes attinge manusque; \\
non frigent. visa est si forte pecunia, sive \\
candida vicini subrisit molle puella, \\
cor tibi rite salit? positum est algente catino \\
durum holus et populi cribro decussa farina: \\
temptemus fauces... \\
\end{align*}
\]

elements are not only overtly present throughout the entirety of the poem, but indeed in those very sections which Harvey attributes to the *comes* (see Harvey’s own comments on lines 21-2, 41-2, 53.)

¹⁴³⁸ Indeed, with regards to the presence of *miser* at line 107, Harvey 1981: 103 writes that it is unlikely to belong to P. as ‘*miser* in the mouth of the *adversaries* is suitably aggressive.’ This seems contrary to his attribution of 63-106.

¹⁴³⁹ One must wonder if the reference to snoring is evocative of *Stertinius* — see Sharland 2010: 239.

¹⁴⁴⁰ The most common interpretation is that P. speaks *tange...frigent* at lines 107-109, and that the *comes* replies (Jenkinson 1980: 34, Braund 2012: 82. Harvey 1981: 103 argues the reverse; *tange...frigent* is the reply of the Stoic to the lecture given by P. from lines 63-105, and P. replies in turn.
Feel my pulse, you fool, and place your hand on my chest: nothing burning here. Feel the tips of my toes and fingers: they’re not cold. If you see money or if the shining girl from next door smiles coyly at you, does your heart beat properly? Tough vegetables served on a chilly plate with flour sifted by the people’s sieve: let’s try your throat…

107-113

This passage follows an exemplum given by S. in which a sick man consults a doctor. Harvey reads *tange…frigent* as the Stoic’s rebuttal to the implication that he is sick — Kißel, Braund, and Jenkinson read the inverse.441 I, however, read no dialogic exchange. Reading the passage as a continuation of the Stoic’s monologue is harmonious with both the ‘dialogic’ features of the passage and the philosophical function of the speech in the poem.

Plaza’s argument that this poem enacts the excision (perhaps repression — *nempe haec adsidue*) of the ‘lower self’ is cogent.442 According to her analysis (and the speaker-attributions argued for above) P. is continuously ridiculed and, eventually, diminished altogether, confirming Persius’ Stoic-Satiric credentials in anticipation for the more ‘philosophical’ poems which follow. Attributing *tange…frigent* to the Stoic aligns both with the subjugation of P. (now silent) and with the function of the Stoic as a manifestation of liberating anger. The Stoic challenges P. to assess whether he (the Stoic) is similar to the exemplum of the sick man — demanding to be confirmed as physically (and, by implication, mentally) sound.443 This is an attempt to justify the lecture and to set up a final comparison (and critique) of P. by S.

Dialogic elements of the passage support this reading. First, I disagree with Harvey’s contention that other scholars have overstated the relationship between this excerpt and the

441 That P. replies to the Stoic’s implication. Plaza 2006 is noticeably silent regarding this problem. It should be noted that in Jenkinson’s commentary, he does not even entertain the possibility that the challenges offered are spoken by the Stoic about the Stoic.

442 This idea is expressed most clearly in Plaza 2006: 234-246

443 Jenkinson 1980: 82 is correct in arguing that the body parts belong to the challenger rather than the challenged. We disagree on the speaker and thus the function of the challenge.
parable of the sick man. The primary function of the parable is best elucidated by Plaza; it is an exemplum which the Stoic uses to divert (or, as she seems to argue later, suppress) P. — a distorted image of what he might become if he doesn’t shape up (or ship out). The secondary function is to introduce the connection between physical and mental faculties. This is evinced in the dialogic reflections and transmutations between the two excerpts:

\[\text{inspice, nescio quid trepidat mihi pectus et aegris} \]
\[\text{faucibus exsuperat gravis halitus, inspice sodes.} \]
\[88-89\]

\[\text{tange, miser, venas et pone in pectore dextram ;} \]
\[\text{nil calet hic. summosque pedes attinge manusque ;} \]
\[\text{non frigent.} \]

The mutual repetition of imperatives (inspice...inspice, tange...attinge...) and turn-initial orders belie the important transformation of the sick man to the Stoic. The anxious niceties of the former become the harsh didacticism of the latter — inspice to tange, sodes to miser. The metrics themselves express conflicting attitudes — the former being delivered in a string of dactyls and enjambment, the latter with more spondaic variation and a touch of Satzvers. The proximity of the two passages (both literally and figuratively) emphasise their relationship and their distinct features. The subject is similar (illness), but the attitudes expressed are philosophically opposed.

---

\[\text{444 Harvey 1981: 103 ‘It is wrong for Nisbet, ‘Persius’, 57, to assert that in this last section of the poem “comes the application of the parable.” The allegory needs no application because it is self-explanatory; and while physical illness in the allegory is merely parallel to, or illustrative of, moral illness, physical illness at 109ff. directly betokens moral illness. There is thus no close link between 88-106 and 109ff.}\]
\[\text{445 Plaza 2006: 231.}\]
The challenge posed to P. by S. is thus: you might turn into the anxious sick man — but feel me, no sickness here! The comparison is consolidated by the post-positional use of *tibi*. Each iteration of this line-opening formula (*X tibi*...) emphasises a contrast between P. and a second element; *haut tibi* compares the Stoic’s ill-spent youth with P.’s Stoic education, *et tibi* compares the two ‘forking paths’ of P.’s life (of which he took the left), and *cor tibi* compares the interlocutors’ relative physical sanity. The iteration of strong imperatives (*tange*), vocatives (*miser*), and post-positional *tibi* characterise and connect the distinct sections of the Stoic’s speech. Thus concludes the analysis of the narratological framework, and the problems of line-attribute.

The Stoic diatribe contains three snippets of speech and a short dialogic exchange. These function in similar vein to the *exempla* of Damasippus in Hor. S. 2.3 and feature a variety of conversational phenomena which further demonstrate Persius’ continued use of stylised speech in his satires. The short outburst *imus | imus praecipites* at lines 41-42 features Persius’ trademark style of exact repetition, coupled with emphatic ellipsis and heavy enjambment. The speech attributed to the soldier in lines 78-85 is replete with dialogic nuances:

*dicat:* ‘quod sapio satis est mihi. non ego curro

esse quod Arkesilas aerumnosique Solones

obstipo capite et figentes lumine terram,

murmura cum secum et rabiosa silentia rodunt

atque exporrecto trutinatuntur verba labello,

---

446 Most editors see the comparative element of *haut tibi* (Harvey 1981: 92), yet Harvey contends that the contrast is ‘illusory’. Harvey recognises the implication (P. etc. should know better than a schoolboy) but asks ‘better than to do what?’ The answer is found in lines 51-53; the *comes* upbraids himself for praying for success in vain pursuits (Jahn’s *omissis seriis inania sectari* — cited by Harvey 1981: 92), then notes that P. is no stranger to critiquing such behaviour, nor to the Stoic philosophy which fuels such critiques. Thus, Jahn does not anticipate lines 60-62 in his question. A recurring target of Stoic haranguing/Satiric critique are ‘prayers of vanity’. The use of the phrase *in voto* to describe the *comes* shameful behaviour is particularly telling.

447 For the use of immediate exact repetition see Harvey 1981: 89.
He might say: ‘what I know is enough for me. I don’t care to be like Arcesilas or those sad Solons going around with bent heads and eyes fixed on the ground, murmuring to themselves and gnawing on rabid silences, words weighing on pouted lips, thinking on the dreams of an old invalid: that from nothing comes nothing and nothing returns to nothing. Is this why you’re so pale? This is why you miss dinner?’

The Stoic characterises the soldier as simultaneously crudely uneducated and learned enough to effectively parody philosophic learning. The stylistics of the excerpt are summarised concisely by Kißel: ‘Die Rede…ist im Formalen durch kolloquiale Wortwahl und eine zum Teil geradezu schwerfällige Syntax geprägt.’ Kißel identifies this ‘simple’ syntax primarily in the opening and closing of the speech; an identification which belies an important dialogic development in the midsection. The stylistics shift from unsophisticated, verb-initial phrases (non ego curo esse quod) to increasingly more complex and poetic expression. The Horatian phrase (obstipo capite) and perversion of a well-known poetic formula (figentes lumine terram) prelude a masterful use of alliteration. The chiastic alliteration of m enclosing murmura (lumine terram murmura cum secum) manifests aurally the muttering philosopher in similar style to Horace, 1.4.115-120 and 133-138. The mimesis of the philosopher is followed by the parody of philosophy itself — the epigrammatic tone of gigni…reverti has received ample discussion in the commentaries. The use of mimetic aspects for effective parody renders the

448 Kißel 1990: 457. Note also the three elisions (capite et, secum et, atque exporrecto) giving the soldier an elision rate of 37.5% – not particularly high, but considerably higher than the average for the poem (26%).
449 Ibid.
soldier a satirist in miniature — the third in a series of persona-babushka dolls — and like most persona-based satire, the attack functions at multiple levels.452

Plaza notes that it is difficult for the reader to square this vignette with the overall message of the poem. Arguing that laughing alongside the Centurion would implicate the reader, she nevertheless notes that ‘…perhaps the military's rough sketch of the madly murmuring sages is too funny for this Stoic satire's good.’453 I propose that the tension between the success of the soldier’s satire and the function of the vignette in the argumentation of the Stoic allow for Persius’ satire to function at (against) multiple levels (targets) simultaneously. At the lowest level, the soldier successfully lampoons philosophers.454 The audience (both the populus and, perhaps, Persius’ reader) laughs with the soldier-satirist at the target of derision. Moving up through the layers of personae, the soldier’s attack is turned against him; his initially clumsy syntax, failure to address the Stoic’s philosophy with any congruency, association with the military, and the description of his audience as anti-intellectual ‘jocks’ emphasise the soldier’s true stupidity.455 Here is the function of the episode in the Stoic’s diatribe — a pre-emptive strike against the possible counter-argument that philosophical thinking (described immediately prior to the soldier in lines 66-76) is worthless.456 The synthesis of these two readings is engaged from the perspective of the (now absent) narrator — the incarnation/representative of Persius ‘now’, wherein we read the self-irony of the Stoic. Self-irony is present in two aspects of the vignette. The first has been noted — the ‘too funny’ characterisation of philosophers by the soldier. The second is somewhat more subtle.

Numerous features of the passage direct our attention to the fact that what we are reading is a Stoic imitation of a soldier, and not their actual speech. The first is the framing device —

452 Persius – The Stoic – The Soldier.
453 A sentiment shared by Kißel 1990: 457, noting that Persius ‘…hat er andererseits nicht gezögert, diesen [the soldier] mit einem pointierten, volkstümlichen Witz auszustatten.’
454 A critique which is received positively by both the soldier’s audience in lines 86-87 and, millennia later, Kißel (1990: 457).
455 On the lack of congruency, see Harvey 1981: 97; on the aversion to the military as a satiric attitude, see Kißel 1990: 458; on the negative description of the audience in lines 86-87, see Plaza 2016: 232. Note also Persius’ generally negative view of populus – 1.64-68.
456 Similar to the interpretation proposed by Kißel 1990: 457.
the subjunctive *dicat*.\(^{457}\) The second is the unsteady stylistics noted above — the fluctuation between prosaic and poetic mimesis is not only an unstable characterisation but is itself evocative of the Stoic’s speech in lines 15-18.\(^{458}\) The mask of the soldier is unstable, and the mannerisms of the Stoic appear to shine through. This reading is reinforced by the parodic philosophical quotation. *Gigni...reverti* expresses an idea which, while certainly not exclusive to Epicurean doctrine, is most similar in expression to Lucretius.\(^{459}\) The emphasis on the Stoic’s creation of this speaker, and the intrusion of his own stylistics and the subsequent instability of the *persona*, supports a reading in which we see the ventriloquism of the soldier by the Stoic. Therefore, it does not seem improbable that the attack on philosophy is deliberately formulated to target Epicureanism in particular, rather than the Stoicism expressed by the *comes*.\(^{460}\) Furthermore, the objections to Spaeth’s 1942 suggestion that *aegroti veteris* references Epicurus are, in light of the analysis presented, considerably weakened.\(^{461}\) A specific, though abstruse, attack on Epicureanism is by no means unbelievable in the mouth of the *comes*. Read in this way, the vignette of the soldier thus produces self-irony with regards to the *comes* — even in playing devil’s advocate, he is unable to step outside his Stoic doctrine.

The introduction to the second vignette has been discussed with reference to its echo in the challenge of the Stoic.\(^{462}\) A brief narratorial interlude separates it from the bath-house scene, presented in the following lines:

> ‘heus bone, tu palles.’ ‘nihil est.’ ‘videas tamen istuc,

---

\(^{457}\) Kißel 1990:457 also recognises the importance of the subjunctive “…den gedachten (vgl.v.78 den Konjunktiv *dicati*) Sprecher.” Compare with the use of more straightforward *dicit* at line 90 and *rogavit* 93.

\(^{458}\) Possibly sub-standard grammar is present at line 15 (*dies ultra miser*) – see Kißel 1990: 388 which is followed by poetic mimesis in the alliteration of *p* and *m* in 16-18 – see Plaza 2006: 239 referencing Saccone 1980.


\(^{460}\) Note also that the parodic comment primarily concerns metaphysics, whereas the lecture itself is on ethics and behaviour.

\(^{461}\) Both Harvey 1981: 99 and Kißel 1990: 463-4 argue that such an esoteric reference would be unbelievable in the mouth of a soldier. However, as I have argued, Persius constructs the soldier-*persona* to be deliberately porous, allowing the stylistics and sentiments of the Stoic to slip through.

\(^{462}\) Page 35.
‘Good sir, you’re pale!’ ‘It’s nothing.’ ‘You should nevertheless get it checked, whatever it is. Your skin is turning yellow without you knowing.’ ‘But you’re even paler; don’t play the tutor with me. I’ve already buried mine; that leaves you.’ ‘Go on then, I’ll be quiet.’

This exchange blends conversational phenomena with restrained use of the hexameter. Repetition is both overt and subtle. The mutual accusation *tu (x) palles* forms the core of the dialogue, emphasised through near-exact repetition, and the re-iteration is itself couched in duplicating metrics. The use of *heus, bone,* and the contracted *sepeli* characterise the exchange as conversational. Conversational referentiality is generated through turn-initial *heus* (indicating surprise/demanding attention) and physical descriptions (*palles, lutea pellis*). Editors note the intertextuality between *ne sis mihi tutor* and Horace’s *ne sis patruus mihi.* As MacKay notes for the Horatian original, and it is equally relevant here, the pronouns (*tu…mihi*) are emphatic, focussing our attention on corporeality and contrastive elements. The contrastive use of subjunctives and imperatives (also conversational features) drives the vignette from ‘friendly’ (didactic) concern (*uideas*) and resistance (*ne sis*), to final exasperation.
This progression is supported by the use of restrained metrics, present in the use of
natural metrical pauses to change speaker, lack of heavy enjambment, and suspension of elision
until the final line. This combination of conversational features and restrained metrics is often
found in reference to the culture of parasites, blanditia, and convivae — an allusion to which is
found preceding this exchange in line 93; de maiore domo.

Summary: Satire 3

According to the reading argued for above, Satire 3 is, like its Horatian model, a monologue
masquerading as a dialogue. The line-attributions noted are most consistent with the dialogic
features of the text, and complement interpretations of the poem which read an excision or
repression of Persius’ ‘lower self’. The iteration of particular stylistics directs our attention to
elements of self-irony in the speech of the Stoic.

The intra-textuality between this poem and those which enclose it has some interesting
implications. Physical isolation, introduced in the opening lines of Satire 1, is repeated again
here — ocius adsit huc aliquis. nemon? Dialogue which involves the satirist continues to exist
in liminal spaces — with fictive interlocutors, and fragments of a persona — and manifests
aggression. Indeed, despite the title (comes – perhaps ironic) and ostensibly laudable attempt to
correct his partner, the Stoic tears down P. with such zeal (miser!) that, by the end of the poem,
it would hardly be surprising if the description of the enraged P. is reflective rather than
deictic. After all, the monologue is vitrea bilis manifest. Self-irony — mild and self-
administered in 44-51, serious and self-inflicted in the end — coheres to both Persius’ penchant
for critiquing himself and his friends, as well as the deeper meta-poetic function of the poem.

---

468 For prohibitive subjunctives see Kißel 1990: 454.
469 Hor 1.9.4-5. Indeed, the phrase invoked at iam pridem...restas corresponds to that of the “pest” in Horace
1.9.28. On maiore domo and rich friends/gift-giving see Harvey 1981: 100; Kißel 1990: 470.
470 The use of comes brings to mind Stoic conceptions of friendship – specifically Cicero’s De Amicitia. The
obvious quote to pull out is from section 80 – quod nisi idem in amicitiam transferetur, verus amicus non
reperietur; est enim qui est tamquam alter idem. For Cicero’s conception of friendship as grounds for giving
advice, see Hall 2009: 127. For the pointed reversal of this idea by Persius, see Keane 2012: 81.
471 For Persius damning both himself and his friends, see Plaza 2006: 91.
This poetic auto-surgery preludes the concern with self-knowledge in the fourth poem. It is both Persius’ descent into himself (ego te intus et in cute novi / ut nemo in sese temptat descendere, nemo) and his attempt to rid himself of unnecessary bodily fluids/personalities (respue quod non es). Persius, alone, suppresses his bad habits with Stoic training – though this too is shown to be problematic.

Roche writes that Satire 3 ‘explores the basic aggression of the Persianic persona which has been developing consistently since the first satire, and undercuts the results of Cornutus’ benign influence’. While it is possible to read such tension between poems 3 and 5, I believe a reading informed by the self-reflexive nature of the text itself, as well as Horatian structural models, provides deeper insight into the function of the poem in the collection. Gowers writes that Horace 1.7 acts as a ‘dumping ground for vitriol’ before the lighter (in content and setting) poems of 1.8 and 1.9. We have witnessed the distancing techniques used by ‘Persius’ (N.) in introducing this poem. This effect is continued into the poem which follows — Persius is present for a brief parenthetical statement, before retreating from the pseudo-Socratic scene. I propose that Persius 3 functions as another satiric dumping ground, simultaneously qualifying the author to hold forth philosophically (having achieved a ‘descent into himself’) and providing catharsis for anger so swollen it splits him.

**Satire 4**

The fourth poem is composed of middling elision and the highest rate of Satzvers — the latter of which is perhaps fitting for the pseudo-Socratic delivery. However, as will be demonstrated, this philosophic end-stopping comprises some of the most sermonic elements of Persius’ poetry. This tension reflects the juxtaposition of the ‘serious’ reference text, and the satiric parody.

Persius retains his position as an introductory narrator from satire 3 and, having shown us his own philosophical self-interrogation, furnishes the reader with a parody of the pseudo-

---

472 Henderson 2009: 86 reads Persius’ satire as a dramatized ‘training of the will’.
473 Roche 2012: 203.
Platonic *Alcibiades* I. Theories of speaker-distribution in this poem fall into three categories, as summarised by Kißel. Dessen, Ehlers, Harvey, and Braund read the poem as essentially a Socratic monologue; Jenkinson and Peterson as a Socratic dialogue; Kißel reads 1-22 as a Socratic monologue, and then 23-52 as a Persian monologue. I will argue for the first interpretation.

Kißel’s primary objections to this reading are that 1) line 23 marks a shift from Greek to Roman ‘scenery’, and 2) that the 2nd person addressee in lines 35-41 does not match the description of Alcibiades offered in the opening. The argument against the first objection is found in Jenkinson: ‘The succeeding of Athenian by Roman ‘scenery’ should be no obstacle to it, as in fact the mixture already occurs at v.8 *Quirites*.’ The inverse is also true — the emphatically Greek *gausape* is found after Kißel’s hypothetical division. Despite predating Kißel’s commentary, Jenkinson’s anticipatory counter-objection is not addressed by Kißel. Indeed, another counter-objection similar in thought, but deeper in reference, is even hinted at by Kißel in their commentary on the presence of *Quirites*; the anachronistic and synchronistic legacy of Horace 2.5. Horace’s quasi-Homeric dialogue begins with an ostensibly Greek setting, which is soon pervaded and transformed by the satiric landscape of contemporary Rome. Satiric tradition lends credence to Jenkinson’s anticipatory counter-objection, and Kißel’s first argument is by no means convincing.

The second objection proposed can be summarised as follows. Socrates describes Alcibiades as being barely able to grow a beard. Socrates addresses Alcibiades using the second-person singular. The second-person singular is later used in a vignette to describe someone *maxillis balantum gausape pectas*. They cannot refer to the same person, and thus the

---

476 These positions are elucidated in Kißel 1990: 495-496.
477 As elsewhere, this has little consequence for the interpretation of dialogic ‘snippets’.
478 Kißel 1990: 496. The first objection compares the presence of Greek words before v.22 such as *theta*, *Anticyras*, *Baucis*, *acima* with ‘Roman’ words after v.22 including *Vettidi*, *Curibus*, *genio*, *farratam...ollam*. The second objection compares the description of Alcibiades as *kaum dem ersten Bartflaum entwachsener* in v.3, 15 with the bearded recipient of the rhetorical harangue in lines 33-42.
480 Line 37 — see Harvey 1981: 119.
481 Kißel 1990: 509.
later speech is not directed to Alcibiades or a surrogate thereof, and thus the vignette does not pertain to Alcibiades, and therefore the speaker of the vignette is not Socrates. Objections to this reading are numerous, but Bartsch’s argument is the most cogent. Bartsch argues that the vignette of the pathic sunbather and the angry bystander is self-indicting; the bystander addresses Socrates, not Alcibiades. The bearded philosopher thus accidentally reveals himself as sexually (and therefore philosophically) compromised, imbuing the poem with a deep sense of irony. A problematic philosopher-speaker is consistent with Persius’ ironic agenda (seen in Satire 3) and indeed with the satiric tradition of self-indicting truth-seekers. Bartsch’s reading is congruent with the consistent imagery used both before and after v.22 (sunbathing, depilation, bodily exposure), a consistency which is diminished by Kißel’s reading. Unity of imagery underpins a unity of discourse — there is little reason to presume that a silent transformation occurs from Socrates to Persius.

Naturally, Kißel is not the only obstacle to the monologic interpretation. Several editors read a sustained and active dialogue between Alcibiades and Socrates. Jenkinson attributes 23-32, 42-43 (caedimus…novimus), and 46-47 (egregium…credam) to Alcibiades. Kißel’s objection to this interpretation is unconvincing. However, one finds in the text stronger grounds for rejecting a dialogic interpretation. The parenthetical introduction from Persius/the narrator notes only Socrates as a speaker (dicere). Lines 23-32 retain the diatribic and

---

482 For objections via alternative interpretations, see Jenkinson 1980: 114 — multiple editors read 35-41 as directed towards one of the interlocutors implicated in lines 25-32 (of which one may be Alcibiades). Another possible objection would be that Alcibiades is (temporarily) displaced by the more general and Protean diatribic second person, as seen generally in Satire and immediately prior in Satire 3 (the shift from singular to plural disce…discete lines 66 and 73.
486 The justifications offered by Jenkinson focus predominantly on the relationship between the ‘two halves’ of the poem (1-22, 23-52) and not the dialogic structure he puts forth – See Jenkinson 1980: 114-115.
487 Kißel 1990: 497 appeals to the philosophic tradition of Alcibiades as a Bewunderer des Sokrates, and argues that as he has accepted Socrates’ advice (indicated in 14ff.) he wouldn’t react with weak appeals to the human condition (v.42-43) or his popularity (v. 46). This reading is a satirical non-sequitur: it is incredibly difficult to square this with the systemic perversion of the philosophic tradition undertaken by both Persius and his fellow satirists.
488 In contrast to Satire 3, where plural verbs are used by the narrator to stress the presence of multiple interlocutors in the beginning.
didactic tone of Socrates’ opening, and would form a confusing response to lines 1-22.\textsuperscript{489} Lines 42-43 are easily attributed to Socrates thanks to the analysis of 35-42 provided by Bartsch; Socrates reveals the (just) criticism he has received, and then universalises the experience to include his own critique of Alcibiades.\textsuperscript{490} ‘We critique and are critiqued in turn — but you, you try to hide your faults/wounds…’ Lines 46-47 are easily dealt with. Socrates ventriloquizes Alcibiades at every opportunity, rendering him a satiric straw man. This is communicated clearly in the text through rhetorical bridging and imperatives; quid deinde loquere...puta, i nunc...suffla..., iterated again before lines 46-47; da verba et decipe nervos.\textsuperscript{491} Thus, I argue for a monologic interpretation of the poem, in which Socrates is the primary speaker for the duration of the poem.

This monologic structure is particularly meaningful in light of Alcibiades I. The ‘Platonic original’ is fundamentally dialogic, both in its structural framework and its philosophical methodology.\textsuperscript{492} Persius’ sexual-moral perversion of Socrates is thus also a corruption of the dialogic-didactic structure of the reference text itself. The almost superfluous question-response pairs of Alcibiades I, in which Socrates not only rejects monologic speech-making but seeks permission to subject Alcibiades to interrogation, is replaced by aggressive and uninterrupted speech, in which his other interlocutor is not only silenced but straw-manned. Persius emphasises this inversion, having Socrates demand speech from Alcibiades (dic, loquere, i nunc, suffla, da verba) while simultaneously silencing him. This inversion demonstrates the interplay

\textsuperscript{489} This objection is implied in Kißel 1990: 497 though with a lack of clarity. Socrates notes Alcibiades’ shortcomings despite philosophical training in lines 1-22. The extension at line 23 both universalises the particular but also pushes the original tension between Alcibiades’ flaws and philosophical tension; as in Satire 3, the lectured must redirect their energies inwardly. If we take 23-32 as Alcibiades’ objection (don’t critique me — nobody has self-knowledge), Socrates’ response at lines 33-41 becomes even more obscure.

\textsuperscript{490} If one reads 35-42 as applicable to Alcibiades, the ward of Pericles reacts to a torrent of critiques from both Socrates and an ignotus with ‘we expose ourselves — that’s life.’ It is extremely difficult to square this interpretation with Socrates’ follow up ‘but you are wounded in secret — trick your nerves if you can’; if Alcibiades is ready to acquiesce to criticism, the final elaboration is meaningless. If we read 35-42 as applicable to Socrates, 42-43 become almost consolatory in the mouth of Alcibiades. The reading argued for above strikes me as the most natural.

\textsuperscript{491} Lines 8, 20, and 45 respectively. The use of (da) verba in particular, as in Satire 3.19 directs our attention to deception and substitution. Kißel 1990: 557 notes that this is not an objection from an interlocutor, but rather an imitation thereof.

