Cronfa - Swansea University Open Access Repository

This is an author produced version of a paper published in:
Horace's Epodes: Contexts, Intertexts, and Reception, ed. P. Bather & C. Stocks

Cronfa URL for this paper:
http://cronfa.swan.ac.uk/Record/cronfa35219

Book chapter :
Goh, I. (2016). *Of Cabbages and Kin: Traces of Lucilius in the First Half of Horace's Epodes.* Horace's Epodes: Contexts, Intertexts, and Reception, ed. P. Bather & C. Stocks, (pp. 63-83). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

This item is brought to you by Swansea University. Any person downloading material is agreeing to abide by the terms of the repository licence. Copies of full text items may be used or reproduced in any format or medium, without prior permission for personal research or study, educational or non-commercial purposes only. The copyright for any work remains with the original author unless otherwise specified. The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder.

Permission for multiple reproductions should be obtained from the original author.

Authors are personally responsible for adhering to copyright and publisher restrictions when uploading content to the repository.

http://www.swansea.ac.uk/library/researchsupport/ris-support/

the iambicist's relationship to an older man is not hostile (contrast Archilochus' relationship with his faithless father-in-law, *Epod.* 6.13), and this older man is praised for his generosity: Maecenas has given more than enough (*satis superque me benignitas tua | ditavit*, 'your kindness has enriched me enough, and more than enough', 31–2), unlike (for example) Lycambes, who did not give what he promised. But a poem of friendship also recalls the beginning of Callimachus' *Iambi*: the moral lesson which the returned Hipponax urges is one of friendship; the scholars gathered at Parmenio's shrine of Sarapis outside Alexandria are enjoined not to envy one another (*Dieg.* VI.3–6), but instead to behave like the generous and unquarrelsome Seven Sages in the story of Bathycles' cup. A Callimachean parallel here too goes together with the development and modification of Archilochus. And the opening *Epode* also importantly transports *iambos* to a Roman setting, away from the locales of the classic iambicists, Paros, Ephesus, Alexandria: the poem begins with the war against Antony (*Epod.* 1.1–4) and reaches for explicitly Roman and Italian images to express Horace's gratitude (Calabrian and Lucanian flocks, Tusculum, *Epod.* 1.27–30). Horace's *iambos* is steeped in the Greek iambic tradition, but it is also something new, Roman, and characteristically Horatian.[134]

[134] On Horace establishing for himself a new position in triumviral society through difference from Archilochus and Catullus, cf. Barchiesi (2001) 156–7. For the *Epodes* and Rome's recent civil wars, see Oliensis (1998) 64–100; and cf. Johnson (2012) e.g. 109–19.

2

Of Cabbages and Kin

Traces of Lucilius in the First Half of Horace's Epodes

Ian Goh

The inventor of Roman verse satire, according to Horace in the first book of his *Satires* (at 1.10.48 among other intimations), was Gaius Lucilius.[1] Stigmatized by Horace as rough and ready, and a verbose versifier, Lucilius, the 'laughing cavalier',[2] is a literary-critical laughing-stock in that first Horatian *opus*. He features by name in *Satires* 1.4 and 1.10, and is influential for 1.5, a voyage to Brundisium that reflects a so-called *Iter Siculum*, and maybe 1.9. After *Satire* 2.1, however, Lucilius disappears from Horace's pages, not even returning for the later hexameter letters which would seem to reflect Lucilian concern for literary history.[3] In this chapter I make an initial foray into the question of whether his influence extended to Horace's non-hexameter works. We need to interrogate Horace's *Epodes* in particular, because they were composed concurrently with and appeared at the same time as *Satires* 2 and seem to evince an aggressive, iambic quality that is somewhat lacking from Horace's first two books

[1] Thanks to the editors, friends, fellow discussants—especially Emily Gowers, to whom I owe a great deal more—and erstwhile colleagues at the Manchester Conference; also to an anonymous reviewer. Mistakes are mine, as are translations (based in Lucilius' case on Warmington).

[2] Gowers (2012) 8.

[3] For which, see e.g. Krenkel (1970); Koster (2001); Hass (2007) 179–233.

written in hexameters. The issue then becomes: how satirical are Horace's *Epodes*?[4]

This question is complicated by the careful structure of this poetry book. The tenth *Epode* seems to provide closure, but signally fails to do so,[5] and a sea-change to a calmer mode begins to take hold, with a change of metre.[6] The move from castigation to erotic matters, and the relative chronology of the political pieces,[7