\textsuperscript{492} See, for example, section 106b.
of form and function, of poetic framework and speakers, and is the most overt example in the satiric catalogue of a satiric attack on the abstract concept of dialogue itself.

Socrates’ monologue contains numerous instances of rhetorical/hypothetical speech. Three of these comprise his ‘ventriloquification’ of Alcibiades. The first is as follows:

\[
\text{maiestate manus. quid deinde loquere? 'Quirites,}
\]
\[
hoc' puta 'non iustum est, illud male, rectius illud.'
\]

Jenkinson prints this line with \textit{puta} included within the apostrophes; Braund does not. Kißel argues cogently that the word belongs to Socrates-as-Socrates, rather than his imitation of Alcibiades.\textsuperscript{493} In support of Kißel and Braund’s interpretation, we also see the use of a second-person singular imperative to fragment imitations of Alcibiades at line 20 (\textit{suffla}), and the coordination between \textit{puta} and \textit{Quirites} is unwieldy for someone \textit{dicenda tacendave calles}.\textsuperscript{494}

This reading is not only more congruent with the use of language and character in the poem — it also renders the line more comedic. The final position of \textit{Quirites} is both emphatic and surprising, introducing Persius’ anachronistic agenda and startling the reader/listener with a vocative non-sequitur.\textsuperscript{495} The \textit{Satzvers}-esque composition of pseudo-Alcibiades’ vague yet \textit{callidus} advice is rudely fragmented by Socrates’ enthusiastic and wholly unnecessary \textit{puta}.\textsuperscript{496} The gnostic delivery of otherwise meaningless ethical suggestions encapsulates Socrates’ critique of Alcibiades — he is skilled in speaking, but morally empty. The sample above also

\textsuperscript{493} Kißel 1990: 510 ‘da die Rede selbst nur in ihrer generellen Thematik umrissen ist und keine konkreten Einzelzüge aufweist, die ihrerseits Beispielcharakter haben könnten.’

\textsuperscript{494} The counter-point that Socrates may wish to portray Alcibiades as unskilled and hesitant in speaking would misinterpret the point of lines 4-22. It is not that Alcibiades is \textit{unskilled}, it is that he lacks the appropriate self-knowledge and Stoic ethics to put it to good use.

\textsuperscript{495} See Harvey 1981: 108.

\textsuperscript{496} Artistry is seen in the chiastic structure \textit{illud male, rectius illud}, strong use of the primary caesura (separating \textit{hoc iustum est} and the chiasmus) and the bucolic diaeresis. The contrast between the definitive \textit{puta} and the indefinite statements themselves is noted by Harvey 1981: 180.
demonstrates the use of parataxis for compression — abridging what would realistically be a longer speech (or perhaps several) into a series of short statements. Persius distils Socrates’ character (puta’) and critique into just over a single line of rhetorical dialogue, condensing abstractions (rhetorical artistry, ethical vacancy, aggressive didacticism) and communicating them through hexameter stylistics.

The second example of Socrates’ in the persona of Alcibiades presents us with a more insistent and emotional parody:

\[
\text{expecta, haut aliud respondeat haec anus. i nunc,}
\]

\[\text{‘Dinomaches ego sum, ’ suffla, ‘sum candidus.’ esto}\]

The imperative tone underlying puta has reached a crescendo — the demands (expecta, i, suffla) pile up on top of each-other with little regard for reality.\(^{497}\) The emphatic self-affirmation (ego) is, again, fragmented by Socrates’ comic enthusiasm/anger.\(^{498}\) The spondaic chiasmus at sum suffla sum seems to manifest the effort implied by sufflare — an aural exhibition accompanied by another. The alliteration of syllable-initial sibilants is perhaps resonant with the sound of sufflare or, more damningly, sibilare.\(^{499}\) Dialogue haché conveys pseudo-Alcibiades’ and Socrates’ emotional state, and alliteration effects mimesis of the formers’ self-inflation and/or the dangerous hiss of gossip.

Socrates temporarily moves on from parodying Alcibiades to provide an example of those who, far from attending to their own faults, critique the faults of those they barely know:

---

\(^{497}\) See Harvey 1981: 19 on expecta and puta.
\(^{498}\) i with asyndetic constructions or multiple imperatives is often found in Plautus — see Kißel 1990: 523.
\(^{499}\) Sibilants being manifestations of sibilare, which itself can imply criticism and gossip — see Horace Sat. 1.1.66 populus me sibilat. An invocation of gossip would not only manifest pseudo-Alcibiades preoccupation with his reception amongst the Quirites (seen most overtly in lines 46-47) but would forebode the gossip in the vignette at 25-32.
quaesieris ‘nostin Vettidi praedia?’ ‘cuius?’
‘dives arat Curibus, quantum non miluus errat.’
‘hunc ais’ ‘hunc dis iratis genioque sinistro,
qui, quandoque iugum pertusa ad compita figit,
seriolae veterem metuens deradere limum
ingemit ‘hoc bene sit’ tunicatum cum sale mordens
cepe et farratam pueris plaudentibus ollam
pannosam faecem morientis sorbet aceti?’

If you ask ‘you know Vettidius’ place?’ ‘Whose?’ ‘The rich one at Cures, whose lands go further than a kite.’ ‘You’re talking about him…’ ‘Yes him! Hated by the gods with an angry spirit who, when he hangs up his yoke at the pierced crossroads, fearing to scrape the old dirt from his jar, groans ‘let it be alright!’ munching an unpeeled onion with salt while his slave-boys cheer their porridge, he swallows the dregs of dying vinegar.’

25-32

The punctuation printed above is proposed by Kißel, who deviates from the common speaker distribution by printing an extra set of apostrophes at ‘hunc ais’ — thus attributing the exaggerated critique of Vettidius to the speaker of nostin Vettidi praedia? Kißel provides a series of objections to the traditional interpretation. Most convincing is his interpretation of

---

500 Jenkinson, Harvey, and Braund print ‘hunc ais, hunc…’. The punctuation above is derived from the interpretation of the scholia.
the relationship between the two vignettes. The presence of *at* (33) implies adversative force to the first vignette, functioning similarly to its use in satire 3. The critic of the first vignette becomes the critiqued of the second, the two vignettes functioning as a single *exemplum* of the universal human problem described in lines 23-23, and of the ‘give-and-take’ in lines 42-43.502

Under this reading, one might wonder about the function of *quaesieris*. According to the traditional interpretation, the implied expansion of this word might be something along the lines of ‘if you ask about others, you’ll hear ridiculous gossip’ — positioning the first speaker as a somewhat innocent or naïve questioner, and the second as an enthusiastic but obviously morally (and intellectually) compromised gossip.503 However, under the interpretation outlined above, we consequently read *quaesieris* as fundamentally ironic. This reading is supported by the construction and function of the speech-turns, and the function of the vignette as noted above. For clarity, I will now refer to the speaker of *nostin...*, *dives...*, and *hunc dis...* as S1, and the speaker of *cuius* and *hunc ais* as S2.

It is clear that the question-answer structure suggested by *quaesieris* is inverted almost immediately. ‘Do you know Vettidius’ estates?’ ‘Whose?’ The line-ending *cuius* emphatically reverses the interrogation — playing on the line-initial verb — and this reversal is sustained into the next line and, as I argue, to the end of the dialogue. The interrogator becomes the interrogated — happily so, as we are presented with no further questions from the initial speaker. This accepted role-reversal calls into question the function of the initial query. In fact, the opening question now seems to be not much of a question at all; it functions neither to pursue particular information regarding Vettidius, nor, it seems, to ascertain whether his interlocutor is familiar with the man; the description provided at line 26 is vague and semi-proverbial. The questions function as speech-acts, seeking to establish ‘in group’ within which the original

---

502 Kißel 1990: 533 also objects that a reading without the apostrophe would render the repetition of *hunc* without function. This is not strictly true — Persius’ penchant for emphatic lexical repetition is well-documented (see Harvey 1981: 18 on Persius 1.120, 2.19, 68, 3.41-2, 88-9, 5.143, 174, 6.22, 68-9.)

503 In a rare moment of agreement, Harvey (1980: 114) cites Jenkinson’s (1973: 523-4) interpretation of the attack in the mouth of the previously clueless (*cuius?*) interlocutor as an exaggerated and cliché critique which indicates he does not actually know Vettidius. I argue that the identification of cliches and exaggeration holds, but the speakers are different.
speaker can carry out his critique. The interrogator is shown to be not only a horrendous gossip, but so invested in pursuing his critique that he is blind to his interlocutor’s disinterest. Finally, the distortion of the speech-act implied in the leading verb reflects the distortion of introspection which the vignette serves to embody. The questioning which could have been directed inwardly — *nee te quaesiveris extra*, Persius warns at 1.7 — is instead expressed outwardly, and Stoic investigation is transformed into a parody of gossip. *Quaesieris* is thus ironic; they’re not *really* asking, because they aren’t *really* seeking any sort of answer. The vignette manifests Socrates’ admonition that nobody attempts self-knowledge and the idea that Alcibiades *could* be doing ‘real philosophy’ but his ‘investigations’ are completely vapid.

The dialogue is a mimetic locus of urbane gossip. Dialogic exchange is introduced with the quasi-comic turn-initial *nostin* followed by an abrupt, line-ending *cuius*? This abrupt line-end, signalling the parodic inversion of the line-opening, suggests the possibility for enjambment which is, however, never realised. Rather, measured speech is conveyed through the suspension of both enjambment and elision in the first few exchanges, rendering line 26 a polished critique in epigrammatic *Satzvers.* The exchange at ‘*hunc ais*’ ‘*hunc* is the tipping point for the gossip. The first *hunc*, signalling (at last) that S2 recognises Vettidius, is seized upon by S1 who either breaks into speech before S2 is done talking (as Kißel interprets) or, if we read *hunc ais* to be a weary attempt to express disinterest, steamrolls over S2’s overly-polite hesitation to deliver his verdict on Vettidius. This excitement on the part of S1 is accompanied by a stylistic shift. Direct repetition paves the way to enjambment and restrained elisions, diminutives, the comic-satiric use of *metuere* for reluctant action, and the parodic contortion of a spoken-prayer formula — all phenomena frequent in Latin dialogic texts. The

---


505 Plaut. *Truc.* 726. The *cuius* breaks into the line, at the last moment, suggesting an enjambment which is never fulfilled.

506 A tone perhaps strengthened by the presence of proverbial speech — see Harvey 1981: 114 on *miluis erat.*

507 Kißel 1990: 533 provided insightful commentary which inspired this section: ‘Der vom Scholiasten bezeugte *Sprecherwechsel zwischen ais und dem zweiten hunc...trägt auch Typisches zur Charakterisierung des durch quaesieris eingeführten Hauptredners bei: Ohne seinen Gesprächspartner auch nur einmal ausreden zu lassen, überschüttet er ihn mit seinem Klatsch.’

508 On *metuere* see Kißel 1990: 539; On diminutives see Harvey 1981: 116 *seriolae*; On *hoc bene sit* see Kißel 1990: 540. As elsewhere, the relationship between elision and ‘excited speech’ is less strong in Persius than in
speaker-attribution presented here opens the vignette to a reading sensitive to stylistic shifts, dialogic interactions, and the function of the conversation in the wider poetic framework.

The attack by the *ignotus* in lines 35-41 features indignant syntax and quasi-philosophical end-stopping:

*despuat: ‘hi mores! penemque arcanaque lumbi*

*runcantem populo marcentis pandere bulbos!*

*tunc cum maxillis balanatum gausape pectas,*

*inguinibus quare detonsus gurgulio exstat?*

*quinque palaestratae licet haec plantaria vellant*

*elixasque nates labefactent forcipe adunca,*

*non tamen ista filix ullo mansuescit aratro.’*

Spits out: ‘Such disgrace! Weeding your prick and the recesses of your backside and exposing your withered nuts to the public! While you comb and perfume the rug on your jaws, why does your windpipe stick out clean-shaven from your groin? Even if five wrestling trainers were to pull out these seedlings and make your boiled buttocks shake with curving clippers, still that bracken of yours won’t be tamed by any plough.’

Horace. However, the elisions at *pertusa ad* and *cepe et* are the only elisions in this exchange and delivered after the climax at *hunc*. The use of elision at dialogically strong points is also seen at *barbatum haec* (parenthetical statement), *ingenium et* (following vocative *pupille Perici*), *non iustum est* (imitated dialogue), *tu igitur and tibi summa boni est* (second-person interaction), *expecta haut* (imperative), *te ignotus* (second-person), *penemque arcanaque, gurgulio extat, forcipe adunca* (imitated speech), *da verba et* (imperative), *tecum habita* (second-person). Including the two examples above, 14/19 of the elisions present in this poem are directly linked to dialogic interaction.
Anger is manifest in the exclamation (*hi mores*), the use of the accusative-infinitive construction, and, more subtly, the increased elision rate (~42%). In contrast to the previous gossip, enjambment is almost equally balanced by end-stopping, generating strong pauses between each attack in similar philosophical vein to both the Stoic from Persius 3 and indeed Socrates himself. This miniature homophobic (and perhaps by analogy, Hellenophobic) diatribe comprises an extended agricultural metaphor, itself evocative of traditional, agrarian Roman practices (and morality). This rustic ‘microlect’ contrasts with *balanatum gausape* — an odd construction which has merited attention. Kißel writes that the first is *volkssprachlich* and the second *umgangssprachlich*. The first comment is entirely unjustified — Kißel himself notes that there is no evidence for this word outside of Persius until Priscus. The second is somewhat dated (see my introduction), though the justification offered provides helpful observations. *Gausape*, a relatively rare word of Greek origin, occurs in the works of eight authors — two of whom are fellow satirists (Lucilius, Horace) and a further pair of whom partake in the satiric/comedic mode (Petronius, Martial). Its use in parodically-minded authors should direct our attention to a possibly parodic function in the text. Kißel notes Pliny the Elder in stating that a *gausape* is a cloth that is rough(er) on one side. The *gausape* is thus an object itself emblematic of the accused it is used to describe — hairy in one place, smooth in another. Furthermore, the collocation of two evidently Greek words in an otherwise thoroughly Roman diatribe is mimetic parody of the accused, an anachronistic blend of homo- and Hellenophobia ridiculing effeminate depilation and Greek erotic-didacticism. The *barbe huilée* connects the blurred spheres of address (Alcibiades, Socrates, Persius’ reader) through a

---

510 These being *runcantem, plantaria, filix, mansuescit aratro* — evoking Cato, Varro, and Virgil’s Georgics — see Harvey 1981: 119-120. *Pandere bulbos* (instead of *pandere vulvas* as is printed in most editions — see the discussion at Kißel 1990: 549) also contributes to this agricultural preoccupation.
511 Kißel 1990: 550
512 Ibid.
515 Harvey 1981: 37 and Kißel 990: 550 note that *balanatum* is formed from *balanus* (cf. Hor. Carm. 3.29.4) itself borrowed from Greek (βάλανος).
joke that can only be understood from the perspective of Persius’ reader. This subtle yet masterful use of dialogue shows Persius’ compression of ideology and language, as well as the philological rewards of recognising fluctuations in microlect.

Summary: Satire 4

The poem is read as Socrates’ monologue to Alcibiades, excepting only the parenthetical introduction from the ever-present satirist. This parodies the dialogic schema presented and supported in the reference text — *Alcibiades I*. Socrates not only silences Alcibiades, but ventriloquizes him — explicitly straw-manning his student in a corruption of the so-called ‘Socratic Method’. Indeed, as Littlewood notes, the Athenian philosophers are ‘translated and infected’ by Persius’ satire — a diagnosis whose symptoms are both the agitated diatribe of the previously-dialectic philosopher, and the anachronistic, geographically fragmented space-time in which the monologue takes place.\(^{516}\)

The vignettes deployed in service of moral didacticism feature dialogic phenomena which convey shifts in conversational tone. Explicitly Roman (*quirites*) and Greek (*balanatum gausape*) are exploited for their socio-linguistic currency. Variations in how dialogue is composed are meaningful for both the characterisation of the speaker, and the function of the dialogue within the poem.

Satire 5

‘Given the restricted output of Persius, it would be misleading to assume his abandonment of the kind of variety found in Lucilius.’\(^{517}\) The fifth poem is the longest in Persius’ collection, and accordingly features the greatest variety of character-speakers. Thankfully, the abundance of dialogue has not met proportionate disagreement over speaker-attribute; the rhetorical figures are delineated with considerably more clarity than the interlocutors of previous poems. In similar vein to Horace 2.3 and 2.7, a host of stereotypical figures are conjured in order to

\(^{516}\) Littlewood 2002: 81.

\(^{517}\) Roche 2012: 200.
explore the numerous failings of mankind. Additionally, abstract concepts are personified and given voice, echoing the ‘voice of Nature’ of Lucretius, and perhaps the *mutto* of Horace 1.2.68, 1.2 Persius continues to re-invigorate satiric *sermo* through both structural and stylistic innovation, rendering his fifth and longest poem a veritable *sartago loquendi*.

The general elision rate is a middling 41%, and the rate of *Satzvers* is roughly 30%. Serious-sounding epigrammatism is often expressed iteratively to convey a single idea encapsulated in multiple lines, or arranged chiastically to emphasise relationships between topics. This extended use of *Satzvers* can be seen in 1-4 (*mos vatibus*), 41-44 (good times with Cornutus), 51-52 (twin fates of P. and C.) arranged with 53-54 (the various fates of mankind), 96-99 (the power of *ratio, lex hominum naturaque*), 107-112 (a series of philosophical questions put to the ‘reader’), and 118-126 (philosophical failings of the ‘reader’). This proliferation of *Satzvers* is noticeably absent from the extended uses of rhetorical speech. Persius’ poetic quilt alternates sermonic enjambed discourse with restrained end-stopped pronouncements.

The opening lines establish Persius’ musings on tragedy and epic, and Cornutus’ swift intervention:

*vatibus hic mos est, centum sibi poscere voces,*
*centum ora et linguas optare in carmina centum,*
*fabula seu maesto ponatur hianda trageodo,*
*vulnera seu Parthi ducentis ab inguine ferrum.*

‘quorsum haec? aut quantas robusti carminis offas ingeris, ut par sit centeno gutture niti?  
grande locuturi nebulae Helicone legunto,  
si quibus aut Procles aut si quibus olla Thyestae  
fervebit saepe insulso cenanda Glyconi.  
tu neque anhelanti, coquitur dum massa camino,  
folle premis ventos, nec clauso murmure raucus*
nescio quid tecum grave cornicaris inepte,
nec scloppo tumidas intendis rumpere buccas.
verba togae sequeris iunctura callidus acri,
ore teres modico, pallentis radere mores
doctus et ingenuo culpam defigere ludo.
hinc trahe, quae dicis, mensasque relinque Mycenis
cum capite et pedibus plebeiaque prandia noris.’

This is the way of bards – to ask for a hundred voices, to pray for a hundred mouths and tongues, whether a gaping tale for a gloomy tragedian, or the wounds of a Parthian pulling a weapon from his groin. ‘Where are you going with this? Or how many lumps of solid song will you heap up, that they need a hundred-fold throat for support? Let those about to speak grandly gather fogs from Helicon, those for whom the the pot of Procne or Thyeste is bubbling away at boring Glyco’s feast. You, while the ore is smelting in the forge, neither force wind from panting bellows nor croak solemn and inept nonsense to yourself, hoarse with secret muttering, nor strain to burst your swollen cheeks with a pop! You follow the language of the toga, skilled at smoothing harshness, polished with moderate speech, learned in scraping pale morals and fixing fault with well-bred wit. Take your speech from here, and leave banquets to Mycenae, heads and feet, and get acquainted with ordinary meals.’
Lines 5-18 are attributed to Cornutus by all editors. This attribution is attested to in the text itself, albeit somewhat delayed. Cornutus’ elision rate is ~29%, lower than that of his student (41%), though the only relationship between elision and dialogue in Persius seems to be that of agitation. Lines 7, 13, and 14 are in Satzvers — a middling rate (16%), which is suitable given that Cornutus’ discourse deals primarily with Persius’ poetic rather than philosophic output. A few notes on several stylistic phenomena. The combination of pleonasm with the third-person imperative at lines 5-7 are perhaps mimetic of ‘authoratative’ Latin (12 tables). Kißel notes the contrast between quorum haec and the mock-grand poetic diction which follows. The brusque nature of the question is emphasised by the strong, spondaic elision in contrast to the light dactyls which iterate in the two previous lines. The force of this transition, affected in part through contrast with the previous lines, preludes a deeper and more structural interaction between Persius’ preamble and Cornutus’ intervention. Various aspects of the opening four lines to this poem convey an affected epic and tragic register — ‘hammy’, perhaps, but not yet fully corrupted as it will be under Cornutus. Corruption is enacted through the transformations of voces to gutture and ora to buccas. In similar vein to Persius 3, onomatopoeia is used to satirize the dialogue it responds to; the use of scloppo and cornicaris trivialise the grandiose affectation in the first four lines. Cornutus interjects, corrupts Persius’ epic-tragic fancies, and provides the iuncturae acres that Persius (the poet) is so known for.

Lexical repetition and strong use of natural metrical pauses are seen in the following:

518 The transition from the wholly second-person address at 5-18 to non equidem hoc studio is strong. For negation + equidem in turn-initial position see Hor. Sat. 2.6.53 (with similar politesse, perhaps). The transition is confirmed with loquimur, and finally specified with Cornute.
519 For pleonastic structures in early Latin, see Murphy 1956: 403.
520 Kißel 1990: 576.
521 Fabula seu…vulnera seu…
522 See Harvey 1981: 125 on vatibus hic mos est anaphora of centum (Virgilian), voces…ora…lingua, vulnera seu… For parodic remark – see Harvey 1981: 125 on the use of hianda. The double elision at centum ora et seems a perfect example of Soubiran’s comments at 1966: 617
523 See Harvey 1981: 127 on centeno gutture as ‘a strict abuse of Latin’.
524 Cornicaris possibly picking up the use of murmure preceding it — see Harvey 1981: 129. Scloppo also perhaps looking forward to the heavy assonance and consonance of p in the final line.
525 See Harvey 1981: 129 on verba togae, 131 on defigere culpam.
'cras hoc fiet idem’ cras fiet ‘quid? quasi magnum
gempe diem donas?’ sed cum lux altera venit,
iarm cras hesternum consumpsimus; ecce aliud cras:
egerit hoc annos et semper paulum erit ultra.

66-68

Kißel prints the *idem* within the speech of the interlocutor, whereas other editors attribute it to Persius.526 I agree with Kißel on the grounds he supplies — the primary caesura is a far more natural place to change speaker, and the feminine caesura in the second foot is used extremely rarely.527 The use of the primary caesurae in both 66 and 67, as well as the bucolic diaeresis in 66, effect strong separation between the speakers, and emphasise Persius’ pithy yet ponderous repetition of *cras fiet*. The continued re-iteration of *cras* creates a playful evolution of the word from adverb to substantive-object to substantive-subject. This personification of his interlocutor’s renunciation of responsibility is a satiric *reductio ad absurdum*; the transformation of *cras* from adverb to subject (*hoc=cras*. . . *egerit* line 69) parodies the implicit stupidity of Persius’ interlocutor.528 ‘Tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow’ — truly, we must imagine Persius agreeing with Macbeth at his most meditative. Perpetual procrastination is a tale told by an idiot, full of (iterated) sound and fury, signifying nothing.

Lines 78-91 contain two dialogic vignettes. The familiar Stoic theme of *libertas* is explored, first in relation to the sarcastically miraculous creation of freedmen, and then in a classic rhetorical give-and-take:

*verterit hunc dominus, momento turbinis exit*

*Marcus Dama. papae! ‘Marco spondente recusas*

---

526 Braund, Harvey, and Jenkinson.
527 Kißel 1990: 642 also provides argument against the reading ‘idem cras fiat’ first proposed by Housman and taken up by Harvey.
528 For the reading of *hoc=cras* see Kißel 1990: 643-644.
credere tu nummos?’ ‘Marco sub iudice palles?’

‘Marcus dixit, ita est.’ ‘assigna, Marce, tabellas.’

haec mera libertas, haec nobis pillea donant.

‘an quisquam est alius liber, nisi ducere vitam
cui licet ut libuit? licet ut volo vivere: non sum
liberior Bruto?’ ‘mendose colligis’ inquit

Stoicus hic aurem mordaci lotus aceto.

‘haec reliqua accipio, ‘licet’ illud et ‘ut volo’ tolle.’

‘vindicata postquam meus a praetore recessi,
cur mihi non liceat, iussit quodcumque voluntas,
excepto siquid Masuri rubrica vetabit?’

disce, sed ira cadat naso rugosaque sanna,

Should his master spin him, out from the spinning-top comes Marcus Dama. Incredible! ‘Do you refuse to lend your money with Marcus as guarantor?’ ‘Do you grow pale with Marcus as a juror?’ ‘Marcus said so, and thus its true.’ ‘Sign, Marcus, this document.’ This is pure freedom, this is what the liberty-hats give us. ‘So is anyone free, unless they can lead their life as is allowed and pleasing? I can live as I want: am I not freer than Brutus?’ ‘You reason spuriously’ says this Stoic, his ear cleansed with biting vinegar, ‘I accept the rest, but remove your ‘can’ and ‘as I want.’ ‘Once I’ve left the praetor as my own master, why can’t I do whatever I want except for what the red-titled statues of Masurius forbid?’ Listen up, but let go your anger and the wrinkled sneer from your nose…

78-91
The punctuation for both vignettes is contested. Despite differences in the use of apostrophes surrounding the various interpunctions regarding Marcus (Marco spondente...Marco sub iudice...etc), editors fundamentally agree regarding the function of the speech-turns — iterating the duties and privileges of the newly-named Marcus.529 I find Braund’s use of multiple sets of apostrophes apt — the remarks imply multiple, distinct events.530 This impressionistic-ironic tapestry demonstrates the use of parataxis for temporal (hypothetical) compression. The presence of conversational phenomena is overt. Turn-initial pronouns/imperatives conform to expected conversational practice. The repeated use of Marcus both generates sermonic repetition and emphasises the subject.531 The iterative nature of the comments — conveying both the proliferation of such events in Persius’ satiric worldview, and the monotony of interrogation one is subjected to for questioning a practice which is sterilis veri — is picked up in the satirist’s retort in haec...haec. This form of dialogic interaction preludes a more detailed sermonic surgery.

Braund and Jenkinson print apostrophes enclosing mendose colligis and haec...tolle; Kiobel does not. I agree with Kiobel’s point regarding the identity of the Stoicus (Persius himself), but I disagree that this precludes the use of apostrophes to indicate vacillation between engaging in hypothetical dialogue and speaking in a satiric aside to the reader. The use of inquit, particularly at the end of a line of hexameter, consistently accompanies a change of speaker from the perspective of the narrator.532 Persius emphasises the fictiveness of his exchange, embodying himself (temporarily) alongside his interlocutor for the amusement of his reader.533 Detailed dialogic interaction is present in line 87. Persius’ self-description directs our attention to his role as a listener.534 His ‘quick apprehension’ is fulfilled in his precise lexical repetition of his

530 The use of dixit and signa imply completed actions and conversational referentiality, respectively.
532 The narrator being the voice that speaks inquit.
534 The importance of ‘ears’ for satiric literary criticism (and indeed Persius’ bodily imagery) are noted in Reckford 1962: 478-482; Bramble 1974: 26.
opponent’s words, reconstituting them into a one-line attack. After the interlocutor’s retort, Persius resumes the more general diatribic mode with the multi-modal *disce* at line 91.535

The exchanges and hypothetical speech in lines 124-131 show a marked increase in elision rate and intertextual conversational phenomena:

‘liber ego’ *unde datum hoc sumis, tot subdite rebus*

*an dominum ignoras, nisi quem vindicta relaxat?*

‘*i puer et strigilis Crispini ad balnea defer*’

*si increpuit ‘cessas nugator?’ servitium acre*

*te nihil impellit nec quidquam extrinsecus intrat,*

*quod nervos agitet ; sed si intus et in iecore aegro*

*nascuntur domini, qui tu impunitior exis*

*atque hic, quem ad strigilis scutica et metus egit erilis?*

‘I’m free’ From where do you draw this conclusion, since you are subject to so many influences? Or do you fail to see a master unless the wand releases you from him? ‘Go, boy, and take Crispinus’ scrapers to the baths.’ If he scolds you ‘are you slow, idiot?’ it’s not fierce slavery that impels you, nothing external enters to control your muscles. But if masters are born inside your sick liver, how do you emerge more unscathed than he whom fear and the masters whips forces to the scrapers.

124-131

535 The use of *disce* to engage a general 2nd person, rather than only a specific interlocutor, is seen in its variations at Pers. 3.66, 73.
Kißel argues that ‘liber ego’ be read in similar fashion to line 126; as rhetorical on the part of the satiric-speaker, rather than belonging to a rhetorical interlocutor.\textsuperscript{536} I agree — the meta-commentary on the ventriloquized response is similar in form to those seen in the third and fourth poems. However, I disagree with Kißel’s statement that there are no indications of increased irritation on the part of Persius (erhöhter gereiztheit).\textsuperscript{13} elisions in 8 lines yields an astronomical rate of 162.5\%. The passage is stuffed, and Persius subjects his straw man to satiric rapid-fire. Indeed, the rhetorical speech-turn (\textit{liber ego}) is barely complicated before Persius interrupts with his critique. The combination of a high elision rate, end-stopping/\textit{Satzvers}, and standard Stoic interrogation in the opening 3 lines is particularly Damasippean. Indeed, the passage in full seems a combination of Horatian and Persian Stoic stylistics. The harsh elision at \textit{servitium acre} is evocative of the harsh Stoic style of 2.3, and leads a more Persian enjambed passage complete with bodily references and satiric updates on philosophic stock analogies.\textsuperscript{537}

The sonic resonance of Damasippus is generated in a passage replete with Horatian references, both overt and subtle. As in the second poem, it seems that Persius conjures the shade of his generic predecessor to not only reinforce the Stoic elements of the satiric tradition, but to take a shadowy jab at the philosophical fence-sitter.\textsuperscript{538} Harvey notes multiple references to Horace’s poetry — of particular interest are \textit{liber ego} and \textit{i puer}.\textsuperscript{539} The first echoes the challenge put to Horace by Davus at 2.7.92 – another example of Persius’ re-presentation of Stoic critique levelled at Horace. That we might read Horace as an implicit target is suggested by the plethora of references and all but confirmed by line 126. Line-initial \textit{i puer} re-iterates Horace’s final line from his first book of satires.\textsuperscript{540} Persius moulds his straw man to the shape

\textsuperscript{536} Kißel 1990: 693.
\textsuperscript{537} \textit{Si intus et in iecore aegro} is evocative of Pers 3.30 \textit{ego te intus et in cute novi} (note the metrical similarity). Persius gives a new twist to the idea of men being worked as dolls by their passions —see Harvey 1981: 162 citing Plato and Marcus Aurelius. See Dinter 2012: 58 on bodily imagery.
\textsuperscript{538} Harvey 1981: 4 notes this tension between constant referentiality and philosophical opposition. Littlewood 2002: 63 notes how Satire 3 also establishes satiric ancestry while deviating from Horace’s philosophical position.
\textsuperscript{539} Harvey 1981: 161-2 noting references in \textit{unde datum}, \textit{servitium acre}...\textit{inpellit, nervos agitet, qui tu inpunitior}, and \textit{scutica}.
\textsuperscript{540} Hor. Sat. 1.10.92.
of Horace — fulfilling Davus’ own Stoic ventriloquism, and iterating Horace’s closing line. The ‘dialogic’ vignette condenses and re-contextualises the tensions and arguments of Horace 2.7 (who is free?) through adopting the former satirist’s Stoic stylistics and then implicating him.

Allusions to Horace continue as the poem quickly transitions from this rhetorical interrogation to abstract personification. Greed and Luxury are given voices: the first resulting in an entertaining conversation, the second in an ominous diatribe. *Avaritia* is treated thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{mane piger stertis. ‘surge’ inquit Avaritia ‘eia} \\
&\text{surge. ‘negas. instat, ‘surge’ inquit. ‘non queo.’ ‘surge.’} \\
&\text{‘et quid agam?’ ‘rogat! en saperdas advehe Ponto,} \\
&\text{castoreum, stuppas, hebennum, tus, lubrica Coa;} \\
&\text{tolle recens primus piper et sitiente camelo;} \\
&\text{verte aliquid, iura.’ ‘sed Iuppiter audiet.’ ‘eheu} \\
&\text{baro, regustatum digitro terebrare salinum} \\
&\text{contentus perages, si vivere cum Iove tendis.’}
\end{align*}
\]

You’re snoring lazily in the morning. ‘Get up’ says Greed, ‘come on, up!’ You refuse. She insists ‘get up’ she says. ‘I can’t’ ‘Up!’ ‘and what shall I do?’ ‘He asks! Look, bring herrings from the black sea, castor, hemp, ebony, incense, glossy Coans. Be first to take fresh pepper from the thirsty camel. Make a deal, swear on it.’ ‘But Jupiter will hear!’ ‘Oh god, you fool, if you want to live with Jupiter you’ll have to be content with scraping away with your finger at the oft-tasted salt-cellar!’

132-139
Harvey notes that the scene is heavily influenced by Horace 2.6, though this vignette does not necessarily implicate him.\footnote{Harvey 1981: 163 —\textit{eia/surge} similar to \textit{eia...urge} 2.6.23-4.} The stichomythic exchanges in 132-133 are peppered with repetition, exclamation, and elision, generating an obviously conversational tone and effecting strong parody of divine-mortal dialogue.\footnote{Repetition of \textit{surge} and \textit{inquit}, both of which are used to effect elision. Exclamations \textit{eia}, \textit{en}, \textit{eheu}. Divine parody in the use of \textit{en} (see Hor. \textit{Sat.} 1.1.15) and potentially \textit{surge} (cf. Verg. \textit{Aen.} 8.59). The consonance of \textit{s} in line 113 perhaps conveying the same sibilant contempt as seen earlier (see also Henderson 1999: 94 on Ov. \textit{Met.} 3.522 Kißel 1990: 700 notes the combination of \textit{eia} with an imperative in Roman comedy.} The blurring of the penthemimeral caesurae through the repeated elision of \textit{surge inquit} is particularly sermonic. The farcical tone is supported also by certain lexical and syntactic features — the use of the third-person \textit{rogat} as an exclamation, and the presence of \textit{baro}.\footnote{Harvey 1981: 163 on \textit{rogat} citing Ter. \textit{Andr.} 877 and Ov. \textit{Am.} 1.8.33-6 (dialogic section). Kißel 1990: 706 on \textit{baro}, noting presence in Lucil.1121 M, Cicero, and Petron. 53.11.} The insistence of \textit{Avaritia} is manifest not only in the repeated use of imperatives, but in consistent exclamatory occupation of the final foot — breaking in to the lines with \textit{eia, surge,} and \textit{eheu}. Sermonic metrics are unified with exclamatory language exemplified in Roman comedy to produce agitated, conversational tone.

Horace’s presence, introduced and implicated in lines 124-131, retained but repressed in 132-139, is conjured again in the speech of Luxuria:

\begin{verbatim}
... ni sollers Luxuria ante
seductum moneat 'quo deinde, insane, ruis, quo?
quid tibi vis? calido sub pectore mascula bilis
intumuit, quam non extinxerit urna cicutaes?
tu mare transsilias? tibi torta cannabe fullo
cena sit in transtro, Vetiientamunque rubellum
exhalet vapida laesum pice sessilis obba?
quid petis? ut nummi, quos hinc quincunce modesto
\end{verbatim}
nutrieras, pergant avidos sudare deunces?

*indulge genio, carpamus dulcia, nostrum est*

*quod vivis; cinis et manes et fabula fies,*

*vive memor leti, fugit hora, hoc quod loquor inde est.*'

Unless sly Luxury takes you aside to warn you ‘And where are you rushing off to now, lunatic? What do you want? Even a jug of hemlock couldn’t quench the macho bile which has swollen beneath your fevered breast. You? Leaping over the sea? You? Having your dinner on the rowers’ bench, reclining on a coiled rope, with a pot-bellied mug reeking of reddish Veientan, spoiled by stale pitch? What for? Do you want the coins which you’ve nurtured here at a modest five per cent to go on to sweat out a greedy eleven? Enjoy yourself, let us seize the good life, life is all we have, you’ll soon be ashes, a ghost, a tale. Live with death in mind. The hour races by and the time I spend talking is subtracted from it.

142-153

Unlike *Avaritia*, *Luxuria* makes no use of exclamations or physical imperatives — the imperatives are abstract (*indulge…vive*) and softened with the inclusive *carpamus dulcia*. However, the intertextual *loci* of the former vignette (Roman Comedy, Horatian poetry) are repeated here, mixed further with a few epic allusions.\(^{544}\) The lack of harsh interjections and the inclusion of Vergilian turns characterise Luxury as more restrained than Greed — demonstrated also in the extensive use of subordinate clauses, the subjunctive mood, and syntactic complexity. Of course, agitation is still present — *insane*, curt questions with *quid* — but to a noticeably lesser degree than *Avaritia*. A further transformation is the shift from elision

\(^{544}\) Harvey 1981: 165-167 notes the many references.
(except for *deinde insane*) to prodelision (*nostrum est, inde est*). This shift can be read in light of the Horatian allusions present in the passage — allusions which are far stronger and more implicative than those in the speech of ‘Greed’.\(^{545}\) The abundance of references not only to Horatian poetry but to Horatian philosophical maxims, especially in the final three lines, seems to re-instate again the pseudo-anti-Horatian agenda of Persius’ philosophical satire.\(^{546}\) Variation in conversational stylistics highlight the nuanced distinctions in the two personifications, and reveal Horace’s shadowy presence underpinning *luxuria*.

Persius continues his dialogic exploration of the problem of freedom in lines 161-173. The opening scene of Terence’s *Eunuchus* is re-constituted with (presumably) Menander’s onomastics and (as usual) a healthy dose of Horatian references: \(^{547}\)

> ‘Dave, cito, hoc credas iubeo, finire dolores
> praeteritos meditor’ (crudum Chaerestratus unguem
> arrodens ait haec) ‘an siccis dedecus obstem
> cognatis? an rem patriam rumore sinistro
> limen ad obscaenum frangam, dum Chrysidis udas
> ebrious ante fores extincta cum face canto?’
> ‘euge puer, sapias, dis depellentibus agnam
> percute.’ ‘sed censen, plorabit, Dave, relicta ?’
> ‘nugaris! solea, puer, obiurgabere rubra,
> ne trepidare velis atque artos rodere casses.
> nunc ferus et violens, at si vocet, haut mora dicas

\(^{545}\) ibid
\(^{547}\) For the names and Menander see Harvey 1981: 171 Kißel 1990: 724 on the scholia.
“quidnam igitur faciam? nec nunc, cum arcessor et ultro supplicet, accedam?” si totus et integer illinc exieras, nec nunc.’ hic hic, quod quaeerimus, hic est non in festuca, lictor quam iactat ineptus.

‘Davus, very soon – you better believe this – I intend to put an end to my sufferings.’ Chaerestratus says this, chewing his bleeding fingernail. ‘Why should I embarrass my sober relations with my scandalous behaviour? Why should I wreck my inheritance at that filthy threshold by getting a bad reputation, drunkenly singing with my torch gone out in front of Chrysis’ dripping door?’ ‘Well done, lad. Be wise, slaughter a lamb for the gods who drive evil away.’ ‘But you don’t think, Davus, she might cry, left alone?’ ‘You’re joking! You’ll get a beating from her red slipper, boy, to stop you struggling and gnawing at her tight nets. Now you are fierce and violent, but if she called you you’d say without delay ‘What shall I do? Shall I not go, even when she invites and positively begs me?’ No, if you have got away whole and in one piece, not even know.’ This, this is what we’re looking for, this is what’s not in the stick waved by the silly lictor!

161-175

Scholars disagree over the attribution of haut mora, producing two alternative interpretations of the final lines.548 The first encloses ‘haut mora’ in apostrophes and attributes it to Davus in the persona of Chaerestratus; quidnam…accedam is then read as direct speech from Ch., and si totus…nec nunc as direct speech from D. The second (printed above) attributes it to Davus as himself, and quidnam..accedam is Davus in persona. Kißel’s objections to the first are strong

548 See Kißel 1990: 734.
– there is no evidence for elliptical haut mora, and interpreting quidnam…accedam as direct speech produces logical and grammatical complexities.\textsuperscript{549} In support of these objections and the second interpretation, I note that the use of the second-person subjunctive ‘verb of speaking’ to ventriloquize one’s interlocutor precedes the hypothetical speech in every other example in the satires of both Horace and Persius.\textsuperscript{550} The use of brackets for the parenthetical insert from the narrator, rather than a break in apostrophes, seems a purely aesthetic choice.\textsuperscript{551}

Given the number of allusions and aggressions towards Horace in the poem, the turn-initial ‘Dave’ recalls Horace’s ill-fated experiences with Stoic ‘philosophers’. This intertextuality is supported by the close modelling of the passage on Horace 2.3.259-71 alongside other resonant poetic constructions. Although Persius quickly clarifies that this sermo is between Davus and Chaerestratus, rather than Davus and Horace, it smacks of (pretended) plausible deniability, as we are constantly bombarded with Horatian language in an ostensibly Horatian vignette.\textsuperscript{552} Persius’ not-so-subtle hints seem to be emphasised 171-173, whose rhetorical structure mirrors that of Davus’ against Horace at 2.7.29-35. ‘Now you act like this, but if you’re invited you’ll say…’ Horace’s satiric superposition as both a self-made man and a garrulous parasite in his relationship to Maecenas is identified by Davus in 2.7, and resonated here.\textsuperscript{553} As in Persius’ second poem, dialogic vignettes in Persius 5 are often composed using Horatian language and referentiality — occasionally to damning effect.

The stylistics of the sermo itself convey Chaerestratus’ vacillation and Davus’ forceful insistence. The fragmented and paratactic opening insists on speed (cito) but is followed by two extended questions, enjambed successively as Chaerestratus rambles on in predominantly spondaic speech.\textsuperscript{554} The consonance of m enclosing rumore gives aural form to the description

\textsuperscript{549} Ibid. Logical in that Chaerestratus’ enthusiasm in ‘haut mora’ would quickly be replaced by strong hesitation, significantly weakening both Davus’ and Persius’ point. Grammatical, in that the indicative in arcessor (and the use of igitur) is incongruent with the subjunctives vocet and dicas.

\textsuperscript{550} Cf. Hor. 1.1.55, 2.6.39, Pers 1.23.

\textsuperscript{551} Cf. Braund and Kißel’s editions.

\textsuperscript{552} Harvey 1981: 171-172 noting finire…meditor from Horace’s mediter finire dolores, the shipwreck at 164-5 from Horace 2.3.18-20, rem patriam for Hor. 1.2.62 rem patris oblimare.

\textsuperscript{553} For this joke in Horace’s satires see Sharland 2010: 96.

\textsuperscript{554} 13 dactyls to 17 spondees (including long anceps).
of Chaerestratus arrodens.\textsuperscript{555} The strong elisions in Davus’ parody of Chaerestratus is emotive. The use of the principal caesurae and new lines to transition between speakers allows for measured transitions, save for Chaerestratus’ \textit{sed censen} which is given a more jarring metrical position. The structure of the \textit{sermo} is iterative. Davus’ initial response mirrors Chaerestratus’ opening, constructed with exclamations, vocatives, and parataxis.\textsuperscript{556} Repetition of form is thus established between the two speakers, and is carried through to the next turns. Both vocatives are repeated, and the fragmented \textit{censen, plorabit, Dave, relicta} is mirrored in \textit{nugaris...rubra}.\textsuperscript{557} The final instance of repetition functions twofold – Davus both re-contextualises the ventriloquised \textit{nec nunc} to undermine its original function, and through this responds to Chaerestratus’ iterated \textit{an...an}. Iterative structures, as argued throughout this thesis, convey iterative events – this is neither the first nor last time we are to imagine this conversation taking place. The sequencing also characterises Davus as both an attentive listener and a clever rhetorician, mirroring and mimicking his interlocutor — a suitable portrayal given his role as satirist in the vignette.

The final piece of dialogue is the voice of \textit{Ambitio}:

\begin{flushleft}
\textit{cretata Ambitio? 'vigila et cicer ingere large}
\textit{rixanti populo, nostra ut Floralia possint}
\textit{aprici meminisse senes.' ‘quid pulchrius!' at cum}
\end{flushleft}

177-179

Most recent editors read \textit{vigila} to \textit{senes} as the speech of \textit{Ambitio} — the arguments put forward by Harvey and Kißel disarm the less-popular alternatives.\textsuperscript{558} The attribution of \textit{quid pulchrius

\textsuperscript{555} For \textit{crudum...haec} signifying that Chaerestratus has been talking to himself, see Kißel 1990: 726. This would align with other consonant examples of ‘talking to oneself’ — cf. Hor.1.4.134-137, Persius 3.83-84. For \textit{rumore} as a similar sound to \textit{murmur}, see Lewis and Short \textit{rumore II}.

\textsuperscript{556} Dave – puer, cito – euge, parataxis of \textit{sapias} and \textit{percute}.

\textsuperscript{557} Harvey 1981: 173 on \textit{censen}.

\textsuperscript{558} See Harvey 1981: Kißel 1990: 740-742
is more complicated. Kißel argues that the use of *pulchrius* is likely a reaction to the election gifts, and is position indicates it belongs to a third interlocutor – one of the *senes aprici*. I agree with Kißel, and note also that *at* is often used in Persius to affect a transition of speaker. The use of *meminisse* directs our attention to possible hypothetical speech, in similar function to other meta-dialogic constructions (*da verba, suffla, dicas* etc). The heightened elision rate and enjambment in the speech of *Ambitio* is particularly sermonic.

**Summary: Satire 5**

Persius’ most ‘chatty’ poem features a plethora of vignettes, the stylistics of which are modulated to produce various effects. In particular, the use of repetition in several dialogues conveys the iterative nature of the problems such *sermones* serve to illustrate. Careful use of repetition and resonance also demonstrates that Persius is a satirist *aurem mordaci lotus aceto*, a satirist who chews up the speech of his ludicrous straw men and spits it back into their faces. This quality, seen also in several interactions throughout the corpus, is transferred also to the satiric figure of Davus.

**Satire 6**

The final poem, despite being potentially unfinished, draws together many of the dialogic-poetic themes and motifs of Persius’ satire: his paradoxical conversational seclusion, his emphasis on self-sufficiency, and his struggle to embrace and escape from Horatian

---

559 A full explanation of the possibilities can be found in Jenkinson 1980: 91-2.
560 Kißel 1990: 742.
561 For the relationship between *meminisse* and speech see Lewis and Short *memini* II.
The perceived softening of the poet’s vitriolic Stoicism is, curiously, paired with the highest elision rate of the collection; ~72%. This further demonstrates either a conscious inversion of the stylistic relationship between elision and Stoicism established by Horace, or a rejection of maintaining one at all. The Satzvers rate is a modest 14% — a decrease from the ‘philosophical’ trio of 3-5 — as the second half is particularly enjambed in Persius’ conversation with his heir.

Line 27 marks the first ingression of rhetorical speech.

‘ast vocat officium: trabe rupta bruttia saxa
prendit amicus inops remque omnem surdaque vota
condidit Ionio, iacet ipse in litore et una
ingentes de puppe dei, iamque obvia mergis
costa ratis lacertae.’ nunc et de caespite vivo

‘But duty calls, a shipwrecked friend clings to the Bruttian rocks, penniless, his entire wealth and his unheard prayers sunk in the Ionian Sea. He himself is stretched out on the shore together with the huge gods from the stern and already the ribs of his shattered boat are exposed to the gulls.’ Now break off a portion of your…

27-31

Editors note this speech belongs to an interlocutor, rather than to Bassus. This is apt — Persius has already left his epistolary friend far behind, having utilised the second person to engage

---

abstract concepts (horoscope) and having shifted the subject of conversation to the proper use of one’s economy. However, some features of the speech do align with the description of Bassus at lines 3-6.\textsuperscript{563} Turn-initial archaic \textit{ast}, the high rate of elision, and the lack of end-stopping or \textit{Satzvers} all work together to studiously avoid Neoteric stylistics — perhaps conveying Bassus’ ‘archaic style’.\textsuperscript{564} Tension, then, exists between the relative anonymity of the interlocutor and the ‘Bassic’ stylistics deployed. Such tension is by no means novel in Persius – the satiric technique of ‘show, don’t tell’ has been demonstrated in his repeated aggressions on Horace. That such a technique should be redeployed against one of Horace’s alleged imitators is not surprising.\textsuperscript{565}

There is considerable disagreement over the attribution of lines 33–40.\textsuperscript{566}

\begin{quote}
... ‘sed cenam funeris heres

\textit{negleget iratus, quod rem curtaveris; urnae}
\textit{ossa inhonora dabit, seu spirent cinnama sordum}
\textit{seu ceraso pecent castiae, nescire paratus.}

\textit{“tune bona incolumnis minuas?”’ et Bestius urget}
\textit{doctores Graios: ‘ita fit: postquam sapere urbi}
\textit{cum pipere et palmis venit nostrum hoc maris expers,}
\textit{faenisecae crasso vitiarunt unguine pultes.’}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{563} \textit{mire opifex numeris veterum primordia vocum | atque marem strepitum fidis intendisse Latinae, | mox iuvenes agitare locos et police honesto | egregious lusisse senes.}
\textsuperscript{564} Kiessel 1990: 803 on \textit{ast}. Harvey 1981: 191-192 notes the following as evocative or parodic of non-satiric poetry – \textit{trabe, rupta, ingentes…dei, obvia mergis}. Artful also is the syllepsis at 28-9 — see Harvey 1981: 191.
\textsuperscript{565} Hooley 1993: 144 and Reckford 2008: 378 on Bassus and ‘Horatianism’.
\textsuperscript{566} This is given a full discussion in Jenkinson 1980: 116-117.
‘But your heir, angry that you are diminishing your wealth, will skimp on the funeral banquet. He will commit your bones to the urn unperfumed, not bothering to find out if the cinnamon smells dull or if the cassia is tainted with cherry. “Are you diminishing your fortune unharmed?!”’ and Bestius blames the Greek professors: ‘That’s the trouble. Ever since this emasculated know-how of ours arrived in Rome along with peppers and dates, the haycutters have spoiled their porridge with thick oil.’

I agree with Jenkinson and Kißel who attribute sed...minuas to a rhetorical interlocutor, with tune...minuas being an imitation of an angry heir.567 However, I disagree with Kißel who states that ‘Form, Inhalt, und Tendenz’ of this speaker matches that of 27-31.568 Strong enjambment and opposition to Persius’ satiric personae are perhaps the only similarities between their stylistics. The pseudo-poetic, quasi-Archaic register of the previous speaker has little in common with the restrained elision and comic-satiric vocabulary featured here.569 The satiric microlect above is complemented by diatribic use of the second person and hypothetical speech. These observations, however, do not necessitate disagreement with Kißel and Jenkinson’s identification of a single rhetorical interlocutor (avarus or ‘objector’), but they do serve to highlight the marked stylistic differences. Elision and archaisms are evoked to reflect Bassus, satiric vocabulary to echo the generic tradition of discussing inheritance. The stylistics of both hypothetical snippets correspond to their characters. Turn-initial and emphatic tune precedes elision. The presence of the substantival infinitive sapere, the prosaic faenisecae, and a high elision rate, render Bestius’ speech as rather ‘down to earth.’570

567 Harvey 1981: 192 notes only that it is an ‘objection’, though the lack of apostrophes in the schema on page 181 may indicate that he considers the speech solely Persius’.
568 Kißel 1990: 809.
569 Harvey 1981: 193 noting curtaveris, the Horace-esque negation with inodora.
From line 41 Persius engages in a hypothetical dialogue with his heir (*quisquis eris*) whose presence is re-affirmed in the following:

\[ an \ prohibes? \ dic \ clare! \ 'non \ adeo' \ inquis \]
\[ 'exossatus \ ager \ iuxta \ est.' \ age, \ si \ mihi \ nulla \]

51-52

The use of *inquis* emphasises the mediated nature of the conversation, rather than the unintroduced, potentially disruptive interlocutors prior. I disagree with Kißel, who reads the use of *inquis* merely as a tool of non-dialogic/dramatic (nicht dramatischen) literature to indicate speakers.571 The use of *quisquis eris* in conjunction with *inquis* forces the reader to confront that this conversation is purely hypothetical — more so than the presence of the former interlocutors. This allows, perhaps, for the generation of self-irony — Persius’ aggressive tone, generated through emphatic juxtaposing pronouns and imperatives (as is carried through to the end of the *sermo*) is directed towards a strawman of his own making.

The position of *inquis* at the end of the verse is common, though the harsh elision at *adeo inquis* to separate the speech-turn is jarring. In combination with the paratactic questions, imperatives, an agitated satirist shines through. Similar stylistics are employed throughout as the *sermo* continues, though the hypothetical mood introduced through *inquis* fades to the background.

New lines are used for heir’s next two speech turns: the strong use of natural metrical pauses, imperatives, and emphatic pronouns are continued:

\[ ... \ praesto \ est \ mihi \ Manius \ heres. \]

571 Kißel 1990: 836.
‘progenius terrae?’ quaere ex me quis mihi quartus

56-57

... an renuis? vis tu gaudere relictis?

‘dest aloquid summae.’ minui mihi, sed tibi totum est,

63-4

Note the iterated structure: end-stopped line, new speech-turn, transition at the penthemimeral caesura, and consonance: quaere...quis...quartus and minui mihi, tibi totum. The hypothetical mood is returned to in the fourth exchange:

...ubi sit fuge quarere, quod mihi quondam

legarat Tadius, neu dicta 'pone paterna,

fenoris accedat merces, hinc exime sumptus:

quid reliquum est?’ reliquum? nunc nunc impensius ungue,

unge, puer, caules...

Don’t ask where the sum that Tadius bequeathed me long ago is, and don’t say ‘Write down your inheritance from your father, add the revenue of interest, subtract the expenses, what’s left?’ Left? Come on come on and pour, boy, pour thickly…

65-69

572 The second alliteration noted by Harvey 1981: 200.
neu dicta has proven vexing for editors. Most recent editors read it as functionally imperative, if somewhat lexically ambiguous. If so, Persius again makes use of verbs of speaking to shift the dialogic frame of reference to the hypothetical – it is clearly the satirist speaking for his heir. Persius’ self-inflicted irritation is conveyed, again, through strong use of repetition and imperatives. Indeed, Harvey notes that this double repetition (*nunc nunc, ungue ungue*) is rare in Persius’ work — perhaps conveying the satirist at his most irate.

The final piece of dialogic interaction of the poem, and the collection, distils both the humour and the hopelessness of Persius’ Stoic-Satiric enterprise. His exasperated and sarcastic advice (*rem duplica*) is taken all too literally:

\[ rem duplica. \textit{feci: iam triplex, iam mihi quarto,} \]
\[ \textit{iam decies redit in rugam; depunge ubi sistam.} \]

The rhetorical figure breaks in at the second foot — Persius’ agitation is transformed into the heir’s excitement, manifest in the elliptical *feci* and strong repetition (*iam*). In return for his heir’s (deliberate?) miscomprehension of Persius’ irony, the satirist takes him literally — *depunge ubi sistam* marking the end of not only the heir’s presence but Persius’ sermones.

**Summary: Satire 6**

Persius’ final poem demonstrates the satirist’s consistent vacillation between dialogic modalities. Strong use of iterative structures and aggressive dialogic phenomena characterise

---

573 Harvey 1981: 200 noting Housman’s complaints and subsequent conjecture of *dic ita*, which Harvey notes as seeming ‘a trifle weak.’ For a fuller history of the issue see Kiessel 1990: 847.
574 For the literal sense of ‘folding’ for multiplication and its relation to *rugam* see Harvey 1981: 203-204.
575 Harvey 1981: 204 on *depunge*.
his final *sermo. nempe haec adsidue* – perhaps the excision of anger in Persius 3 lasts only so long.

**Speech-Turns**

The analysis above yields the following chart of speech-turns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turns</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>1 MC</th>
<th>1 FC</th>
<th>2 Initial</th>
<th>2 MC</th>
<th>3 MC</th>
<th>4 MC</th>
<th>5 Initial</th>
<th>5 FC</th>
<th>6 Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marked use of new-lines, primary caesurae, and the beginning of the sixth foot reflects the general patterns seen also in Horace. Persius is far more restrictive in where speech-turns take place – use of the feminine caesurae is extremely rare, and Persius makes use of 10 different metrical positions as opposed to Horace’s 14. Comparing the two poets, one also sees a sharp drop in the use of the bucolic diaeresis in Persius – used only ~5% of the time (7/143) as opposed to Horace’s 14% (49/341). These conclusions seem to map to our general understanding of Persius as a satiric poet – more exacting with his language and metrics, and less idyllic.\(^{576}\)

**Chapter Conclusion**

Persius’ sermonic identity is one of imitation, repetition, and allusion. In contrast to Horace’s easily recognisable voice and interlocutors, Persius’ conversations are unified only by the latent

\(^{576}\) Perhaps shifting further away from its inverse, pastoral poetry – see Relihan 1989: 148.
anger which underpins them. The satirist’s position as a self-isolationist is reflected in his choice to filter his rhetorical interlocutors predominantly through the works of the more dialogically inclined — namely, Horace. Rhetorical interlocution is approached with tongue firmly in cheek — the expected ‘suspension of disbelief’ is dropped early in the collection, and Persius’ ludicrous straw men are constructed only to have their own words twisted against them, or their deleterious wishes cynically fulfilled.

According to the analysis above, Persius repeats several stylistic aspects of *sermo* seen in Horace. There is a general concentration of repetition, ellipsis, parataxis, asyndeton, proverbial speech, and conversational phenomena seen in other dialogic texts (such as vocabulary prevalent in comedy, satire etc.) Variations in rates of elision and end-stopping are often paired with the modulation of such phenomena to produce juxtaposing or complementary microlects. Nisbet’s contention that ‘all of Persius’ characters speak like Persius’ is true only if comparing the cohort with the individual – otherwise, there are marked differences between the aggressive yet philosophical end-stopping of Socrates, the agitated prayer of the greedy man and the superstitious request of the nurse, the hurried and pleading ‘sick man’ and the vignettes of restrained urban gossip.

In light of the analysis above, Nisbet’s contention that all of Persius’ characters speak like Persius can only remain valid if the speakers are unified by their disunity.577 Unlike his satiric predecessors, Persius does not establish a stable voice of his own (in contrast to the more consistent elision rate of Horace’s own voice) — nor does he reproduce similar relationships between philosophic and stylistic expression in the style of Horace and Epicureanism/Stoicism. Each vignette is a world unto itself — deriving mode of expression more from its intertextuality, than an underlying schema. One of the more interesting results of this analysis is Persius’ self-alignment with the figure of Davus in Horace 2.7. Two observations from other scholars may help to explain this move. Cucchiarelli has argued that Horace 2.7 presents the ‘birth of Satire’ in the form of the liberated Davus on the Saturnalia.578 McNelis, among others, notes that Persius aligns his poetry closely with the aggressive iambic tradition — ‘Persius reclaims for

---

577 Nisbet 1963: 56.
578 Cucchiarelli 2012: 165.
The mask of Davus presents the image of both the quintessential outsider and the foundational satiric spirit. Persius’ adoption of and adaptation to Horace’s slave positions his poetry as antagonistic towards his predecessor, but nonetheless indebted to his output. Horatian satire might not work for Nero’s Rome, but perhaps Davus’ does.\footnote{McNelis 2012: 252.}

\footnote{Osgood 2012: 3 we are ‘constantly reminded that Horatian satire doesn’t work for Nero’s Rome.’ See also Tzounakas 2005: 571 for this.}
Chapter Four: Decimus Junius Juvenalis

Introduction

This thesis has, in many places, attempted to answer that perennial question (*qui parle?*) which haunts readers of Latin satire. Although I have approached this problem as one pertaining to character-speakers within the text, it is also one that has been considered through the lens of authorial historicity. When thus considered, the question appears to become more difficult to answer as one progresses through the satirists in chronological order. Viewing the authors in generic and diachronic succession, Juvenal completes the trend of the progressively retreating satirist — fading into an obscurity that Geue describes as anonymity, deliberate or otherwise. 581

*Qui parle?* No idea, really.

This historical lacuna, however, is no impediment to the sermonic analysis of the text; *au contraire*, it streamlines it. The multi-dimensional puzzles of Horace’s political relationships and Persius’ philosophical education are manifest only through the authors’ insistence on seasoning (Horace) or sprinkling (Persius) their works with biographical details. Juvenal does no such thing. 582 For current intents and purposes, Juvenal *is* his poetry.

A diachronic mindset also highlights a curious paradox of Juvenal’s work/being — one that is particularly relevant to the study of *sermo*. Although Juvenal advances Persius’ ‘satiric isolation’, it also seems as if he returns some particularly Lucilian features to Latin satire. 583 Keane writes that Juvenal’s ‘most notable contribution to satire is colorful, sustained narrative of human activities’ and that he takes us ‘to the homes of the great, and even to foreign parts, to show us what he is attacking.’ 584 Alongside his ‘cinematic’ documentation of human (Roman) life is his supposed ‘collecting’ of accompanying *sermo*. 585 This dual-focus on contemporary human activity and manifestations of *sermo*, coupled with his variety of speech and speakers, is reminiscent of Lucilius (at least, from what we can tell and how he is received

582 Ibid.
583 For readings of Juvenal ‘re-claiming’ Lucilian aspects of satire see McNelis 2012: 261
584 Keane 2003: 257.
585 For Juvenal as ‘cinematic’ see Jones 2007: 150. Supposed, as he self-presents as a satirist writing what he witnesses – see my analysis of the first poem.
in the other poets.) As a corpus, the works of Juvenal radiate deliberate anonymity and a re-fashioned Lucilian interest in language, complete with conversational variation and linguistic commentary.586

Scholars have often discussed Juvenal’s work with reference to a ‘progression’ from indignation to quasi-ironic philosophizing.587 This chapter will demonstrate that a concurrent progression is also at play — one which sees Juvenal shift from an on-the-ground anonymous correspondent to an epistolary satirist re-working generic conversations. However, as recent scholarship has sought to call readings of a linear progression of Juvenal’s satiric philosophy into question, so too must I state from the outset that this general sermonic trend is not without deviations.588 What can be said with reasonable certainty, and will be argued henceforth, is that conversational variation tends to concentrate in the earlier poems, and that there seems to be a correlation with conversational stylistics and poems overtly engaged with Juvenal’s contemporary society — rather than poems which adhere more closely to satiric mainstays. Therefore, the reader will find that the analysis in this chapter is weighted unevenly — the earlier poems have a greater wealth of material to discuss, and some of the later poems are given only a passing mention.

Text and Speakers

I work from J. Willis’ 1997 edition of the text and note where my reading diverges. The primary commentaries referred to are Courtney’s (2013 reprint), and the 2007 reprint of Mayor’s. Braund’s Loeb is utilised for comparing punctuation and speaker-distribution.

Quantitative Analysis

586 For Juvenal commenting on linguistic phenomena, see Fögen 2014.
The following table shows the rates of elision and *Satzvers* across the poems, as well as relative to ‘rhetorical speech’ and the satirist’s narration. These figures will be used to contextualise analysis of specific instances of these phenomena within the poems, as well as to compare the overall stylistics of the satirists studied.

**Table 12 Rates of Elision and Satzvers in Juvenal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Elision Rate</th>
<th>Satzvers Rate</th>
<th>Elision Rate</th>
<th>Satzvers Rate</th>
<th>Elision Rate</th>
<th>Satzvers Rate</th>
<th>Elision Rate</th>
<th>Satzvers Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>33%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14%</strong></td>
<td><strong>29%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 shows the metrical position of speaker transitions in the text, as well as the amount of rhetorical speech relative to the poem. Those marked with an asterisk feature an elision at the speaker boundary.
Table 13 Speech-Turns in Juvenal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>F. Speech Lines</th>
<th>Turns</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3FC</th>
<th>3MC</th>
<th>4MC</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5 FC</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>% F. Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 (1*)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3832</td>
<td>211.5</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In keeping with the practice seen in the works of Horace and Persius, Juvenal predominantly utilises new lines, primary caesurae, and the bucolic diaeresis to change speaker. A return to marked use of the beginning of the fifth foot for speaker transitions maps to our understanding of Juvenal as invoking a particularly ‘epic’ register (coincidentally, using that metrical position at the same rate as Horace).

Satire 1

Following the practice of his two predecessors, Juvenal incepts his satiric oeuvre with a question: *semper ego auditor tantum?* Where Horace’s opening defined his position as the primary interlocutor in conversation with Maecenas, and Persius carved out his idiosyncratic style of embittered self-examination (*quis leget haec?*), Juvenal’s introductory interrogation highlights a crucial aspect of his metapoetic positioning, and foreshadows a thematic aspect of his *sermo*. Juvenal fashions himself as a chronicler of Rome’s moral ailments and, accordingly, of the people and conversations which manifest them. Juvenal establishes himself as the satiric *auditor* — a poet who is *subjected* to the poetry and dialogue of others. We are thus invited both to *join* Juvenal in listening to the speech of others, and to *endure* Juvenal’s own brand of satiric *sermo*. 

---

Table 13 Speech-Turns in Juvenal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>F. Speech Lines</th>
<th>Turns</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3FC</th>
<th>3MC</th>
<th>4MC</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5 FC</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>% F. Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 (1*)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3832</td>
<td>211.5</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satire 1 contains the second highest amount of rhetorical speech relative to its length, and the sources of speech are numerous.\textsuperscript{589} Elision rates are stable when comparing narration to speech — though qualitative analysis shows adroit use of it in particular scenarios. The rate of Satzvers and end-stopping is markedly higher in speech as opposed to narration; a quantitative value that reflects Juvenal’s predilection for new-lines to change speakers, and for pithy conversational finishers. This poem also features speech-turns which change addressee abruptly — see the analysis on lines 123-126. Internal changes of addressee have been seen before, though Persius confines such phenomena to the intrusion of the plural on the singular, and the shift from conversation to diatribe.\textsuperscript{590} Juvenal, here and in other poems, uses it to animate multi-speaker ( > 2) scenes.

After 100 lines of hexameter, a speaker other than the satiric narrator finally arrives:

\begin{verbatim}
agnitus accipies. iubet a praecone vocari
ipsos Troiugenas, nam vexant limen et ipsi
nobiscum. ‘da praetori, da deinde tribuno.’
sed libertinus prior est. ‘prior’ inquit ‘ego adsum.
cur timeam dubitemve locum defendere, quamvis
natus ad Euphraten, molles quod in aure fenestrae
arguerint, licet ipse negem? sed quinque tabernae
quadriringenta parant. quid confert purpura maior
optandum, si Laurenti custodit in agro
conductas Corvinus oves, ego possideo plus
Pallante et Licinis?’ exspectent ergo tribuni
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{589} Sources including a praeco, a freedman, a clever cliens, and a rhetorical interlocutor.
\textsuperscript{590} Pers 3.66 in particular.
Once recognised, you’ll receive. He tells the herald to summon even the Trojan-born elite – they too besiege the threshold with us. ‘Pay the praetor, then pay the tribune.’ But a freedman is before them. ‘I was here first,’ he says, ‘Why shouldn’t I stand my ground without fear or hesitation, even though I was born on the Euphrates? A fact that the womanly windows in my ears would proclaim, even if I denied it myself. But my five shops give me an income of four hundred thousand. What more can the broader purple stripe bestow, if a Corvinus herds leased sheep of Laurentine land while I own more than Pallas and people like Licinus.’ So let the tribunes wait…

101-109

The extract above is the first instantiation of ‘dialogue’ in the corpus, and displays several features of rhetorical dialogue that are quasi-thematic in Juvenal’s Satires — features stylistic, and narratological. We see marked use of the primary caesurae and line-breaks to change speaker, save for line 103. The use of the strong caesura in the second foot to change speaker is more prevalent in Juvenal than his predecessors. This semi-standard position, coupled with the imperative da and a lack of authorial introduction (cf. the inquit which introduces the speech of the freedman), engenders a somewhat rough transition. The repetition and parataxis are, by this stage, familiar phenomena — delineating the unannounced voice as belonging to the scene envisioned in the lines prior, and not the continued narration.

The narratological framework of this excerpt is emblematic not only of Juvenal’s general use of rhetorical interlocutors, but indeed Juvenal’s sermonic position which the poet stakes out in this very poem:

---

591 Roughly 8% of turns occur at this position in Juvenal – compare with 7% for Persius and 5% for Horace.
592 See also the parataxis in lines 107-109, noted in Courtney 2013: 87.
Juvenal’s dramatization of his satiric activity sets him apart from his generic predecessors and indeed the public he so prolifically (capaces) scrutinises. A brief comparison of the prior satirists’ sermonic positioning informs this reading. Lucilius’ famed libertas is identified not only by his Roman successors — Breed writes that the posthumously proclaimed progenitor was ‘nobody’s client, and had no need to wear a mask’. His account of the dispute between Scaevola and Albucius indicates that he was by no means averse to ‘documenting’ public and political affairs which took place in the heart of Rome — an act which Horace seems to deliberately shy away from. Horace’s sermones feign the life and times of a private citizen; Book 1 is (predominantly) a one-sided conversation with Maecenas, and Book 2 are eavesdropped conversations. The work’s self-conscious referentiality alludes to the secluded composition of his works, and their private reception amongst friends. Fragments of Horace’s more-public interactions are presented as memories, physically dislocated from the ‘stage’ of the Satires themselves. Persius takes this seclusion further. Scribimus inclusi, secrete loquimur — his libellus is not just invitation-only (as in Horace), it is suppressed, possibly dangerous, and metaphorically buried in an unmarked grave. The conversations are unanswered epistles, vigorous self-interrogation, anachronistic interventions in Plato — the only glimmer of a third-party (intervening between Persius and himself) in the entire collection.

595 Horace Sat. 1.4. 72-75, 10.78-92, 2.3.1-16.
596 Satires 1.9 and 2.6 especially.
597 Pers 1.120
is Cornutus, occupying a scant 14 lines.\textsuperscript{598} We see, then, a marked withdrawal of the Satirist from public life and conversation across these three authors. Where do we place Juvenal?

The answer rests on understanding two key aspects of Juvenal’s poetry. The first is his anonymity. Geue’s seminal monograph on the topic elaborates on previous identifications of Juvenal’s ‘selflessness’ — the lacuna of autobiographical detail, the conversations with unidentifiable interlocutors, the lack of a persistent persona — and highlights the use of speech to further this anonymous agenda.\textsuperscript{599} Juvenal engages ‘gossip and displaced speech’, avoiding confrontation, and renders his own satiric voice (through which we might come to know him) impossible to pin down, appearing in disjointed geographical and philosophical terrains seemingly at random, only to disappear without a trace. In this regard, the generic withdrawal of the satiric persona from public engagement is ostensibly complete.\textsuperscript{600} Barthes’ famous qui parle is answered by the text: personne.\textsuperscript{601}

Juvenal’s anonymity defines the primary point of view of the satiric narrator — it colours one half of any and every conversation within the corpus, rhetorical or otherwise. The second aspect to consider, underpinning but not necessarily defining the speech of ‘the other’, is Juvenal’s prolific and aggressive engagement with his own satiric world, naturally centred on Rome but nonetheless extending outwards to the borders of the empire.\textsuperscript{602} This is neither the oft-intruded space of amicitia created by Horace, nor Persius’ isolated and feverish laboratory (aliquid decoctius), but an entire empire, however impressionistically it is presented to us.\textsuperscript{603} Indeed, as Uden notes, Juvenal’s Lucilius functions as an analogy to describe the socio-political task of his own satire — to attack ‘contemporary’ wrongdoing.\textsuperscript{604} Like his construction of

\textsuperscript{598} Pers. 5.5-19.
\textsuperscript{599} Geue 2017: 9 notes that Uden 2014 approached this topic in relation to oratorical practices and the second sophistic, whereas Geue himself analyses the corpus against a socio-political backdrop.
\textsuperscript{600} This idea of a generic vanishing act has its roots in Fiske 1920: 87 (‘…Persius and Juvenal, with their increasing tendency to suppress even the shadowy outlines of the adversarius.’) Witke 1962: 156 (‘Horace wins his audience with a smile…Persius weaves the audience into himself by engulfing them…Juvenal excoriates [them].’) Keane 2018: 222 (Lucilius’ satire is far truer to the idea of sermo than the later authors.)
\textsuperscript{601} Geue 2017: 8 on the obsession of satiric scholars with Barthes’ challenge.
\textsuperscript{602} Juvenal’s world is created through an archaeology of Roman culture - this process is articulated in the introduction to Uden’s 2014 monograph.
\textsuperscript{603} Discussed in Fratantuono 2015: 150 and at length in Umurhan’s 2018 book Juvenal’s Global Awareness.
\textsuperscript{604} Uden 2014: 32-35. ‘Contemporary’ in quotation marks as Juvenal claims to only attack the dead. See also Nappa 2013: 409.
Lucilius, Juvenal figures himself a satiric vigilante operating in public. Unlike Lucilius, the satirist is now a faceless, disembodied voice, and the public are nameless shadows. Satire as a genre has simultaneously come full circle and continued its spiral into authorial obscurity: it is once again publicly engaged, but the satirist is, for the most part, a silent observer — an anonymous, omniscient presence in a world devoid of named-names.\(^{605}\)

With these observations in mind, it is striking that the first rhetorical interlocution featured in the corpus encapsulates these themes. Juvenal’s presence at the scene is established (nobiscum), yet downplayed — the conversation takes place before him, and both the satirist and his invited audience (accipies) are scarcely involved. The degradation of Roman values displayed in the conversation is subjected not to satiric intervention, but merely to transcription. The scene, as it were, speaks for itself. The double imperative directed towards the praeco invokes the ‘natural’ master-slave relationship, yet leads a speech-turn which itself introduces the inversion of the expected social hierarchies — a praetor and a tribune should not be receiving the sportula.\(^{606}\) Indeed, the strong commands issued to the slave reference a social structure that seems almost laughable in light of the speech of the freedman, who is rich enough to be an equestrian, and bold enough to take a place before the magistrates.\(^{607}\) The freedman’s self-absorption requires little stylistic exegesis — emphatic use of the first person pronoun, aggregate use of first-person verbs (adsum, timeam, dubitem), and conversational referentiality centred predominantly around his being (position, description of dress) all communicate what Juvenal presents as an over-inflated ego. The relationship between the two utterances, then, is not only the establishment and continuation of scene: the first recalls the traditional Roman social structure, and the second evinces its inversion.

The sportula scene continues, and more direct speech is offered as proof of the complete breakdown of the client-patron relationship:

---

\(^{605}\) This idea is an extension of Ehrhardt’s (2014: 486) reading of Juvenal’s persona in Juv. 15.

\(^{606}\) Braund 1996: 99.

hic petit absenti nota iam callidus arte
ostendens vacuam et clausam pro coniuge sellam.

‘Galla mea est.’ inquit, ‘citius dimitte. moraris?
profer, Galla, caput. noli vexare; quiescit.’

Here someone skilled at a familiar trick makes a claim for his absent wife, displaying an empty, curtained sedan in her stead. ‘That’s my Galla,’ he says ‘quickly deal with us. You hesitate? Poke your head out, Galla. Don’t disturb her, she’s resting.’

The punctuation is mostly unproblematic. The use of asyndeton and parataxis conveys the nervous hurry (citius) the hustler is in — a rather stark contrast to the loquacious self-aggrandising of the freedman. Dialogue shows the degradation of social structures — here, the institution of marriage is used as a farcical shield for greed.

Juvenal is privy to, but not complicit in, the events surrounding the handout of the sportula. The event is described in vivid, present-tense narration, but the cornerstones of the vignette are the clips of conversation which incriminate the speakers. The vignette is thus a satiric collage — utterances are collected supposedly ‘in the field’, and then re-presented in a framework which analyses them as part of an interlinked and deep-running problem. As such, the dialogue is constructed to be mimetic — of the morals of the speakers, of the social structures they engage with, and of the conversational scene portrayed. This stylistic construction is itself contrastive with the other use of rhetorical speech in this poem — address to the satirist himself:

608 Braund 2004: 142 puts a separate pair of apostrophes around noli...quiescit in the Loeb, possibly indicating that they read speech from the praeco. However, in the commentary from the same author, they follow the standard attribution (Braund 1996: 102 ‘The husband’s words, first to the slave distributing the dole, then to his wife, then to the slave again.’) Courtney 2013: 90 argues that the most ‘lively’ reading attributes noli...quiescere to the dispensator. Either reading functions for the analysis of phenomena.
...dicas hic forsitan ‘unde ingenium par materiae? unde illa priorum scribendi quodcumque animo flagrante liberet simplicitas?’ cuius non audio dicere nomen? quid refert dictis ignoscat Mucius an non? ‘pone Tigellinum, taeda lucebis in illa qua stantes ardent qui fixo guttura fumant, <quorum informe unco trahitur post fata cadaver> et latum media sulcum deducit harena.’ qui dedit ergo tribus patruis aconita, vehatur pensilibus plumis atque illinc despiciat nos? ‘cum veniat contra, digito compesce labellum: accusator erit qui verbo dixerit “hic est.”’

Perhaps you might say ‘From where comes the talent to match the subject? From where, that frankness of those prior for writing whatever their burning spirits liked?’ Whose name do I not dare to say? What does it matter if Mucius forgives my works or not? ‘Describe Tigellinus: you’ll burn on that torch where man stand, burning and smoking with their throats fastened <until your shapeless cadaver is dragged by a hook after your fate> and traces a broad furrow straight across the arena.’ He who gives aconite to three uncles, shall I let him be carried by on swaying feather-cushions and thence look down on us? ‘When he comes by, hold your finger to your lips: he who says ‘It’s him’ will be an informer!’
The introduction of a rhetorical interlocutor proper — one who addresses the narrator, rather than provides a dislocated vignette — is signalled by the satirist, and given the aniceps to announce their emphatic unde. This initial interlocution sets the tone for the rhetorical conversation; this is not an embodied scene in the style of the previous vignettes, but rather an abstract, metapoetic interrogation. Fittingly, the conversational referentiality seen earlier is conspicuously absent; even the imperative compesce in the interlocutor’s follow-up is relegated to an imagined or future scenario (veniat). Note also how the satirist’s engagement with sermo changes. The previous, embodied silence is replaced with direct response and re-interrogation; Juvenal’s attitude of ‘non-confrontation’ does not seem to extend to these rhetorical inquiries. The contrast between these two states builds on the general reading of his persona (or rather lack thereof) offered by Geue: as a public individual, Juvenal is an anonymous, silent bystander. But as a satirist and poet, he is interactive and engaged. The irony of his comment at lines 158-159 is that, as far as we can tell, the morally corrupt do pass by unhindered — Juvenal’s vengeance is enacted after the fact, and while he imagines (dices) himself a strong interlocutor, he presents himself as a silent enabler. Juvenal never actually says ‘hic est’.

Summary: Juvenal 1

Juvenal ends his poem in rhetorical dialogue with an interlocutor, conforming to generic conventions and once again demonstrating the central role of the interlocutor, and thus sermo, in programmatic satiric poems. The stylistic juxtaposition of ‘vignettes’ and satiric-rhetorical

---

609 Note that I substitute Willis’ dices with dicas under the guidance of Courtney 2013: 95.
610 I disagree with Braund’s (1999: 107) comment that ‘an objector immediately interrupts, initiating the dialogue with which the poem closes.’ There is no interruption – the satirist fully introduces the concept of another voice before its presence — nor is the phenomenon, therefore, immediate — relegated as it is to the end of the line which incepts the sermo.
611 This paradox (or, if we want to get personal, hypocrisy) on the part of the satiric voice seems to be part of a wider framework of contradictions composing the persona — see Braund 1996: 119-220 on Juvenal’s claims to attack contemporaries in the opening, and the closing line of the poem.
612 On the theme of inverting norms, hic est often carries positive connotations — see Courtney 2013: 96.
back and forth will be seen to be somewhat characteristic of Juvenal’s poetry. Already in the first poem, there is ample evidence to suggest that Juvenal is a decidedly ‘conversational’ poet in his own way – both stylistically and thematically.

**Satire Two**

Braund reads Juvenal’s second satire as a continuation of the *persona* established in the opening poem.\(^6\) This reading is perhaps also reflected in the stylistics — the elision and *Satzvers* rates hardly deviate (Juv. 1 E = 26%, S = 23%; Juv. 2 E = 29%, S = 20%). Striking, however, is the inclusion of a lengthy diatribe from another speaker.\(^7\) Several scholars have already noted that Laronia, whose speech is featured in lines 37-63, functions as ‘second’ satirist in this second poem.\(^8\) Despite the inclusion of an alternative (and perhaps surprisingly, female) voice, there remains a lack of analysis on whether this voice is noticeably distinguishable from that of the assumedly-male narrator.\(^9\) This section, then, will focus primarily on the *sermo* of Laronia, drawing on parallel studies on female speech in genres with which Juvenal’s *satires* engage. There is, however, a snippet of dialogue which precedes the main event. Laronia’s voice, despite being the loudest, is nevertheless one of several dialogic exchanges in the poem, and her presence is necessarily coloured by this procedural context. The first *sermo* is as follows:

\[
\text{dat veniam: sed peiores, qui talia verbis} \\
\text{Herculis invadunt et de virtute locuti} \\
\text{clunem agitant. ‘ego te ceventem, Sexte, verebor?’}
\]

---

\(^6\) Braund 2004: 147.

\(^7\) Rhetorical in a narratological fashion, without commenting on their supposed historicity.

\(^8\) Geue 2017: 84; Moodie 2012: 93; Sulprizio 2020: 23-4. I print ‘second’ with apostrophe marks to avoid begging the question of a possible bifurcation of satiric opinion.

\(^9\) Braund’s 1999 commentary offers a few stylistic observations, and Geue 2017: 84 writes that Laronia is ‘very Juvenalian’ in her use of gossip, displaced speech, and indirect confrontation. What is missing is i) whether there is some underlying stylistic unity in her speech, 2) how (if at all) any unity or disunity compares to the stylistics of the narrator, and 3) what the narratological implications are of her inclusion.
infamis Varillus ait, ‘quo deterior te?’

loripedem rectus derideat, Athiopem albus.

grants forgiveness. Much worse are people who attack such conduct in the words of Hercules and who shake their arses having talked about virtue. ‘Shall I be in awe of you, Sex tus, shaking your arse?’ says the notorious Varillus. ‘How am I worse than you?’ It should be the man who walks upright who mocks the man who limps, the white who mocks the Ethiopian.

19-23

Sermonic stylistics are clearly manifest here: emphatic pronouns (ego, te, Sexte), parataxis, implied embodiment (ceventem), and a delayed vocative which fragments the syntax. This perpetuates the general trend in Juvenal of employing such phenomena in ‘vignettes’, as opposed to rhetorical interlocution towards the satirist. Furthermore, just as the conversations surrounding the distribution of the sportula embodied the inversion of values and social structures, so too does this short interrogation manifest the distortion of the ‘rule’ summarised in iterative Satzvers from lines 23-28: let the better man play censor. This inversion — that a pathetic Roman should attempt to claim some moral high ground — preludes the potentially greater inversion located in Laronia: that a woman should take up the satiric mantle. Lines 19 to 23 thus introduce and display the central motifs of the poem, paving the way for Laronia’s unstable diatribe through demonstrating the ‘topsy-turvy’ nature of Rome’s current moral state.

‘In satiric discourse as in all Roman elite literary discourse, women are the ultimate outsiders….’ Gellar-Goad’s comment regarding the presence of Laronia highlights the

---

617 Braund 1996: 125 notes that’ specific names and direct speech create a striking vignette.’ Courtney 2013: 105 on the ‘adversative asyndeton.’
618 Akin to the Saturnalian reversal of Horace 2.7, though this time on the axis of gender rather than liberty.
central tension of her presence in the poem; do we laugh with her (subridens) or at her?\textsuperscript{620} Naturally, the problem runs deeper than Laronia or Satire 2 (are we to take any satirist at face-value?), yet this does not mean one should hand-wave all related inquiries. Before asking whether a reader is to take the \textit{sermo muliebris} seriously, we must investigate whether what we are reading is really ‘female speech’. Does Laronia \textit{sound} like a woman to the Roman ear? How does her diatribe diverge from that of Juvenal’s? Once we have established a nuanced understanding of the text itself, then and only then can we proceed to questions of context and interpretation. The speech itself is as follows:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Non tulit ex illis torvum Laronia quendam}
\textit{clamantem toties, ‘ubi nunc, Lex Iulia, dormis?’}
\textit{atque ita subridens: ‘felicia tempora, quae te}
\textit{moribus opponunt! habeat iam Roma pudorem.}
\textit{tertius a caelo cecidit Cato. sed tamen unde}
\textit{haec emis, hirsute spirant opobalsama collo}
\textit{quae tibi? ne pudeat dominum monstrare tabernae.}
\textit{quod si vexantur leges ac iura, citari}
\textit{ante omnes debet Scantinia. respice primum}
\textit{ac scrutare viros: faciunt peiora, sed illos}
\textit{defendit numerus iunctaeque umbone phalanges.}
\textit{magna inter molles concordia. non erit ullum}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{620} Gellar-Goad himself notes the various interpretations Laronia’s presence has met with; Henderson 1999: 196 argues that her ‘pointedly gendered satire’ undercuts the poem and thus the satirist, as no reader contemporary with Juvenal can be expected to take a woman seriously. I will address this issue following analysis of the speech itself.
exemplum in nostro tam detestabile sexu.

Tedia non lambit Cluviam nec Flora Catullam:

Hispo subit iuvenes et morbo pallet utroque.

nunquid nos agimus causas ? civilia iura

novimus ? aut ullo strepitu fora vestra movemus ?

luctantur pauae, comedunt colyphia pauae.

vos lanam trahitis calathisque peracta refertis

vellera, vos tenui praegnantem stamine fusum

Penelope melius, levius torquetis Arachne.

horrida quale facit residens in codice paelex.

nota est cur solo tabulas impleverit Hister

liberto, dederit vivus cur multa puellae:

dives eris, magno quae dormis tertia lecto.

tu nube atque tace : donnant arcana cylindros.

de nobis post haec tristis sententia fertur ?

dat veniam corvis, vexat censura columbas.'

fugerunt trepidi vera ac manifesta canentem

Stoicidae : quid enim falsi Laronia ?

Laronia could not stand one of those grim individuals constantly shouting ‘Where now, O Julian law, do you sleep?’ and, smiling, she speaks thus: ‘What fortunate times, that set you up as the enemy of corrupt morality! Now let Rome have a sense of shame: a third Cato has tumbled from the sky! But anyway where did you buy this balsam perfume which wafts from your shaggy neck? Don’t be embarrassed to
point out the shop owner. But if it’s a matter of waking up laws and statutes, it’s the Scantinian law which should be summoned before all the rest. Look at men first, scrutinise them. They behave worse, but their numbers and phalanxes of overlapping shields protect them. The solidarity between effemimates is enormous. You won’t find any example so revolting in our sex. Tedia doesn’t tongue Cluvia, nor Flora Catulla, but Hispo submits to young men and turns pale from both diseases. We women don’t plead cases, do we? Or claim expertise in civil law? Or disturb your courts with an uproar? Few women wrestle, few women consume the meat-rich diet. But you tease the wool and you bring the prepared fleeced back in baskets. You turn the spindle that’s pregnant with fine thread better than Penelope, more deftly than Arachne. The sort of thing a dishevelled mistress does sitting on a stump. It’s common knowledge why Hister filled his will with his freedman alone, why in his lifetime he made many gifts to his young, still-virgin wife. She who sleeps third in a large bed will be rich. Marry and keep quiet: secrets provide jewels. After all this, is a verdict of guilty passed on us? That’s a judgement that acquits the ravens and condemns the doves.’ As she uttered the obvious truth, the would-be Stoics ran away in a panic. Was anything Laronia said false?

To begin, let us consider the distribution of elision and Satzvers. Laronia elides at a slightly lower rate (24%) than the poem as a whole (29%) and the satirist’s voice when isolated from rhetorical speech (31%). Her speech features a higher rate (31%) of Satzvers than the poem (20%) and ‘Juvenal’ (17%). Neither of these variations are particularly egregious. However, when analysed in their immediate context, some interesting parallels arise in the sermones of Laronia and Juvenal. But first, the elephant in the room. Is this speech particularly female?

To answer this question, two key studies must first be consulted. Dutsch’s 2008 book, *Feminine Discourse in Roman Comedy: On Echoes and Voices*, presents both a meta-analysis of previous studies within this field as well as summaries of stylistics employed to represent
female speech in the works of Terence and Plautus. Many of the phenomena often found in female speech from Roman comedy seem to be absent from Laronia’s diatribe, including \textit{blanditia}, self-pity, polite formulae, possessive addresses, and a discourse of inclusion manifested through referring to or implying intimate connections between relevant interlocutors.\footnote{Dutsch 2008: 4, 21, 28, 35, 50.} Indeed, with Dutsch’s study in mind, much of the speech seems a direct inversion of what one might expect from a female speaker, generic context withstanding. There is no preamble establishing good-will or intent, the rhetoric is by no means a disorganised ‘laundry list’ of worries but a focused attack, there is no identification of mutual or symmetrical desires, and Laronia never once gives a ‘token admission’ that, given her gender, her credibility is questionable. There are, therefore, few parallels between this excerpt and the general motifs and phenomena seen in female speech in Roman comedy.

This should not, however, be read as a direct discrepancy, nor understood as a deliberate inversion of norms (at least, not yet.) The second relevant study must be consulted. Kruschwitz’s 2012 study, and meta-study, ‘Language, Sex and (Lack of) Power. Reassessing the Linguistic Discourse about Female Speech in Latin Sources’ may aid us in approaching the question of Laronia’s ‘femininity’. Importantly, Kruschwitz argues that ‘Female Speech’ is not reducible to a particular ‘register’ of Latin, but rather comprises various \textit{strata} of speech-act tactics that are employed in response to conversational context.\footnote{Kruschwitz 2012: 197, 205.} Of particular relevance to this thesis are two of Kruschwitz’s points. The first is his hypothesis that feminine \textit{blandimenta} function as a substitute for \textit{auctoritas} in speech-acts — hence explaining why the deployment of such tactics by men is negatively received in Roman literature. He writes:

\begin{quote}
‘The underlying assumption must be that — whereas it is appropriate (and in fact: necessary) for women in their social network(s) to resort
\end{quote}

\footnote{In particular, Kruschwitz argues for an interpretation of speech based on network theory, and that the type of ‘female speech’ employed at any given time can be understood through analysing the social relationship between the two speakers.}
to such linguistic behaviour on occasion — males are supposed to negotiate their business differently.’ Kruschwitz 2012: 205

Many of the phenomena associated with female speech in Dutsch’s book revolve around expressions of *blandimenta* — expressions which seem to be employed primarily in speech-acts that seek some favour or action from the interlocutor. This brings me to Kruschwitz’s second point — that *blandimenta*, and indeed all (female) speech in Latin literature, are integrally related to the patriarchal social structures in which the relevant actors move. That is to say, the speech that occurs between two women is different from that between a woman and a man, with other variables including social status, age, and social relationship. I return to the case of Laronia. It is clear that she is talking to an effeminate man — possibly a *cinaedus* — most likely Roman (*tertius Cato*), who has attempted to claim the moral high ground — probably not for the first time. In light of the linguistic function of *blandimenta*, and indeed in light of the thematic inversion that runs through this (and other) poems, we should not expect genuine elements of *blandimenta* in the speech of Laronia. Her speech-act is neither favour-seeking nor directed towards someone of higher social status. Rather, as she takes the position of satiric power over the effeminate man, we can expect the language with the opposite function to *blandimenta*.

Laronia’s speech reads as a diatribe conspicuously absent of genuine *blandimenta*, a *sermo* in which femininity is weaponised in an hermaphroditic attack. Kruschwitz, in their conclusion, notes that women in Roman comedy tend ‘to give preference to expressions and enunciation characterised by a relatively higher level of prestige and status’ in speech-acts through which they seek to secure conversational authority. One reads this in Laronia’s opening statement — specifically in the use of Republican ‘moral’ language and references.

---

623 ‘Stoics’ in satire having, by now, a long history of moral haranguing.
624 Umurhan 2011: 240 notes that Juvenal’s persona is hermaphroditic through the use of the anonymous female satirist and his use of gossip.
625 Kruschwitz 2012: 208.
626 Braund 1996: 130 noting the use of *moribus* as cognate with several instances in the works of Cicero. Courtney 2013: 106 compares the opening to Cicero’s famous *o tempora! o mores!* – both lexemes being present in the lines above. Evoking the two Catos reinforces the pseudo-Republican tone.
The ironic question which follows — *where did you get your perfume?* — combines the pragmalinguistic appearance of *blandimenta* with the sociopragmatic function of invective. According to this reading, what Laronia presents is polite in form, but not function — *faux politesse* being, as we have seen, a major component of many satiric interactions across the canon. However, it is precisely because such tactics *are* so common in the satires that one could also read this as an aspect of Laronia’s *satiric mode* — especially given other aspects of her speech which mirror that of ‘Juvenal’. Consider lines 47-50 alongside 25-28:

*quid nostrum terris non misceat et mare caelo,*

*si fur displiceat Verri, homicida Miloni,*

*Clodius accuset moechos, Catilina Cethegum,*

*in tabulam Sullae si dicant discipuli tres?*

Who would not confuse sky and land, sea and sky,

if a thief displeased Verres, a murderer Milo,

if Clodius accused adulterers and Catiline Cethegus,

if Sulla’s three disciples criticised his lists?

The two passages both feature a concentration of names delivered with end-stopping and *Satzvers*. Juvenal utilises names drawn from a ‘safe’ pool — the dead (*quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis atque Latina*). In similar fashion, Laronia invokes the names of Republican (dead) women. She also follows satiric suit in switching between singular and plural second-person pronouns (and possibly addressees), and in her pronounced use of *Satzvers* to close her diatribe.

---

627 A deliberate inversion of the aforementioned function of *blandimenta* to create space for personal discussion and favour-seeking through reinforcing sympathetic relationships.

628 Braund 1996: 133 notes the origins for all save Tedia, of whom no information survives.
It is evident that Laronia’s speech i) is not mimetic of stereotypical female speech as seen in Roman comedy, ii) deliberately inverts social structures of *auctoritas* and the gender-relevant language used to engage it and iii) is imitative or continuative of the style seen elsewhere in Juvenal’s works. Whether or not we read her stylistics as a simple perpetuation of Juvenal’s style (not modulating his poetics for this speaker) or a deliberate female-*spin* on his particular brand of satire, is left to the reader. The lack of variation in both elision and *Satzvers* amongst Juvenal’s ‘main’ speakers seems to indicate that the satirist does not engage in the same type of varied characterisation as Horace, but the data by no means excludes reading Juvenal as an author who renders his ‘fellow satirists’ in the same poetic register as himself.

Laronia’s speech is followed by another diatribe against what are presented as ‘effeminate’ men — this time from Juvenal himself, against Creticus, on the grounds that he dresses incorrectly.629 This embodied second-person attack — delineated through Juvenal’s descriptions of Creticus’ clothing and the surrounding environment — garners a response from the target himself: ‘*sed iulius ardet, aestuo*’ — a short, sharp, paratactic statement with no introduction, responded to directly, and pithily, by the satirist on-scene (*nudus agas*). This shifts Juvenal’s narratological position from a mere recorder of embodied *sermo* to an active participant. The diatribe continues — still supposedly directed towards Creticus (*accipient te | paulatim qui longa domi redimicula sumunt*), though the second person now seems to function primarily in a purely diatribic fashion.630 Juvenal then catastrophises — following the chain of causation from wearing gauzy clothing to the rites of *Bona Dea*, the cultivators of which are given the following speech:

*solis ara deae maribus patet. ‘ite, profanae’*

*clamatur, ‘nullo gemit hic tibicina cornu.’*

---

629 Braund 1996: 140 notes the possible historical interpretations of this name, favouring reading an attack on an eminent lawyer.

630 It is worth noting the implied continued presence of Creticus — it fixes Juvenal’s speech on a ‘physical’ and relevant target (much like Laronia), allowing the audience to avoid direct confrontation with the satirist whilst maintaining the lively, second-person mode.
The parody of the usual ritual cry *ite profani*, and the impersonal *clamatur*, is noted by Braund.\(^{631}\) The comparison she draws with two lines in the *Aeneid* is apt, though there is more to be said for the correspondence:

*adventate dea ‘procul o procul este, profane,’*

*conclamat vates, ‘totoque absistite luco,’*

Virg. *Aen.* 6.258-259

The two lines are almost metrically identical – the only difference being Juvenal’s dactyl in the third foot of the second line.\(^{632}\) Mimicry is also present in the use of end-stopping, the position of *profanae*, and the use of the new line to introduce the verb of speaking. Indeed, the use of strong pauses to initiate speech (bucolic diaeresis, 2\(^{nd}\) masculine caesura), the double *Satzvers*, the parataxis, and aversion to elision are all congruent with the general stylistics of ritual/prayer language seen throughout the other satirists. The echo of Virgil’s Sibyl is of particular interest given the earlier characterisation of Laronia as *vera ac manifesta canentem*.\(^{633}\) As Stewart noted in 1994, the juxtaposition of ‘a travesty of the *bona dea*’ and Domitianic moralising is a key aspect of the poem’s satiric architecture.\(^{634}\) Thematic inversion, focused in this poem on religion and masculinity, is again made manifest through contrastive sections of *sermo*. Laronia — a speaker already compromised by the mere fact of her gender, let alone the popular readings of her as a courtesan or adulterous aristocrat – takes (and is given by Juvenal) the moral high ground as a satirist-cum-prophet. Genuine censorial and religious *auctoritas* is shown as being displaced from the assumed *loci* (men, temples), and expressed in perhaps the most maligned anti-hero imaginable to Juvenal’s audience — a

\(^{631}\) Braund 1996: 147 noting the whole thing as parodic of Virg. *Aen.* 6.258. See also the discussion in Karakasis 2011: 226.

\(^{632}\) Possibly due to Virgil’s freer use of elision — *totoque absistite*.

\(^{633}\) Line 65.

\(^{634}\) Stewart 1994: 330.
promiscuous woman. While the *sermo* at the rites of the *Bona Dea* is presented as a corrupt form of ritual, Laronia’s speech has none of the trappings of prophetic speech, yet all of its power. The theme of hypocrisy is thus generated through re-aligning appearance and behaviour, speech and speaker.

**Summary: Juvenal 2**

The remaining *sermo* of this poem needs little exegesis. The short conversation at lines 132-135 display the usual use of metrical pauses, repetition, and question-chains seen in similar vignettes used as exempla.\(^{635}\) I agree with Braund that *et tamen…tribuno* is probably spoken by a rhetorical interlocutor.\(^{636}\) The key manifestation of dialogue in Juvenal’s second poem is that of Laronia. In the analysis above, I have argued that themes of gender, religion, and authority and enmeshed in both her speech itself, as well as its poetic context and relationship to other snippets of *sermo*. Laronia is decidedly unfemale in her speech when compared to representations from Roman comedy. Instead, her gender is transformed through Juvenal’s satiric mode into a foundation for invective – carrying out satire’s quasi-obsession with subversion and inversion.\(^{637}\)

**Satire 3**

Juvenal’s pseudo-dialogue with Umbricius raises three key questions relevant to the study of *sermo*: is Umbricius’ speech distinguishable from Juvenal’s usual satiric mode? What are the implications of any stylistic relationship between the narrator and Umbricius? How does this

---

\(^{635}\) Initiating speech at the bucolic diaeresis, changing speaker at a new line and then the third masculine caesura, and ending the vignette another penthemimeral caesura. Repetition of *officium* and turn-initial interrogatives. Braund 1996: 157 notes that *quid quaeris* is ‘casual’ and no more emphatic than English ‘Oh’. One can be more specific — *quid quaeris* occurs often in epistolic and dialogic contexts (Hor. *Ep.* 1.10.8, Cic. *Att.* 1.14.6, 7.11.4, 9.10.2 Ter. *Heaut.* 1.10, Cordes 2009: 435, writing on its appearance in Seneca’s *Oedipus* (v.860) classifies it as a rhetorical question.

\(^{636}\) Braund 1996: 165 against the lack of apostrophes in Willis 1997: 19. The use of the adversative particle *tamen* coupled with the second-person imperative which follows the concession (*aspice*) accords nicely with dialogic interaction – cf. 5.80.

\(^{637}\) This reading is also found in Nappa’s 1998 article, though drawn from an analysis of the structure of argumentation.
particular narratological framework generate and effect meaning? These questions are to be considered alongside the execution and function of rhetorical speech and conversational vignettes.

To begin to answer the three primary questions, let us examine rates of elision and *Satzvers*. Umbricius elides at a rate of 37%, and employs *Satzvers* at a rate of 16%. These figures do not deviate significantly from the average across Juvenal’s poems, but Umbricius does elide at a considerably higher rate than that of the narrator who introduces him in lines 1-21 (24%), and at a higher rate than the average of the rhetorical speakers Umbricius deploys in his diatribe (23%). Geue has noted that Umbricius is an ‘older style’ of satirist — perhaps this increased elision rate brings his speech closer to that of Horace’s ‘personal’ diction.638 Indeed, as will be demonstrated, several aspects of Umbricius’ lament for Rome seem to echo aspects of Juvenal’s satiric predecessors.639

This intertextuality between Umbricius and pre-Juvenal satire can be explored further. The framing of the poem closely mirrors (and parodies) that of Virgil’s first eclogue, yet also smacks of Horace 2.2 and 2.6.640 Horace 2.2 also shows a relative increase of elision when moving from the satirist to a speaker who praises the countryside, and 2.6 contains the infamous ‘city mouse, country mouse’ story, an obvious parallel to Umbricius’ lament. Indeed, just as Cervius’ anthropomorphic fable inextricably links the concepts of wealth, urbanity, and a life of danger (in that order), so too does Umbricius move from a discussion of perceived wealth-inequality to a diatribe against other aspects of city life, before closing with a lively account of the dangers facing those who remain at Rome. Furthermore, the incident with ‘the bully’ in lines 278-299 not only echoes the Molossian hounds of Hor. *Sat.* 2.6.110-115 (chasing a rustically-inclined ‘virtuous’ Roman from the city to the country), but also re-instantiates one of the central motifs of Horace’s second book of satires — the satiric reversal. This reversal — where the satirist becomes the satiric target of another — is most overtly

638 Geue 2017: 75.
639 This has been flagged by Braund 1996: 231.
640 Braund 1996: 235. Staley 2000 and Geue 2015 discuss Virgilian themes in this poem. Of interest is the common reading of Umbricius (and his diatribe) as a satiric corruption of the pastoral and heroic aspects of Virgil’s Augustan Rome. Hor. *Sat.* 2.2, 2.6 and Juvenal 3 all feature similar dialogic modalities wherein the narrator ‘remembers’ a specific *sermo*.
executed in Horace 2.3 and 2.7, as well as Persius’ third poem. These structural intertextualities engender a connection between Umbricius and Juvenal’s predecessors. This connection is strengthened by several unassuming references within the *sermo*.

Several aspects of Umbricius’ ‘autobiography’ mirror Horace’s self-presentation in his Satires. In lines 239-249, Umbricius complains of the traffic in Rome (*si vocat officium*) and provides a graphic description of the violent struggle to get through the crowd which corresponds to Horace’s own complaint in *Sat.* 2.6.23-31. Both satirists betray a fear of being outpaced by another in reaching their goals. While Umbricius’ goal is vague within the lines in question, Braund astutely notes that Umbricius, throughout his speech as a whole, reveals his desire not to *escape* from the ‘rat race’, but to succeed in it. Horace’s motivations are sardonically pointed out to him by a rhetorical interlocutor — *tu pulses omne quod obstat* | *ad Maecenatem memori si mente recurras* (Hor. *Sat.* 2.6.30-31). Both interlocutors strive for upwards social mobility in an urban context, despite their feigned rustic rhetoric and disavowal of such pursuits. This geminate satiric ‘weak spot’, for which both Horace and Umbricius are attacked for, hints at further underlying connections.

The ‘conversation’ between Juvenal and ‘Mr. Shady’ supposedly takes place in the Egerian Valley, a previously idyllic and symbolically *pastoral* locus which has recently become occupied by one of satire’s favourite ‘boogeymen’ — the Jews. There may be more to this collocation than meets the eye. The encroachment of the ‘Jewish motif’ into the poem not only characterises the setting of the *sermo*, but is later inextricably tied to the identity of its main interlocutor. Umbricius, lamenting his assault from the bully, states:

\[
\text{fortior. ‘unde venis?’ exclamat; ‘cuius aceto,}
\]

### Footnotes

641 Aspects beyond the most overt, being the professed preference for the countryside.

642 Cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.6.24 *ne prior officio quisquam respondeat*, urge and Juv. 3.239 *si vocat officium*...

643 Juv. 3.240-243 *dives...ante tamen veniet*. Horace’s fear in the footnote above.


645 Horace’s attempted upwards mobility is critiqued by both Davus and Damasippus. Umbricius is forced to give up his seat for richer patrons at the theatre in lines 153-9.

646 See Shumate 2006: 19, 22.
Umbricius recounts an experience from his perspective, real or imagined. The identification of Umbricius with the Jewish population, real or metaphorical, is reminiscent of Horace’s closing statements in his satiric *apologia*:

... *cui si concedere nolis,*

*multa poetarum veniat manus, auxilio quae*

*sit mihi (nam multo plures sumus), ac veluti te*

*Iudaei cogemus in hanc concedere turbam.*

If you won’t concede to this, a great troop of poets shall come – allies as they are to me (for we are so many), and just like the Jews, we will force you to concede to our crowd!

---

647 Line 289 *si rixa est, ubi tu pulsas, ego vapulo tantum.*
Nolland, in their analysis of this passage alongside Cicero Pro. Flacc. 66, argues cogently for interpreting the metaphor as referring to political influence, rather than religious proselytizing:

‘There seems to have been a Jewish population sizeable enough to make possible the congregation in public places of large numbers of unoccupied Jews, probably of the poorer classes…they had discovered that acting together in this way they could have a ‘political’ influence out of all proportion to their own importance in the community.’ Nolland 1979: 353

Horace, the last of the canonical ‘pre-isolationist’ satirists, identifies analogously with an outsider minority who nonetheless occupy a threatening position in Roman society — much like the imagined reception of the ‘satirist’ himself.648 Indeed, these ‘threatening outsiders’ are described as having corrupted the pastoral and pseudo-epic idyll that constitutes the setting of the sermo — perhaps symbolising satire’s own encroachment on topics and spaces previously ‘reserved’ for other genres. With Horatian intertextuality and the opening lines of the poem in mind, the bully’s comment functions not only to insult the xenophobic Umbricius on his own terms, but to evoke the generic relationships between satirists, Jews, and threats from outside the cultural norm.

What does all of this mean for our interpretation of the poem? To answer this, let us consider the following:

648 This is perhaps also seen in Hor. Sat. 1.9.67-71 where Fuscus, another figure who satirises the satirist, identifies as unus multorum in the context of adhering to Jewish principles — in order to safely endanger his target (Horace).
i) Umbricius embodies aspects of Horace’s satiric persona and is generally understood to represent pre-Juvenalian satire.\\footnote{649}
iid) He, like Horace, becomes the target of other active satirists in a manner reminiscent of pre-Juvenalian satirists. Juvenal himself is never subjected to this.\\footnote{650}
iii) Juvenal listens to Umbricius’ lament in a liminal generic and geographic space, populated by others Umbricius both hates and is identified with.
iv) Umbricius is presented as a failure in his contemporary Roman society. His satiric puissance is ineffective, and he ends up leaving Rome (Juvenal’s satiric space) for the country.

Considering these observations, I propose the following interpretation. Umbricius represents pre-Juvenalian satire which, in the current socio-literary climate, fails in its endeavours. Aspects of Horatian satire — the ‘powerful minority’, the pseudo-rusticity, the expected reciprocity — are unable to weather the social and political upheavals which separate Horace and Juvenal.\\footnote{651} This sermo, then, is both an aggressive farewell to satiric blanditia, and a functioning apologia for Juvenal’s reclamation of the iambic-invective tradition which Juvenal reads in Lucilius.\\footnote{652}

The intertextuality with Horatian satire extends beyond Umbricius’ representation of earlier satire. While lamenting that the rich have an easier time providing credible witnesses, he provides the following snippet of speech:

\begin{quote}
protinus ad censum, de moribus ultima fiet
\end{quote}

\\footnote{649} This is an extrapolation of the idea presented in Geue 2017: 75. The modelling of Umbricius on primarily Horatian material (as far as we can tell – perhaps there is more of Lucilius than we can say given the state of the fragments) rather than Persius may follow from Juvenal’s silence regarding his predecessor in his programmatic poem — Osgood 2012: 3.
\\footnote{650} The closest Juvenal comes to becoming a direct target is Naevolus’ explosion at lines 9.48-49 – see my discussion thereon.
\\footnote{651} Geue 2017: 82 on reciprocity.
\\footnote{652} Aggressive, as Umbricius is torn apart both by other satirists and by the inconsistencies in his diatribe.
quiaestio. ‘quot pascit servos? quot possidet agri
iugera? quam multa magnaque paropside cenat?’
quantum quisque sua nummorum servat in arca,
tantum habet et fidei.

Straight to his means; his morals are the last thing questioned. ‘How
many slaves does he keep? How many acres of farmland? How many
and how lavish his dinners?’ How much anyone keeps in their treasury,
that is how much they are to be trusted.
140-14

The use of paratactic lines of questioning to convey both agitation and temporal compression
is reminiscent of a similar scene from Horace Satires 1.6:

nam ut quisque insanus nigris medium impediit crus
pellibus et latum demisit pectore clavum,
audit continuo: ‘quis homo hic est?’ ‘quo patre natus?’
Hor. Sat. 1.6.27-29

Umbricius’ expansion of Horace’s rhetorical trick also demonstrates the transformation of the
latter’s anxieties. The ‘gate-keeping’ Horace supposedly experienced and subsequently
denounced was centred primarily on his social class and status as the son of a freedman, and
the political barriers thus encountered. Umbricius, on the other hand, laments that wealth (and
not birth?) now dictates class and status, and laments the legal ramifications thereof. Juvenal
displaces the ‘older style’ satirist into the author’s contemporary construction of reality, and
‘updates’ his struggle appropriately.
The small speech delivered by the anonymous interlocutor (lines 153-158) at the theatre is noticeably void of conversational phenomena, especially in contrast to the paratactic questions which precede it, and the aggressive imperative which is to follow.\textsuperscript{653} We have seen similar aversion to sermonic stylistics when representing urbane or faux-polite speech – the deployment of a similar schema here seems likely. Indeed, conversational phenomena make a strong return in the bully’s interrogation — question chains (unde, cuius, quis), repetition (cuius...cuius, aut...aut...), imperatives (ede...dic...accipe), and parataxis generating the lively and aggressive interrogation.\textsuperscript{654}

Summary: Juvenal 3

I have supported and advanced the reading of Umbricius as a representative of pre-Juvenalian satire. Structural aspects of his characterisation, including a few features of his dialogue, evince a particularly Horatian flavour to this failed satirist.\textsuperscript{655} Additionally, the distribution of conversational phenomena in rhetorical speech continues to demonstrate both intertextual resonances with Juvenal’s predecessors, as well as the general schema seen thus far throughout the satirists as a collective. Conversational phenomena tend to aggregate in particularly aggressive or animated speech, whereas the injunction against sitting in the ‘wrong’ benches at the theatre is devoid of both said phenomena and indeed the second person entirely.

Satire 4

\textsuperscript{653} Courtney 2013: 148 notes that si pudor est is a ‘common phrase’ – Braund 1996: 200 notes a similar use in Mart. 2.37.10, strengthening the case for reading proverbial meaning, but not enough (in my opinion) to warrant a particularly conversational reading. Aggression in line 187-8 accipe et istud | fermentum tibi habe. Double elision, emphatic pronoun, double imperatives.

\textsuperscript{654} Lines 292-296. One wonders if this is a Juvenalian reversal of Horace 1.9 – the ‘hanger on’ assaults Horace with an aggressively polite interrogation from which Horace is saved, whereas here the ‘pest’ is Lucilian in force, and Umbricius only escapes when he leaves the city.

\textsuperscript{655} Umbricius’ other flaws noted by Hardie 1988: 235. Other critiques of Horace and Maecenas can be found in Juv. 12 (Frantantuono 2015: 298).
Juvenal’s ‘mock-epic’ is delivered with slightly increased elision, and slightly lower Satzvers — perhaps a modulation closer to Virgilian diction, though the differences are slight enough to be negligible. Structural mimesis of epic sermo may also be seen in the strict adherence to natural metrical divisions for the initiation of speech — turns beginning only at new-lines, primary caesurae, or at the fifth or sixth feet. Of interest is the difference in elision rates between narration and rhetorical speech — 34 and 42%, respectively. This is apt considering the motif of haste which underpins the various snippets of dialogue.

The first instance of speech featured in this Domitianic parody of epic is from the Picenian fisherman:

...
tum Picens ‘accipe’ dixit

‘privatis maiora foci. genialis agatur

iste dies. propera stomachum laxare sagina

et tua servatum consume in saecula rhombum.

ipse capi voluit.’ quid apertius? et tamen illi

Then the Picenian said ‘Accept this, too big for a private kitchen. Let this day be a holiday. Hurry up and stretch your stomach with feasting, and eat up a turbot preserved for your epoch. It wanted to be caught!’

What is more blatant? And nevertheless…

65-69

The use of the bucolic diaeresis to initiate speech, with the insertion of the verb of speech in the anceps, is particularly fitting for the ‘lofty’ diction adopted by the satiric narrator and present

656 10% Satzvers as opposed to the average 14.5, and 35% elision compared to 32.5.
in aspects of this *sermo*. Epic allusions encase a particularly parodic speech-vignette, whose stylistics are contrastive with its supposed sermonic context. Turn-initial *accipe*, seen elsewhere in the satiric corpus with similar function, not only takes the place of any politeness strategy we might expect from a fisherman in dialogue with an emperor, but is itself considerably forceful. Direct use of the imperative is continued in *propera*...*consume* — the fisherman seems to be speaking rather casually to the emperor. Indeed, the emperor is talked about as if he himself were a fish – to be fattened up on *sagina*. This ‘casual’ tone is reinforced through the use of *iste* where one would expect *hic* in epic diction, and the ‘mundane’ corruption of *animal laxare* to *stomachum laxare*. The snippet ends, and Juvenal asks — *quid apertius*? What could be more obvious flattery than the fish wanting to be eaten, and what could be more unreserved than the fisherman’s speech?

There are a variety of readings available as to why the fisherman speaks thus. Is he unaccustomed to courtly politesse? Perhaps he is making fun of the emperor himself? Without discounting the potential for multiple meanings, one element of this poem may help explain the behaviour. The imperative *propera* in the speech of the fisherman is resonant with several other instances of the verb throughout the poem, and indeed with the motif of haste expressed elsewhere in other terms. It seems the world is in a rush to have Domitian eat this fish – a context which is foregrounded in lines 58-59.

*stridebat deformis hiems praedamque recentem servabat; tamen hic properat, velut urgueat Auster.*

---

657 Epic aspects in *tua seruatum...in saecula* Braund 1996: 250, Courtney 2013: 182.
658 Consider turn-initial *accipe* at Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.307.
659 Courtney 2013: 183.
660 ibid
661 For *aperio* and unreserved speech or character cf. Lewis and Short Aperio B. Trop. II including Ter. *And.* 1, 2, 24; *Eun.* 5.1.3Phorm. 4, 3, 49, Cic. *Ad Brut.* 1.5.3.
662 59 — *tamen hic properat* ‘he [the fisherman] hurries’, 76 ‘*currite, iam sedit*’ *rapta properabat...*, 94 *proximus eiusdem properabat* Acilius, 134 rotam *citius properate*, 146 *festinare* coactos.
The fish is going bad. The ‘race against time’ to have Domitian eat the fish before it rots seems the most likely explanation for the fisherman’s brashness, though is by no means mutually exclusive with reading him as ‘boorish’ or ‘uncivilised’. ‘Take this fish, let there be a festival, chop chop, stretch your stomach etc.’ The fact that this notion of haste is carried on through the speech of multiple subsequent interlocutors demonstrates deliberate construction of *sermo* in relation to the larger poetic motif.

As flagged earlier, subsequent speech fixates on haste. *curr*itis, *iam sedit!* is spoken by Domitian’s advisor Pegasus to his colleagues and conforms to the tension of the ticking fish-bomb. However, where the fisherman’s flattery of Domitian was curt and interwoven with imperatives, some of the advisors take the opposite approach. The implied (but not printed) long-winded speech from another advisor Catullus brings the decay of the fish, and thus disaster, ever closer. Indeed, the danger of his diatribe seems represented in his speaking *in laevum conversus*. This tense comedy of errors, wherein haste is needed for the fish but the dinner drags on with constant flattery, continues as Veiento seeks to one-up Catullus’ speech with a divine prophecy, in which visionary and military language combine to farcical effect. The following lines contain Domitian’s only speech, and Montanus’ reply:

‘quidnam igitur censes? conciditur?’ ‘absit ab illo dedecus hoc.’ Montanus ait, ‘testa alta paretur quae tenui muro spaciosum colligat orbem. debetur magnus patinae subitusque Prometheus. argillam atque rotam citius properate; sed ex hoc

---

663 Braund 1996: 248. Courtney 2013: 59 notes the same for the use of Auster – a warm wind which would hasten decay.
664 Lines 119-120 Nemo magis rhombum stupuit; nam plurima dixit | in laevum conversus; at illi dextra iacebat. The danger of *sermo* being flagged in lines 86-88.
666 Lines 124-128. Courtney 2013: 192 on the use of *sudes* as military omen.
tempore iam, Caesar, figuli tua castra sequuntur."

‘What, therefore, do you recommend? Should it be cut up?’ ‘Let it be spared such an outrage’ says Montanus ‘let a deep platter be prepared which will contain the spacious circumference with a delicate wall. A great Prometheus is required for this dish at once. Quick, bring the clay and wheel! But from this time, Caesar, let potters follow your entourage.’

130-135

Domitian’s only speech in the poem is terse and formulaic — juxtaposed against the flattery which precedes and follows it. Note the distinct negative politeness employed by Montanus – aversion to directly negating Domitian’s wish through de-personalising and periphrasis, the use of impersonal verbs (debetur) and jussive subjunctives (sequantur) — compared to what is most likely an aside to one of the slaves (argillam atque rotam citius properate). Montanus’ sermo maintains the humorous balancing act of proper deference to Domitian and the necessary alacrity to serve up the wondrous turbot.

Summary: Juvenal 4

Manifestations of sermo revolve around the comic tension central to the poem – the decaying fish, and Domitianiac politesse. Of course, beneath the surface of this culinary farce lies allusions to the more sinister and repressive aspects of Domitian’s reign. Adroit manipulation of politeness strategies, imperatives, and dialogic-narratological resonances

---

667 These aspects are discussed in Braund 1996: 264-265. On indirectness and politeness see Leech 2014: 89-95. Reading the properate as directed to a slave is supported by Braund 1996: 265 and Courtney 2013: 192-193. An internal change of addressee is seen also in 1.123-126.

(uses of *propero*) generate a richness of meaning in even the smallest snippet of speech (*currifte, iam sedit!*), with each interlocution functioning in relation to the larger poetic schema.

**Satire 5**

Juvenal’s diatribe against the state of patron-client relationships threads in and out of an extended dinner-party vignette. Naturally, the reader is treated to a few instances of direct speech from the persons involved. Structurally, the poem has a slightly diminished elision rate (27%) and middling rate of Satzvers (16%). Juvenal’s fifth poem perhaps also marks the beginning of a generally downward trend in his use of rhetorical speech — the rate of speech/line remaining below 5% until the thirteenth satire.\(^{669}\)

The guest — the second person addressee of Juvenal’s diatribe — is imagined reaching for the white bread and being met with a restrained rebuke from a servant.

> ‘vis tu consuetis, audax conviva, canistris
impleri panisque tui novisse colorem?’
> ‘scilicet hoc fuerat, propter quod saepe relicta
coniuge per montem adversum gelidasque curri
Esquilias, fremeret saeva cum grandine vernus
Iuppiter et multo stillaret paenula nimbo.’

> ‘Would you, bold diner, keep to the usual bread baskets, and know the colour of your own bread?’ ‘Of course, it was for this I so often left my wife and ran up the freezing Esquiline, while spring-time Jupiter raged above with cruel hail and my cloak was dripping with so much rain!’

---

\(^{669}\) The rates are as follows: 15.5, 20, 3.8 (though we must remember that Umbricius’ speech makes up the most of the poem), 9, 5, 3, 5, .2, 1.5 (similar to 3, Naevolus’ speech is extensive), 4.8, 0, 0.75, 9.5, 6, 4.3, 5.
The use of new lines to change speaker effect smooth transitions — fitting for the peremptory politeness utilised in the first speech-turn. Both Braund and Courtney note that the use of *vis tu* here is peremptory.\(^{670}\) This use of this on-record politeness strategy is naturally at odds with the ‘expected’ conventions.\(^{671}\) The first is that the slave avoids the indirect and/or negative politeness strategies which would be expected given the social hierarchy (see the opening to Horace *Satires 2.7*) — the status of the client is implicitly lowered through this speech-act. Indeed, the ever-present theme of social inversion is manifest in the speech of the slave — described as *superbus* by the narrator — who then ascribes the label of *audax* to the guest.\(^{672}\) Indeed, the collocation of *audax* and *convivia* reflects the balancing act in the slave’s speech; the peremptory request bordering on the imperative, yet remaining just within the realm of formulaic politeness to warrant no outright response.\(^{673}\) This lack of response points to another aspect of on-record politeness — its public engagement. On-record requests can draw direct attention to the act sought (hands off the bread) and engenders the potential for public pressure on both parties. The marked silence that meets the slave’s ‘impertinent’ behaviour — both here and elsewhere — implies a household (and by extension, a society) which fosters and permits this inversion.\(^{674}\) Indeed, the implied futility of chastisement of un-inversion is presented in the monologic tone of the guest’s ‘response’ — opening with *scilicet* and containing no dialogic phenomena it is, as Braund notes, directed only to himself.\(^{675}\) Finally, the use of inclusive and/or referential language (*tu, consuetis*) are usually associated with social equals, or requests from social ‘superiors’.\(^{676}\) The dialogic interaction is one-sided — the slave all-but commanding the guest — and another representation of satiric faux-politesse.

---

\(^{670}\) Braund 1996: 74-5; Courtney 2013: 205.

\(^{671}\) ‘Expected’ of Juvenal’s ideal world, rather than how he views his contemporary society.

\(^{672}\) Line 66 *maxima quaeque domus servis est plena superbis*. The potential reading of the slave as a micro-satirist is strengthened through reference to the guest’s molar — Braund 1996: 299 citing Pers. 1.115.

\(^{673}\) Tension exists between what Leech 2014: 88 refers to as ‘pragmalinguistic politeness’ — context invariant based on lexigrammatical form (*vis tu*), and ‘sociopragmatic politeness’ — relative to norms in the social situation (*audax convivia*).

\(^{674}\) Lines 62-65 describe how the slaves ignore the client; 67 has a slave offering bread *quanto murmure* — all of which act with impunity.

\(^{675}\) Braund 1996: 289.

\(^{676}\) Braund 1996: 289 notes that *consuetis* implies that the slave knows the patron has been present at several previous dinners.
A small dialogic interlude in lines 118-119 iterates an elided formula seen elsewhere in the corpus, and sets-up the use of the vocative formula \( O x \) to be recalled later in the poem:

\[
\text{maiores. ‘tibi habe frumentum,’ Alledius inquit, 'O Libye: disiunge boves, dum tubera mittas.'}
\]

The two elisions around the ‘brusque form of refusal’ \( tibi habe \) echo its use at 3.187.\(^{677}\) The concentration of elision around what seems to be formulaic disparagement contrasts with the pithy, quasi-Satzvers pomposity of the following line.\(^ {678}\) The use of the imperatives, especially in the context of a poem in which slaves are a dialogic focal point, evokes perceived structures of social (and in this case, geographic) power dynamics. This aspect, and the use of the vocative \( O \), will be recalled in discussion of the final manifestation of \( sermo \).

The extract first discussed (74-9) functions both within its immediate poetic context, and in relation to another dialogic turn in lines 135-8. Juvenal sets up a hypothetical in which the addressee Trebius is suddenly granted an equestrian fortune. The result:

\[
\text{‘da Trebio; pone ad Trebium. vis, frater, ab ipsis ilibus?’ o nummi, vobis hunc praestat honorem; vos estis frater. dominus tamen et domini rex si vis tu fieri…}
\]

\[\text{__________________________}\]

\(^{677}\) Accipe et istud | fermentum tibi habe. Courteney 2013: 152.

\(^{678}\) Quasi as it can be read as syntactically complete by itself, or inclusive of \( tibi \).
'Give some to Trebius! Serve it to Trebius! Would you like, brother, a piece from the loin?’ O Cash! It’s to you he offers this honour, it’s you that is his brother. But if you’d like to become…

As both Courtney and Braund note, the two imperatives are directed towards a slave, whereas the change in register at *vis, frater* indicates address to Trebius. Trebius’ transformation from neglected guest to favoured ‘frater’ is enacted through lively and emphatic dialogue, whose reading is informed by both its immediate context and its dialogic antecedents. The contrasts and iterative aspects, both within the speech from *da to ilibus* and the surrounding narration, draw together the three manifestations of *sermo*. The brusque imperatives delivered to the slaves manifest the hitherto absence of ‘normative’ control which Trebius has lamented – a re-version (inversion of inversion) of power dynamics — and echo the dismissive tone addressed to the personification of Libya. The use of turn-initial *vis* in address to Trebius iterates the *vis tu* which began the slave’s ‘polite order’ at line 74; again, a re-version, both linguistically (the use of *vis* as a genuine question, rather than a peremptory order) and socially (Trebius occupying the equal social rank one would expect with the speaker of *vis*). Indeed, the use of *frater* replaces *audax convivia*, and Braund reads positive connotation in the repetition of Trebius’ name. This hypothetical *sermo*, then, takes elements of the ‘real’ humiliation the addressee had been subjected to and directly inverts them.

This same mechanism of transformative repetition can be read in Juvenal’s narration. The use of the vocative *O* is repeated, though with its original irony inverted. Alledius diminishes the power of his abstract addressee (Libya) through ironic use of a grandiose formula; Juvenal utilises the same formula to refer to the increased power of money. The *vis (tu)* formula is iterated yet again – alongside the previously polite *frater* — but is now soaked in irony. *Nummi* takes the syntactic and socio-cultural positions of Libya and Trebius — a powerful abstract personification and favoured guest at *convivia*.

---

679 Braund 1996: 298; Courtney 2013: 212.
Summary: Juvenal 5

Sermonic interludes in this poem are characterised by contrastive patterns of politeness and structures of interlocking iteration. The various transformations of politeness surrounding the use of *vis* in particular demonstrates an attention to conversational detail seemingly at odds with broader readings of Juvenal as a somewhat ‘lesser’ dialogic poet. The analysis above suggests that, while the *quantity* of conversation in Juvenal’s satiric poetry may be lesser relative to Horace and Persius, the level of detail in the vignettes themselves, and in their structural relationships, is by no means always diminished.

Satire 6

Juvenal’s sprawling diatribe against women has received a plethora of different literary readings – some reconcilable, others utterly exclusive. The analysis undertaken below makes no attempt to ‘solve’ the question of Satire 6. Rather, the study of this poem from a primarily conversational angle will highlight how stylistics are used to characterise particular *exempla* and vignettes. One notes both the lack of variation in rates of elision as a whole, and the significant variation in *Satzvers*. This is a general trend in the corpus – *sermo* is more metrically self-contained than Juvenal’s sprawling narration. Note that this analysis is undertaken exclusive of the Oxford fragment.

The harangue is littered with conversational interactions, both ‘documented’ (vignettes) and rhetorical (addressed to the satirist). Line 55 incepts the first instantiation of the latter:

```
‘magna tamen fama est cuiusdam rure paterno
viventis’ vivat Gabiis ut vixit in agro,
vivat Fidenis, et agello cedo paterno.
55-57
```

<sup>581</sup> An idea expressed most forcefully in Fiske 1920: 87, the echoes of which are still felt (see Keane 2018: 222).
Although Willis prints *pedano* for *paterno* in 55, the iterative structures within the line renders the original *paterno* particularly appealing.\(^\text{682}\) I agree with Braund and Watson (and Watson) who read *magna…viventis* as belonging to another interlocutor.\(^\text{683}\) The *aversion* to an end-stopped construction here, particularly when the speech merely detracts from the satirist’s argument and does not envision an embodied vignette, allows for the disruptive and unexpected *viventis* which begins line 56. This enjambment emphasises the line-initial word both as an aspect of the speech-turn and an aspect of the line. As the former, it draws attention to the fact that the woman in question is *currently alive* — an anomaly which Juvenal’s argument would scarcely admit, being obsessed with the temporal decay of women’s virtue.\(^\text{684}\) In the line (and as turn-taking dialogue), it is recycled by the satirist and repeated, heavy with irony.\(^\text{685}\)

Line 136 is a standard, *Satzvers* interrogative from a rhetorical interlocutor — Juvenal appears to reply in pithy kind.\(^\text{686}\) This structure is repeated in lines 142 and 143 — *Satzvers* interruption, *Satzvers* reply. Dialogic interaction between the satirist and his adversary is broken with the inclusion of the vignette at lines 146-148. As Watson and Watson have noted, repetition of *exi*, the corruption of formulaic phrasing, the use of the diminutive *sarciniculas*, and the temporality expressed in *iam…saepe…ocius…prope* give the impression of vivid dialogue and the eagerness with which the husband (via the freedman) seeks to remove his wife.\(^\text{687}\) The brusqueness of the interaction is epitomised in the leading *Satzvers*, giving way to further emphasis through the metrically identical repetition of *exi*. The aggregation of conversational phenomena in vignettes, as opposed to rhetorical interlocution to the satirist, is exemplified in this section of the poem.

---

\(^{682}\) Willis 1997: 59.

\(^{683}\) Braund 1996: 55 as indicated by apostrophes; Watson and Watson 2014: 93 attribute it to Ursidius, but there is little reason it could not also belong to a standard rhetorical interlocutor.

\(^{684}\) Flagged in lines 45-6: *quid quod et antiques uxor de morbias illi | quaequit?* Courtney 2013: 230 notes this as the likely interpretation. Watson and Watson 2014: 91 note the emphatic force of *quid quod*.

\(^{685}\) This irony is perhaps aurally manifested in the assonance of the long -o; *O x* being a vocative formula often used ironically in satire.

\(^{686}\) Line 138 is uncertain, but Juvenal’s response *bis quingena dedit: tanti vocat ille pudicam* reads fine by itself.

\(^{687}\) Watson and Watson 2014: 121. Courtney 2013: 240 also notes the corruption of the usual divorce formula.
Another Satzvers interlocution begins the next section of Juvenal’s diatribe — on noble women.\textsuperscript{688} The allegory of Amphion and Niobe is presented in vivid dialogue, instantiating what Watson and Watson refer to as the ‘sacral style’, and what I have referred to in the study of Horace and Persius rather generally as the ‘language of prayer’.

\begin{quote}
\textit{tolle tuum tecum Hannibalem victumque Syphacem}
\textit{in castris et cum tota Carthagine migra.}
\textit{‘parce, precor, Paean, et tu, dea, pone sagittas;}
\textit{nil pueri faciunt, ipsam configite matrem,’}
\textit{Amphion clamat, sed Paean contrahit arcum.}
\textit{extulit ergo greges natorum ipsumque parentem,}
\end{quote}

Remove, I beg, your Hannibal and conquered Syphax in his camp and with all of Carthage in tow, leave! ‘Mercy, I beg, Paean, and you, goddess, put down your arrows! The boys are innocent, shoot the mother herself!’ Amphion shouts, but Paean draws his bow. Thus she carried off her flocks of children and the father too…

170-175

As Persius recycles Horatian language in his construction of ‘prayer’ scenes, so too does Juvenal mimic and transform Ovidian material through a satiric filter.\textsuperscript{690} The use of Satzvers to contain formulaic prayers, coupled with iterative structures (consonance of p) and terse language, mirrors the representations of prayer seen elsewhere in the satiric corpus. Repetition,

\textsuperscript{688} Line 161.
\textsuperscript{689} Watson and Watson 2014: 131.
\textsuperscript{690} Courtney 2013: 243-244 and Watson and Watson 2014: 130-131 note that the scene itself is lifted from Ovid, and the following aspects mimic Ovidian style: scornful alliteration at \textit{tolle tecum}, the use of \textit{parce precor}, the use of \textit{clamare} for a verb of speech.
both overt and subtle, strengthens the allegorical link between Juvenal’s Cornelia and Ovid’s Niobe. These are: alliteration (tolle tuum tecum...parce precor Paean), line-initial imperatives (tolle, parce), double imperatives (tolle...migra, parce...pone), emphatic pronouns (tecum, et tu).\textsuperscript{691} The metrical structures enclosing the Ovidian vignette also feature iteration: umque Syphacement closing 170 as umque parentem closes 175; and the spondaic lines 171 and 174. As Courtney writes, the episode is an example of ‘Juvenal’s favourite technique of deflating grand figures of mythology by bringing them down to the domestic level’.\textsuperscript{692} The analysis above shows that iterative structures (sonic, lexical, and formulaic) tightens the analogy, and that Juvenal continues to instantiate aspects of ‘prayer language’ in similar form to his satiric predecessors.

Aggregate conversational phenomena are easily spotted in the episode concerning the unjust crucifixion of a slave:


‘o demens! ita servus homo est? nil fecerit, esto: hoc volo, sic iubeo: sit pro ratione voluntas.’

‘Crucify that slave.’ ‘What crime has he committed deserving of punishment? Who is the witness? Who denounced him? Listen: no delay is too long when someone’s life is at stake.’ ‘You idiot! Is a slave a person? He didn’t do anything – so be it. I want this, I order it – let my will be reason enough.’

\textsuperscript{691} Willis prints tecum whereas Watson and Watson print precor —this would merely strengthen the argument above as another example of exact repetition.

\textsuperscript{692} Courtney 2013: 244.
Many of the phenomena require little exegesis — lexical repetition (*servus, quis, vol*), imperatives, parataxis, and asydenton. Of interest is the triple elision in line 221. Courtney reads the chain of questions in the preceding lines as ‘breathless’ — an apt observation, considering how synaloepha is used to cram a series of spondaic terms into a single line; no delay indeed. Indeed, this subtle stylistic, in combination with the paratactic and asyndetic structures surrounding it, lends a tone of imperious haste to the *sermo*.

The scene in which a woman finds herself caught *in flagrante delicto* features a similar aggregation of phenomena.

*sed iacet in servi complexibus aut equitis ‘dic dic aliquem, sodes, hic, Quintiliane, colorem.’
‘haeremus, dic ipsa.’ ‘olim convenerat,’ inquit,
‘ut faceres tu quod velles, nec non ego possem indulgere mihi. clames licet et mare caelo
confundas: homo sum.’ nihil est audacious illis*

But she is lying in the arms of a servant or a knight. ‘Speak, speak, Quintilian, my friend, a line of defence.’ ‘I’m stuck: speak for yourself.’ ‘We agreed a long time ago’ she says ‘that you could do what you liked, and that I could please myself. You can yell all you like and turn the sea into the sky – I am human.’ Nothing is more audacious than these.

---

693 For the asyndetic cola see Watson and Watson 2014: 143. Courtney 2013: 247 notes the relationship between *volo* and *voluntas* and postulates mimicry of the sovereign formula *velitis iubeatis*. 
I diverge from Willis’ use of apostrophes in favour of the more popular reading.\footnote{Willis uses apostrophes to enclose only \textit{haeremus} and from \textit{olim} to \textit{sum}. The latter is uncontroversial; the former reads the imperatives \textit{dic} as from the satirist to the involved parties. However, the aggregation of conversational phenomena highlighted above suggest direct dialogue. Both Watson and Watson and Braund print the apostrophes used above.} Metrical and syntactic nuances effect a dramatic change in tone. The woman’s address to Quintilian is emotive — the iterated imperative, the fragmented syntax, vocative name, and the use of \textit{sodes} culminating in a sudden plea.\footnote{Sudden as the turn begins at the last possible moment in line 279. Watson and Watson 2014: 158 note that geminate imperatives (first two instances of \textit{dic}) are rare and emphatic in imperial poetry.} Quintilian’s pithy response repeats the imperative and is cut short by the woman — as indicated by the conspicuous elision at \textit{ipsa olim}.\footnote{Conspicuous as it blurs the penthemimeral caesura, occurs over a spondee, and is the only elision present in the lines above.} In lieu of Quintilian’s rhetorical argument, she presents her case utilising coded, highly implicative language, as well as two proverbial formulae.\footnote{Implicative language in \textit{conuenerat} and \textit{indulgere mihi} – see Courtney 2013: 254 and Watson and Watson 2014: 159.} Note the dramatic transformation of tone centred on the elision. The speech-turn addressed to Quintilian is composed of inclusive terms of familiarity and frank address — elements of speech to be expected between close ‘equals’. This is contrastive with the indirectness of her turn towards her husband — distancing is achieved through temporal displacement (\textit{olim}), implication, and generalisation through the use of proverbs. Her interruption is thus the prelude to a carefully pronounced dismissal of her husband. The use of what would be the primary caesura to change speakers, rather than a new line, retains the connection between \textit{haeremus}...\textit{ipsa} and the beginning of her turn.\footnote{See also the connection between the end of her speech and the satirist’s commentary in the final line (284).} Quintilian is stuck – but she is evidently not.\footnote{Watson and Watson 2014: 159 note that her use of \textit{homo sum} is perhaps coloured by the previous rejection of a similar argument in the vignette at lines 219-223. One wonders at a deeper connection considering the use of servitude in satire’s exploration of being a ‘slave’ to \textit{libido} – cf. Hor. \textit{Sat.} 1.2, 2.7.}

The rest of the poem is interspersed with fragmentary commands and questions, adding sermonic colour to the increasingly lengthy diatribe. The final dialogic interaction re-iterates

---

\footnotetext[694]{Willis uses apostrophes to enclose only \textit{haeremus} and from \textit{olim} to \textit{sum}. The latter is uncontroversial; the former reads the imperatives \textit{dic} as from the satirist to the involved parties. However, the aggregation of conversational phenomena highlighted above suggest direct dialogue. Both Watson and Watson and Braund print the apostrophes used above.}
\footnotetext[695]{Sudden as the turn begins at the last possible moment in line 279. Watson and Watson 2014: 158 note that geminate imperatives (first two instances of \textit{dic}) are rare and emphatic in imperial poetry.}
\footnotetext[696]{Conspicuous as it blurs the penthemimeral caesura, occurs over a spondee, and is the only elision present in the lines above.}
\footnotetext[697]{Implicative language in \textit{conuenerat} and \textit{indulgere mihi} – see Courtney 2013: 254 and Watson and Watson 2014: 159.}
\footnotetext[698]{See also the connection between the end of her speech and the satirist’s commentary in the final line (284).}
\footnotetext[699]{Watson and Watson 2014: 159 note that her use of \textit{homo sum} is perhaps coloured by the previous rejection of a similar argument in the vignette at lines 219-223. One wonders at a deeper connection considering the use of servitude in satire’s exploration of being a ‘slave’ to \textit{libido} – cf. Hor. \textit{Sat.} 1.2, 2.7.}
satirist-interlocutor interaction first seen at the beginning of the poem — and is similarly contextualised in Juvenal’s meta-poetic narratology:

\[
\text{nos utinam vani! sed clamat Pontia ‘feci,}\\
\text{confiteor, puersique meis aconita paravi,}\\
\text{quae deprensa patent. facinus tamen ipsa peregi.’}\\
\text{tune duos una, savissima vipera, cena?}\\
\text{tune duos? ‘septem, si septem forte fuissent.’}
\]

If only I spoke falsely! But Pontia declares: ‘I did it, I confess, I prepared aconite to my own boys. The deed lies open to all. Nevertheless I did it myself.’ You killed two yourself, most savage viper, with a single meal? Two yourself? ‘Seven, if there had been seven.’

638-642

This dialogue is introduced by line 634 — fingimus haec altum Saturna sumente coturnum — drawing attention both to the meta-poetic aspect of satire and indeed the driving ego (or indeed egos) behind the diatribe. This involvement of the satiric ego in discourse is similar to that seen in lines 55-57; and is similarly composed of synchronic repetition.\(^700\) This aspect is complemented by diachronic repetition with the other sermonic vignettes — the use of the final anceps to stress the verb, clause-initial iteration from the satirist, and elliptical speech.\(^701\) Thus,

---

\(^700\) Septem...septem picking up duos...duos. Also possibly tune...tune picking up the heavy use of first-person verbs in the first turn from the woman.

\(^701\) Final anceps stressing the verb seen at: Hor. Sat. 1.1.55, 1.2.54, 1.3.78, 1.6.38, 2.1.60, 2.3.59, 152, 160, 2.6.61, 2.7.5, 22, Pers. 3.83-85, 5.132-3, Juv. 1.104, 125-126, Juv. 2.21, 37, 5.220, 221, 279. Clause-initial repetition seen at: Hor. Sat. 1.3.32-34, 1.4.133-138, 2.7.116, Juv 1.153-4.
the final dialogic vignette instantiates the general stylistics of *sermo* seen throughout the corpus, the engagement of the satiric narrator in rhetorical debate following contextualisation of the ‘authorial’ ego, and some emphatic aspects of *sermo* particular to Juvenal’s longest poem.

**Summary: Juvenal 6**

Juvenal’s diatribe on women features surprisingly little speech from the gender in question. Indeed, the primarily monologic nature of this satire is perhaps alluded to in lines 634-7 — Juvenal exceeding both the thematic motifs associated with the genre of satire, and indeed its stylistic reliance on *sermo* as concept. As seen elsewhere and is arguably thematic in Juvenal’s poetry, dialogue is utilised primarily to represent and emphasise social inversion and/or parodic juxtaposition. Iterative structures and repetition therefore not only instantiate the conversational phenomena of repetition as mimetic of *sermo*, but serve to transform the function and meaning of the iterated item. Furthermore, Juvenal draws on a wide array of linguistic and poetic resources to modulate the variety of voices in the poem — including the metrical structure of his chosen genre. With regards to the study of representations of feminine speech, it remains difficult to parse whether these vignettes interact with Juvenal’s contemporary conceptions thereof. What can be said for certain is there is little in the speeches analysed above which conforms to expected female speech as constructed from alternative literary sources. That there might be deliberate inversion of expected feminine speech — especially in the use of imperatives and authorial language when talking to their husbands — seems likely considering Juvenal’s programme of social inversion, and indeed the construction of Laronia’s speech in Satire 2.

**Satire 7**

Braund writes that this poem ‘marks a new departure for Juvenal’ — arguing that it begins the assumption of a new, calmer persona which contrasts with his previous *ira et indignatio*. One also wonders if he refers to the length of the poem.

---

This identification of a considerable tone-shift coincides with a severe decline in the use of sermonic stylistics in the construction of rhetorical speech. Although roughly 5% of the poem consists of fictive speech – both rhetorical (directed to the satirist) and historical (functioning as a vignette) — the colourful use of dialogic language metrical nuances seen in the previous six poems is conspicuously absent. Therefore, this section will simply defend the speaker-attribution adopted (primarily following Braund.)

There are two instances where Willis and Braund diverge in their use of apostrophes. The first is at lines 124-5:

‘Aemilio dabitur quantum licet, et melius nos

egimus.’ huius enim stat currus aeneus, alti

Willis prints no apostrophes — both Courtney and Braund attribute Aemilio...egimus to an interlocutor.\(^{704}\) I agree with the latter editors due to Juvenal’s use of the singular and plural throughout the poem. The extended ‘lament’ for writers is constructed so as to present Juvenal as an omniscient but predominantly uninvolved party; the narrator’s use of the first-person in all other cases functions to present the inspired writer, the disembodied voice of counsel, or in (condescending) sympathy with writers in potentia (fidimus eloquio?) — never once indicating that the author engages in any of the intellectual activities he lists after poetry.\(^{705}\) On the contrary, specific writers are often summoned by the group in the plural, before the singular is used to elucidate the particularities of their suffering.\(^{706}\) That is to say, given Juvenal’s self-identification as specifically a poet (fitting for his genre) and subsequent aversion to identification with any other group (despite giving advice thereon), it seems likely that egimus belongs to a representative of the causidici.

\(^{704}\) Braund 2004: 304; Courtney 2013: 320.

\(^{705}\) 48 nos tamen hoc agimus...49 ducimus referring to writing poetry; 56 qualem nequeo monstrare et sentio tantum; 171 si nostra movebunt | consilia

\(^{706}\) 20 hoc agite, o iuvenes, 65 pectora vestra, 98 vester...scriptores, historians referred to en masse by the interlocutor at 105 sed genus ignavum.
The other point of contention concerns the finale:

‘haec’ inquit ‘cura’ sed cum se verterit annus,
accipe victori populus quod postulat aurum.

242-243

Willis encloses all but inquit in apostrophes — Braund prints above.\(^{707}\) I agree with Braund (and assumedly Courtney) — the adversative effect of sed at the primary caesura in particular seems to effect a strong change in rhetorical direction and thus a likely change in speaker.\(^ {708}\)

To illustrate the pronounced lack of sermonic stylistics, consider the vignette from lines 158-166. The student’s speech turn is the most conversationally charged in the poem: mercedem appellas? Quid enim scio? — a strong elision and paratactic, emphatic (enim) questions delivering a sermonic force which is undercut by the rhetor’s reply beginning at the bucolic diaeresis.\(^ {709}\) Perhaps in mock-deference to the rhetor’s idiolect, his pseudo-reply (spoken to himself) is initially depersonalised (arguitur), only resuming any semblance of dialogue at the end — quantum vis stipulare et protinus accipe: quid do | ut totiens ilum pater audiat.\(^ {710}\) This is undoubtedly the most conversational vignette of the poem, yet it is only bookended by familiar phenomena.

**Summary: Juvenal 7**

---

\(^{707}\) Courtney 2013: 333 seems to agree with Braund as they identify the closing lines as an ἀπροσδόκητον ‘which of course does not report the actual words of the parent but is Juvenal’s sarcastic paraphrase of them.’

\(^{708}\) See similar use of sed as turn-initial at line 105. Accipe transforming the narrator’s own accipe at line 36 – first learn the tricks used to con you, then take your miserable pay.

\(^{709}\) A transition repeated when the satirist resumes at line 166.

\(^{710}\) Lines 165-6. Courtney 2013: 165 writes that the indicative do is used deliberatively citing Sen. Ep. 79.5 – from the comparison it seems a function of dialogic language, though whether it is specific to it is another question entirely.
The lack of conversational stylistics reflects the lack of conversation in the poem. Even in the vignette just described, one could hardly call the interaction dialogic — the teacher gives no reply to his interlocutor, embodying a type of diatribic disengagement which is all too familiar to readers of Juvenal. Diatribic use of the second person is seen in several instances throughout the poem to engage with rhetorical interlocution, yet only in isolation — there is no extended conversation.  

Satire 8

This poem features the second lowest rate of speech to lines of Juvenal’s corpus (outstripped only by 11). Paradoxically, it also features one of the most overt and clear engagements with the concept of sermo.

Of the two dialogic interactions in the poem, the first is pointedly sermonic. While the poem is ostensibly addressed to Ponticus, Juvenal overtly shifts his attention to the true object of his initial diatribe in line 39:

\[
\text{his ego quem monui? tecum est mihi sermo, Rubelli}
\]

The use of the term sermo here is an obvious focal point for this thesis. Its dialogic connotations are both summary and anticipatory — referring to the second-person diatribe delivered in the previous lines, and also to the ‘conversation’ with Rubelli which follows. Note the emphatic use of pronouns and the vocative surrounding sermo — as well as the prodelision at tecum est. The conversation is fully realised at line 44:

---

711 Lines 105-6, 188-190.
712 The use of a silent addressee to frame the poem is a pseudo-epistolary/dialogic throwback to Horace’s first book of Satires – perhaps another aspect of Juvenal’s ‘transformation’ as his poetry continues; a resumption of a more restrained form of satire. For readings of diminishing indignatio in Juvenal’s works see Hutchinson 1989: 118; Keane 2003: 270; 2007: 27, 54; Bellandi 2009: 488.
713 Both Willis and Courtney 2013: 343 support the presence of est as opposed to Clausen’s omission (present in Braund’s Loeb).
‘vos humiles’ inquis ‘vulgi pars ultima nostri,
quorum nemo queat patriam monstrare parentis;
ast ego Cecropides.’ vivas et originis huius

Although Rubellius’ speech features pointed use of pronouns, there continues a general aversion to other sermonic stylistics in Juvenal’s later poems. The aversion to clausal enjambment, combined with the overt condescension and pithy final remark, conveys a distinctly haughty tone. Furthermore, the use of *ast*, having received little comment from modern editors, can not only function to support the nostalgic/archaic (Cecropides) disdain, but also to amplify its own quasi-legal resonances. 714 Indeed, dialogic interaction between the satirist and Rubellius is found not only in Juvenal’s direct (and formulaic?) response *vivas*, his repetition of Cecropides (line 53), but perhaps also his use of a legal vignette to rebut Rubellius. 715 Juvenal’s self-described *sermo* with Rubellius is not merely a vignette to establish a straw-man; Rubellius is used as a ‘talking head’ to introduce terms and ideas in a particular dialogic context which, as is often the case, are then turned back against him.

**Summary: Juvenal 8**

The second use of dialogue in the poem is a traditional satiric deployment of *dicet*, introducing a hypothetical interlocutor to posit a potential rebuttal — met with a pseudo-Horatian ironic turn *esto*. 716 The initial *sermo* with Rubellius evinces Juvenal’s interlocutorial whack-a-mole — manifested earlier in his representation of *sermo*, and now re-worked into his narratological framework, in a similar manner to earlier satirists. The use of the generic *dicet* to summon an interlocutor, and to then ‘agree’ with them to begin an ironic deconstruction of their point,

714 See Pers. 2.39-40 for similar function.
715 On *vivas* as possibly proverbial see Mayor 2007: 12, Courtney 2013: 344. Consider also Juvenal’s use of *vivat* at 6.55-57 in response to another interlocutor.
716 Line 163-4.
reads as a shift towards more ‘traditional’ satiric engagement with conversation, as opposed to Juvenal’s previous reliance on (extended) vignettes rather than rhetorical engagement.

**Satire 9**

We come at last to the only complete dialogue of Juvenal’s satiric output. Bellandi, in his chapter on this poem, writes the following:

‘[Dialogue allows for] the dynamic interplay of forces in a personality taken all in all, rather than a single act in which they become concrete and are fixed…[we have] the optical illusion of a person with a vivid and many-faceted character, in splendid independence of his creator.’

Bellandi 2009: 491

The fundamental distinction Bellandi draws between Satires 3 and 9 is one that is upheld and concurrent throughout this thesis. The relative ‘reality’ of speech and speaker are meaningful structural features of the text, and are utilised by the poet to generate meaning not only in the individual poem, but indeed within collections of texts and across the boundaries of their own output through intertextual engagement. Satire 9 is something of a generic throwback to Horace’s second book — *sermo merus*, with no narratological framing or interruption à la Persius.

The structural elements of the poem are as follows. Naevolus elides at a rate of 43%, and speaks in Satzvers at a rate of 10%. ‘Juvenal’ elides at a rate of 28%, and uses Satzvers at a rate of 18%. Naevolus’ elision rate is heightened, not only in direct contrast with his interlocutor, but also when viewed against the general elision rate in Juvenal (32.50%). This disparity is reminiscent of that seen in Satire 3, where I posited that Umbricius’ elision rate is

717 Bellandi 2009: 489 notes that the use of dialogue has retroactive consequences for the reading of satire 3 – Umbricius now seems ‘an allusion in comparison [to Naevolus’ dialogue].’
resonant with other generally Horatian aspects of his satiric persona. While I do not propose that Naevolus is to be read even as a pseudo-Horatian figure, there are enough points of contact between the three figures to warrant a brief discussion.

The shadow of Horace in Mr. Shady has been discussed — Umbricius and Naevolus too, share many features. Naturally, both speakers also make use of the general ‘satiric’ repertoire of rhetorical interlocution. Both function as stand-in satirists and commit self-incrimination through their diatribe. Both speakers blame fate for their sufferings, are spurned on by old-age to seek recourse, and complain of poverty. In short, both speakers lament their inability to get rich quick — an obviously ironic complaint, given Juvenal’s condemnation of economic fixation. Furthermore, Naevolus has certain resonances with Horace which Umbricius does not. This is seen primarily in his position in, and anxiety over, a patron-client relationship. Other similarities are to be seen in Juvenal’s description of Naevolus as *agebas vernam equitem, conviva ioco mordente facetus* (10), Naevolus being unable to keep secrets (Horace has a ‘leaky ear’), the juxtaposition between *certice modo contentus* and Naevolus’ wishes for the trappings of wealth (an accusation often levelled against Horace), and Naevolus’ regurgitation of Horace *Odes* 1.11. How are we to interpret this? Umbricius represents the failure of Horatian satire in the face of Juvenal’s contemporary context. Naevolus may continue the refraction of Juvenal’s generic predecessors through substitute satirists — fusing the grotesque physicality of Persius 4 with Horace’s satiric ‘Achilles heel’ (relationship with Maecenas) in order to carve an updated path through familiar territory.

The instantiation of previous satirists — though heavily distorted — has been seen enacted in Persius and, as I have argued, in Juvenal 3. The iteration of particular motifs in

---

719 Bellandi 2009: 475 identifies other overlaps with Umbricius, namely their tone and argument structure.
722 For Horace as *equites* see Freudenburg 2021: 76 on Horace *Sat.* 2.1.75; for his reception amongst later satirists as witty see Pers.1.118; for Horace accused of greed see the finale of Hor. *Sat.* 2.3, Davus’ harangue in 2.7, and Ulysses as a stand-in for Horace in 2.5 – Freudenburg 2021: 205.
723 Persius 4 is also the closest the poet comes to a true dialogue.
724 Also potentially by Horace in 1.9 – see Ferris-Hill 2011.
the construction of Naevolus’ character may manifest, again, the genre’s predilection for engaging literary predecessors through sermonic modalities.

Dialogic analysis of Satire 9 bifurcates into two simultaneous studies – an investigation of the conversation as held between ‘Juvenal’ and Naevolus, and Naevolus’ use of rhetorical speech in his diatribic lament. The former is, perhaps surprisingly, mostly void of dialogic phenomena which requires any further exegesis. Courtney has written that ‘the urbane politeness of the interlocutors reminds us of a Platonic dialogue’. While the dialogue is potentially necessarily resonant with the Platonic dialogues (as the schematic template for satiric dialogue as a miniature genre), to attribute ‘urbane politeness’ to both interlocutors is something of a generalisation. There are two instances of politeness strategies in their interactions. The first is that which opens the poem — _Scire velim quare totiens mihi, Naevole, tristis | occuras fronte obducta ceu Marsya victus_. Although pseudo-indirectness (leading into pseudo-politeness) is deployed by Juvenal to attract Naevolus’ attention, it is, as always, a flimsy cover for barely concealed ridicule. The second instance is Juvenal’s use of ‘positive politeness’ in lines 90-91: _iusta doloris | Naevole, causa tui_. Emphatic agreement and the iteration of Naevolus’ name conform to the expected ironic pseudo-socratic posturing ‘Juvenal’ adopts. The change in strategy perhaps reflects the progression of the poem — by this stage, it is clear that Naevolus’ needs little prompting to continue his complaint; minimisation of ‘Juvenal’s imposition is unnecessary, and the satirist plays into his role as Naevolus’ confidante.

Of interest is the complete lack of reciprocal politeness strategies from Naevolus. No terms of friendship or endearment are used (the repetition of Naevolus’ name in stark contrast to the silence regarding Juvenal’s), he orders Juvenal around with the imperative and the future, and potentially (accidentally?) conflates Juvenal at one point with his own pathetic patrons. The final point rests on identifying a change of speaker at line 46:

‘quam dominum’ sed tu sane tenerum et puerum te

____________________________

725 Courtney 2013: 424.
et pulchrum et dignum cyatho caeloque putabas.
‘vos humili asseculae, vos indulgebitis unquam
cultori, iam nec morbo donare parati?’

‘…than he who ploughs his master.’ But surely you thought yourself a soft and pretty boy and worthy of the heavenly cup. ‘You people, will you ever indulge your needy follower, your attendant, are you now not prepared to spend money on your sickness?’

46-49

Braund reads ‘Juvenal’ speaking sed...putabas, whereas Courtney and Willis include it in Naevolus’ speech. I agree with Braund on the grounds of structural congruity. Courtney writes that here, ‘the patron piles every laudatory epithet on himself. He thought himself a Ganymede (the archetypical Catamitus…) though he was old and ugly.’ The argument for attributing the line to Naevolus, then, seems to be the application of terms associated with passive sexual practice to the second-person. This, however, does not accord with the immediate poetic context. Naevolus himself is the one associated with Ganymede according to Juvenal (lines 22-23), and refers pseudo-ironically to himself as κίναιδος in line 37. The physical description of Naevolus pre-bankruptcy, offered by ‘Juvenal’ in the opening, accords with the general descriptions of homosexual male partners in satire regardless of active or passive role. That is to say, despite Naevolus only taking an active sexual role in the poem, his descriptors are drawn from the general milieu of satiric representations of homosexuals, rather than a specific sexual role. Therefore, attributing the speech-turn to Naevolus because it describes a catamitus is not a particularly strong argument.

726 Courtney 2013: 380.
728 Pers 4.35-41.
Moving from negative to positive argumentation, there are several elements of the speech-turn which are more congruent with reading ‘Juvenal’ as the speaker. The first is the tense of *putabas*. ‘Juvenal’ makes use of the imperfect multiple times in his initial address to Naevolus — contentus agebas | vernam equitem (9-10), Bruttia praestabat calidi tibi fascia visci (14), notior Aufidio moechus celebrare solebas (25) — and in each instance, the imperfect is used to describe Naevolus’ pre-bankruptcy state. Naevolus himself makes no use of the imperfect until line 76, when recounting how he previously saved his patron’s marriage. Indeed, Naevolus’ diatribe is delivered predominantly in the present and future — lamenting his present condition, foreseeing its continuation — and his rhetorical interaction with his patron follows suit. It seems unlikely that Naevolus would thus employ *putabas* as directed towards his patron; there is little reason to relegate this one particular fault to the imperfect when all others are discussed in the present, and all other rhetorical interactions are presented vividly in the present. Given Juvenal’s use of the imperfect to refer to Naevolus’ physical state before their current *sermo*, *sed…putabas* is most likely spoken by the satirist.

Returning to the question of Naevolus’ impoliteness, we can now see nuances in lines 46-50 which indicate close dialogic interaction and Naevolus’ subsequent bad manners. The repetition of *vos*, responding to *te*, not only demonstrates the attentive engagement of the speakers, but engenders a confusion of addressees — reading as if Juvenal is included in *vos*. Like many speakers in Latin satire, it seems that Naevolus too easily slips into the diatribic mode — subjecting ‘Juvenal’ to the same ambiguous (and provocative) use of the second-person as the satirists inflict upon their readers. Naevolus’ ‘spasm of anger’, as Courtney terms it, is a visceral reaction against his own familiar epithets — perhaps he has endured such cloying terms from his patron(s) — and far from being ‘not strictly relevant to the train of thought’, directly replies to the implied argument supplied by the satirist: *I thought you considered yourself pretty (and thus successful?) ‘When will you people ever gratify a lowly sycophant (even if he is pretty!)*

---

729 *Tabulas quoque ruperat et iam | migrabat* (75-76)
730 Rhetorical interaction in the present and future tenses from lines 48 onwards.
731 Mimetic structure is also perhaps seen in Juvenal’s elisions following Naevolus’ 6 elisions at 43-44.
Turning from questions of politeness to the content of Naevolus’ speech, there are a few stylistic nuances of relevance. The first is the use of heavy elision in lines 43-44:

\[
an \text{facile et pronom est agere intra viscera penem}
\]

\[
\text{legitimum atque illic hesternae occurrere cenae?}
\]

Two lines of triple elisions/prodelision, realising the rather graphic imagery with poetic ‘stuffing’ of the lines (and the words running into \textit{occurrere} each other) and also perhaps a Naevolus’ particular agitation.\footnote{Sturtevant 1916: 36 on elision and rapidity of speech.} Naevolus’ speech also features a short use of rhetorical speech that instantiates the use of paratactic syntax to convey temporal compression and repetition:

\[
quod tamen ulterius monstrum quam mollis avarus?
\]

\[
‘\textit{haec tribui: deinde illa dedi; max plura tulisti.’}
\]

38-39

Elliptical paratactic statements are used not only to convey the clipped and dismissive speech it relates, but also to allow for poetic temporal compression of events – with multiple points in time being explicitly referred to (\textit{deinde…mox}). One must also note his corruption of Homer at line 37 (mirrored by Juvenal with Virgil at line 102) — both instances serving to juxtapose the source material with the interlocutor’s contemporary milieu. The use of speech and quotation to indicate moral-poetic inversion is par for the satiric course. The attribution of Greek to the interlocutor, and Latin for ‘Juvenal’, perhaps saves some face for our intrepid correspondent.\footnote{Fögen 2014: 80 summarises Juvenal’s moral representation of the Greek language.}
Summary: Juvenal 9

This brief analysis of Satire 9 has demonstrated that, while Juvenal’s dialogic interaction is certainly not as extensive or intricately wrought as Horace’s, the interlocutors are not without conversational colour. Attentive listening is present in mimetic and iterative structures, poetic stylistics are used to add emotional emphasis to particular turns, and the presence of politeness structures elsewhere in Juvenal’s corpus makes their absence in Naevolus’ speech particularly striking.\(^{734}\)

Satire 10

‘This poem…is presented as a kind of didactic “sermon”, reminiscent of Horace’s diatribe satires…’ Braund’s introductory comment to Juvenal’s 10\(^{th}\) poem concisely summarises several intertextual aspects — the theme of ‘human wishes/prayer’, the didactic (as opposed to irate) tone, and the progressive movement through different objects of human desire.\(^{735}\) It also (coincidentally?) reflects the mirrored elision rate (approximately 40%), experiments in philosophical personae, and the varied use of recorded sermones as moral exempla.\(^{736}\) Stylistically, the poem presents a higher (Horatian) rate of elision, and a generally lower rate of Satzvers (9%). More specifically, however, it is the satirist himself who retains the high rate of elision, whereas rhetorical speech elides at a rate of only 23%. The snippets of speech presented are various — prayers, gossip, one-liners from Hannibal himself — and their narratological function equally multi-faceted.

The familiar satiric motif of misguided prayer makes an early appearance at line 24.

\[\textit{prima fere vota et cunctis notissima templis}\]

\(^{734}\) Compare to politeness in satire 5.

\(^{735}\) Braund 2004: 364; see also Hutchinson 1989: 118

\(^{736}\) The use of gossip/conversation in satire 10 is noted in Knoche 2009: 260, Umurhan 2011: 236. For the persona of Democritus see Keane 2003: 269.
Although both Willis and Braund do not print apostrophes, the use of *nostra...arca* is indicative that we are to imagine an alternative speaker. Indeed the transition to another speaker is neither announced nor directly engaged — its presence felt from the use of contextual language (subjunctive with *ut*) and relegated to a mere *exemplum* as Juvenal discusses it in the third person. This style of engagement — Juvenal’s silent scribbling at the crossroads — is thematic in this poem. Repetition in the language of prayer is by now familiar (*ut...ut*). Note the contrasting line-openings in *divitiae...fictilibus* enclosing the prayer (both making strong use of the caesura in the second foot), and the use of *sed* to introduce the narrator’s rebuttal — the latter will become familiar as the poem continues. Here, it suffices to say that prayers for wealth continue to be represented in satire with iterative and emotive (*maxima toto*) language, usually not in Satzvers.

The conversation presented in lines 69-72 has been deemed ‘casual and slangy’ by Knoche.\(^{737}\) Let us see if we can improve upon this summation. The first *sermo* is as follows:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{... gaudent omnes: ‘quae labra! quis illi} \\
\text{vultus erat! nunquam, si quid mihi credis, amavi} \\
\text{hunc hominem. ‘sed quo cecidit sub crimen? quisnam} \\
\text{delator? quibus indicibus, quo teste probavit?’} \\
\text{‘nil horum. verbosa et grandis epistula venit}\end{align*}\]

\(^{737}\) Knoche 2009: 260.
Everyone celebrates: ‘What lips! What a face he has! But I never, believe you me, liked the man.’ ‘But under what charge did he fall? Who was the informer? With what evidence, by what witness was it proved?’ ‘None of those. A long and wordy letter came from Capri.’ ‘There you have it, I ask no more.’…

Conversational elements of this extract are as follows (in order of appearance): elliptical idiomatic expressions (quae…erat), parenthetical aside (si…credis), question-chain/iteration (quo…quisnam…quibus), idiomatic expression (bene habet), conversational referentiality (nil plus interrogo). Note the use of negative politeness which seek agreement: the expanded parenthetical statement from si…credis, the sermonic evacuation at nil…interrogo — both have antecedents in Horace’s sermones, and both function to communicate non-threating behaviour. The danger of politically charged gossip remains an ever present shadow – sometimes remarked upon explicitly (satire 4), other times an implied presence, as we see here.

Indeed, the danger of certain sermo is described in no uncertain terms in the conversation which immediately follows.

... ‘perituros audio multos.’

‘nil dubium: magna est fornacula.’ ‘pallidulus mi

Bruttidius meus ad Martis fuit obvius aram;

738 See Dickey 2012: 167 on bene habet; on quae...erat see Courtney 2013: 405 noting a similar formulation in Lucil. 43.
739 Si...credis an expansion of the town-mouse’s mihi crede at 2.6.93, nil...interrogo cf. nil ultra quaero plebeius at 2.3.188.
quam timeo, victus ne poenas exigat Aiax

ut male defensus, curramus praecepit et,

dum iacet in ripa, calcemus Caesaris hostem.

sed videant servi, ne quis neget et pavidum in ius
cervice obstricta dominum trahat. ’hi sermones
tunc de Seiano, secreta haec murmura vulgi.

‘I hear many are about to perish.’ ‘No doubt about it. The furnace is huge.’ ‘My friend Bruttidius looked rather pale when I met him at the altar of Mars. How I fear lest defeated Ajax take revenge for being badly defended, let’s hurry along now and, while it’s lying on the banks, stamp on the enemy of Caesar. But let the slaves see, lest any should deny it and drag their shaking master to court with his neck bound.’ These were the conversations about Sejanus, these were the secret murmurs of the people.

81-89

Remus’ crowd speak frankly though clandestinely. The use of diminutives and monosyllabic line-endings (*mi, et, ius*) are particularly ‘casual’ elements of their *sermo* which are not featured in the previous extract. However, it is not in their stylistics that these two dialogues function as a pair, but in their content and imagined context. These two constructions of *sermo* are presented as having opposing origins. *sed quid turba Remi* follows the first conversation and preludes the second, and Juvenal classifies the second as *secreta vulgi*. The differences in conversational content seem predicated not upon relative social status, but rather on the speaker’s socio-political liability. The ‘patricians’ of the first conversation seek, through their

---

740 Courtney 2013: 405.
speech, to appear in concordance with Sejanus’ downfall, emphasising their credibility and their non-aggression towards the state (\textit{nil plus} etc). The ‘Plebeians’ enact the inverse — their speech demonstrates their anxiety and fear directly, and the protection of clandestine conversation allows for scheming and the expression of state-fuelled anxiety. Through a double synecdoche of ‘Romans’, Juvenal shows two sides of the same problem — the danger of conversation — and emphasises, again, how appearances, manifested through speech, are often deceptive.

Other uses of speech are limited — Hannibal’s two lines, Cicero’s \textit{Satzvers}, the usual prayer for long-life, and a question from a doting mother.\footnote{Hannibal 155-156, Cicero 122, prayer 188, mother 291-292\&324. Note that the prayer conforms to the usual constructions — repetition \textit{da...da}, and parataxis.} The use of \textit{sermo} to represent the various figures used as \textit{exempla} aligns both with the structural, generic composition of the poem — a style of satire similar to Horace’s first book and Persius 2 (complete with references to the folly of human wishes) — and with Juvenal’s idiosyncratic fixation on the socio-political risks of conversation.\footnote{Courtney 2013: 393.} It is telling that the most extended speech-vignette in the poem revolves around ‘contemporary’ political ordeals, as opposed to the short snippets allocated to Republican matters.

\textbf{Satires 11-12}

Neither Juvenal’s monologue on the topic of ‘know thyself’ nor his dramatic philosophical account of his friend Catullus at sea, contain uses of rhetorical speech suitable for exegesis in this thesis.

\textbf{Satire 13}

Despite containing the second-highest rate of non-satirist speech per line, dialogue in this poem is not particularly conversational. This comes as no surprise — the speeches at lines 92-
105 and 113-119 are an internal monologue and a deprecation of a silent deity, respectively. Indeed, the most ‘dialogic’ aspect of speech within the poem is the beginning of the latter extract: ‘audis | Iuppiter, haec, nec labra moves, cum mittere vocem... where the speech begins without preamble on the final foot, introducing strong enjambment. The lack of sermonic variation in the poem is reflected in the relative rates of elision and Satzvers — 39% and 13% for ‘Juvenal’, 38% and 17% for other speaks cumulatively. The division of speakers is metrically uniform with the standards of the genre, save for line 84:

\[ \textit{si vero et pater est, \textasciitilde{c}omedam\textasciitilde{'} inquit flebile \textasciitilde{'}nati} \]
\[ \textit{sinciput elixi Pharioque madentis aceto.} \]

The spondaic elision over the hephthemimeral caesura (and indeed speaker boundaries) is somewhat unusual, though more common in Juvenal with ‘verbs of speaking’ such as inquit. Though it is tempting to read a potential obscuration of the subjunctive, thus opening up the line to multiple interpretations (comede being particularly egregious), Soubiran notes that an elision of vowel + m most likely retained a nasal resonance, thus preserving the meaning of comedam.\textsuperscript{743}

**Satire 14**

As is thematic in Juvenal, conversational phenomena are generally concentrated in dialogic vignettes, and less prominent in ‘rhetorical’ dialogue directed towards the satirist. The irate dominus in lines 60-62 speaks in imperatives, parataxis, asyndeton, and with strong conversational referentiality (hic...alter). The ‘gravity’ of his orders is emphasised through marked end-stopping. The speech attributed to an old man of the Marsi/ Hernici/ Vestini is

\textsuperscript{743} Soubiran 1966: 71.
particularly contrastive with both the vignettes which surround it (60-62, 191-207) and comprises several features reminiscent of ‘senile’ speech from Roman comedy.\textsuperscript{744}

\begin{quote}
‘\textit{vivite contenti casulis et collibus istis}

\textit{o puere’ Marsus dicebat et Hernicus olim}

\textit{Vestinusque senex: ‘panem quaeramus aratro, qui satis est mensis: laudant hoc numina ruris, quorum ope et auxilio gratae post munus aristae contingunt homini veteris fastidia quercus.}

\textit{nil vetitum fecisse volet, quem non pudet alto per glaciem perone tegi, qui summovet euros pellibus inversis: peregrina ignotaque nobis ad scelus atque nefas, quaecumque est, purpura ducit.’}
\end{quote}

‘Live content with huts and these hills, boys.’ So an old man of the Marsi or Hernici or Vestini used to say: ‘let us seek our bread with the plough, enough for our tables. The rustic gods approve this, and by their help and assistance did the distaste for ancient acorns come upon man after the gift of pleasing corn. He would not want to do anything forbidden, who is not embarrassed to wear high boots in the ice, who banishes the east winds with inside-out skins. Exotic and unfamiliar purple, whatever it is, leads to crime and wickedness’

\textsuperscript{744} As presented in Karakasis 2005: 68-83. The core observation made by Karakasis is that senile speakers have a ‘penchant for wordiness.’
The accumulation of quasi-synonyms aligns with Karakasis’ description of senile speech — 
*ope et auxilio, peregrina ignotaque, ad scelus atque nefas.*745 With regards to the third example, note the use of unelided *atque* — a linguistically conservative feature and one which Butterfield considers unlike satiric conceptions of ‘everyday speech.’ 746 Linguistic conservatism is also potentially present in *nil vetitum fecisse volet* — Courtney notes that this sense of *velle* followed by the perfect infinitive is common in legal contexts, which also feature other archaic/conservative elements.747 The quasi-polysyndetic speech and ‘wordiness’ characterises the speaker as (comically) senile, and is naturally contrastive with the dialogue that precedes it. Juxtaposition heightens the already parodic characterisations, and the presence of this comic-senile register seems to indicate that Juvenal ‘quotes’ with tongue still in cheek.

The satirist is nostalgic for such *sermo* — *haec illi veteres praecepta minoribus: at nunc*...The rustic, meandering wisdom of the Republican past is, again, contrasted with present-day dialogue. The father’s injunction to his son (lines 191-207) begins with the same use of paratactic commands as the master in lines 60-62. That such mimicry implies similarity is obvious — both speakers being fathers who fail to impart ‘good’ wisdom onto their sons, despite their dictatorial preference for the imperative. This is also seen in the short snippet near the end of the poem from the *dominus frumenti* — employing a turn-initial imperative with paratactic and iterative statements.748 The alignment of these three sermonic *exempla* is complemented by their contrastive elements with the senile speech discussed earlier. Vocative forms of *puer* are utilised in both speeches, yet to opposite effects.749 The old man’s unelided

---

745 Courtney 2013: 510 on *quaecumque est* functioning the same as *ignota.*
748 292-295. Iterative *nil...nil...*
749 *O pueri* functioning in similar vein to *O boni* – the father’s *puer* both refers to the immediate familial relation and, coupled with physical imperatives (rather than the abstract *vivite*) is reminiscent of orders to slaves or underlings – cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.92
atque is mirrored by the father’s elided dis atque ipso.\textsuperscript{750} All snippets engage in the ‘paternal didactic mode’ — though the sub-genres of Republican rambling and contemporary reprimand are stylistically differentiated.

**Summary: Juvenal 14**

Speech in satire 14 is not conversational — rather, it consists of orders, delivered primarily in various flavours of paternal didacticism. \textit{verre} (60), \textit{vivite} (179), \textit{accipe} (191), and even Juvenal himself joining in with \textit{dic, o vanissime} (211). Interlocking patterns of repetition and transformation reveal the relationships between speakers: the \textit{domini} in lines 60-62 and 292-295; the fathers in 60-62, 179-188, and 191-207; the didacts in all of the above plus the satirist himself in lines 211-255. Thus, although (as Courtney notes) the theme of parental influence diminishes from line 255, the structural aspects of \textit{sermo} continue to reinforce the relationships between moral decay (avarice) and ‘parental’ authority (manifested both in biological parents and other figures of authority — the \textit{veteres, domini}, satirist.) Contemporary authority is expressed in paratactic, iterative orders. ‘Older’ didacticism is expressed in more archaic figures of speech, conforming in part to senile speech seen in Roman comedy. Dissenting opinions addressed to the satirist are modulated — \textit{inquit} (153), \textit{dices} (225).

**Satire 15**

The only manifestation of \textit{Sermo} in this poem is an imagined retort against Odysseus from one of the Phaeaceans. Courtney has already discussed all \textit{sermonic} aspects of relevance: the use of \textit{nemo} + indicative as a ‘colloquial substitute’ (that is, statistically more frequent in Roman Comedy) for the imperative, which itself contrasts with the faux-epic aspects of the speech.\textsuperscript{751} Note also the unelided \textit{atque} giving an even more archaic feel to the epic

\textsuperscript{750} Line 206.
\textsuperscript{751} Courtney 2013: 526-527.
Laestrygonas atque Cyclopas. Pseudo-epic gravity is present also in the use of heavy spondaic elisions; fingentem immanis drawing out the sense of immanis; crediderim aut, and grunnisse Elpenora giving aural presence to grunnisse. These nuances add a semi-epic flavour to the short diatribe against Ulysses.

Satire 16

As this poem is widely accepted as unfinished, I will not comment on the distribution of particular stylistics across the whole. From what survives, it seems that the sermonic structure of the poem is similar to those which immediately precede it — poems 12-15 all feature a ‘silent’ recipient of Juvenal’s monologue, functioning a la Maecenas in Horace Book 1. I print ‘silent’ as Juvenal seems to supply Gallius’ responses. Willis’ inquis at line 18 (as opposed to conjectured igitur, or Braund’s inquit) is in keeping with the use of the second-person singular to address Juvenal’s correspondent, and with the use of first-person plural verbs in the satiric examination of the subject. In keeping with the general schema, the rhetorical speech from Gallius is signalled, though not particularly conversational. In contrast to this (and iterating the general schema) is the vignette of legal testimony in lines 29-30. Though the speech itself consists only of 3 words, they are so arranged as to encapsulate (literally) the episode.

‘da testem’ iudex cum dixerit, audeat ille
nescioquis pugnos qui vidit, dicere ‘vidi’

Note how direct speech encloses the episode, which is constructed with paratactic conditionals. Courtney highlights that this form of parataxis as being decidedly unCiceronian.

752 On igitur etc. see Courtney 2013: 545. Uses of the second-person singular at lines 21 tibi, 24 habeas, 33 possis. First-person plural at tractemus (7), sollicitemus (28), notemus (35).
753 Speech beginning at the primary caesura with a superlative iustissima, signalled in the following line with inquis. Note that nec mihi derit occupies the same metrical position as Horace’s haud mihi dero/quicquam/vita – a generic line-ending, perhaps (Hor. Sat. 1.9.56, 2.1.17, 2.6.115.
754 Courtney 2013: 546.
Considering Juvenal’s use of this vignette as a general *exemplum*, it seems that the combination of elliptical speech and parataxis are, again, utilised to convey an iterative event. In the 4 lines that follow, Juvenal’s commentary on the vignette is composed of repetitious structures and heavy consonance of *m*.

\[
et credam dignum barba dignumque capillis
maiorum. citius falsum producere testem
contra paganum possis quam vera loquentem
contra fortunam armati contraque pudorem.
\]

I’d believe him worthy of the beard and long hair of our ancestors. You could faster produce a false witness against the farmer than someone to speak the truth against the fortune and honour of an armed man.

31-34

Repetition is present in leading *-umque* for the fifth foot, line-initial *contra x-x-um*, threefold use of *contra*, and line-ending accusatives. One wonders, given the use of such consonance to convey philosophical meditation and/or old-school didacticism in the works of Horace and Persius, if Juvenal adopts a ‘chewy’ Republican tone in his *mos maiorum* flavoured moralising.\(^{755}\)

**Chapter Conclusion**

---

\(^{755}\) A counter-argument to this could be raised given the presence of *paganum* in this sense, being a more recent development in the language (see Courtney 2013: 546.)
Overall, Juvenal generally makes greater use of conversational phenomena and stylistics in his descriptions of sermo enacted in historical or rhetorical vignettes, rather than in his interactions with the familiar ‘rhetorical interlocutor’. Despite his reception as a satirist who is less conversational than his predecessors, there are several instances of vivid and poetically complex dialogue which engage both satiric intertextuality and the socio-linguistic context of his writings. As seen in the poetry of Horace and Persius, snippets of conversation often function not only as exempla of whatever social or moral decay Juvenal happens to be talking about, but also as iterative and resonant structures which are echoed and transformed as the poems progress. This interplay of narration and dialogue undermines reading these vignettes as ‘static unities’ — rather, they are more appropriately read as the visible peaks of the underlying theme of the relevant poem.\textsuperscript{756} The subversion of social expectations and the inversion of power structures are thematic motifs of Juvenal’s poetry, and are often expressed and indeed made manifest in the speech he attributes to others.

Advances in Juvenalian scholarship offered by this chapter are as follows. Sermo plays a more dominant role in Juvenal’s early work — evinced by both the greater concentration of dialogue-per-line, and also the stylistic variation utilised. Laronia’s satiric diatribe is decidedly unfeminine — at least, with regards to reconstructions of female speech from Roman comedy. Juvenal’s conversation with Umbricius reveals the latter’s proximity to the satirist’s generic predecessor — a new manifestation of Horace’s self-indicting diatribes. The fourth poem is constructed around a series of inter-locking conversational snippets, all of which play with ideas of haste and political deference. Long-winded pseudo-senile speech is iterated from Roman comedy in Juvenal 14. A number of satiric conversational stylistics seen in previous poets have also been iterated — parataxis/asyndeton for temporal compression, concentrations of elision around sermo, inter- and intra-speaker repetition, and the (mis)use of politeness structures.

\textsuperscript{756} Miller 2012: 327 suggests that each vignette is a static unity.
**Conclusion**

In lieu of a grand, unifying theory of *sermo* in Latin satire, I have sought to analyse instances of dialogue ‘from the ground up’; relying first on methodologies derived from CA and intertextual philology to inform a reading of the text, before widening the scope of interpretation to questions of literary theory and interactions between reader, text, and author. It is now time to pull the focus back even further — to view the many and varied uses of conversation not as individuated fragments, but as a holistic (if not cohesive) literary expression, and a fundamental aspect of their enclosing genre. While the broader the theory, the more exceptions seem to occur, there are nevertheless several aspects of satiric *sermo* that are widely iterated amongst the authors and direct our attention to the inextricable link between the two concepts.

Latin Satire is a genre conscious of variations in language, register, and idiolect. This is manifest not only in the authors’ exploration of the speech of others, but also in their meta-poetic fashioning and re-fashioning of themselves. You are what you speak. Yet not all speech is created equal – I have argued throughout this thesis that dialogue is deployed with sensitivity to its modality; the heuristics of ‘direct dialogue’ are different to those of ‘quotation’, and these differences are meaningful for our interpretation of the texts. Furthermore, speech is constructed not as a simple 1:1 correspondence of thought and expression — the satirists constantly direct our attention to the possibility (and probability) of misinformation, misdirection, and misrepresentation. Consequently, both the message and the medium are critically important for understanding the poetic function of conversation.

I have also argued throughout that full comprehension of the poems necessitates reading *sermo* as a dialogically interactive phenomenon. Meaning is construed with reference not only to speech and speaker, but how individual speech-turns interact with each other. This interaction can be limited to single lines or span entire works and, indeed, multiple authors. Iteration and transformation are the two most common modes of interaction — the representation of speech-elements in a new context, or the transformation of speech-elements through iterating structure. The difference between intertextuality and dialogic interaction is thus primarily semantic — though the novel focus on the latter in this thesis has revealed a wealth of new insight into the poems, and the artistry with which conversation is woven throughout the poetry.
Sermonic stylistics include the following: the instantiation of politeness techniques, the variation of elision and Satzvers for the generation of idiolect and/or emotional tone, use of parataxis/asyndeton for dialogic emphasis as well as poetic temporal compression, repetition in and between speakers, ‘transformation’ of interlocutorial language through re-contextualisation, mimicry, and parody. Sermo is often manifested as an exemplum of the themes and topics of the poem/poet, and (often) contribute to larger poetic structures – usually ones of binary opposition and contrast.

For the three extant poets, satire is sermonic from the start. Their works are ushered in with a question, and their initial poems are programmatic in their interaction with rhetorical interlocutors. This is indicative of one of the key functions of dialogue in satire – a means of positioning (and re-positioning) the satiric voice. It is through dialogue – rhetorical or pseudo-Platonic – that the satirist is challenged, defined, degraded, and sometimes disassembled. Speech is thus a double-edged sword – a means of poetic expression and self-definition, but also a source of danger – be that literary, political, legislative, spiritual, or even physical. The satirists are both drawn to and revolted by sermo populi, a relationship which parallels their mimicry and disavowal of poetic genres, motifs, and even each other.

Having demonstrated the productivity of the methodologies used throughout, it is my hope that philologists will continue to employ the advancements made in areas such as CA and socio-linguistics. Poetry, prose, rhetoric, and conversation are, after all, fundamentally expressions of language, and exist in constant symbiosis. I hope to have provided both theoretical and practical evidence that scholarship can continue to work with dialogic texts without the baggage of ‘colloquial’ studies. The stylistic patterns presented evince, above all, a nexus of intertextuality which one can study and comprehend without necessarily linking it to reconstructions of Latin ‘daily speech.’ Where appropriate, we can compare these patterns to what we observe in spoken conversation more generally in human culture – though such comparison must always be grounded in the immediate poetic and textual context. Sermo can be mimetic of conversation – but it is not inherently so.

One more thing. Stylistic patterns of sermo seen in this thesis may well extend beyond the satiric canon. The next logical step would be an investigation of sermo across a wider variety of texts which engage in representations of speech – the elegiac poets, Lucretius, and Martial.
being the obvious candidates. Such a study may well produce a ‘map’ of character speech common to classical Latin more generally.
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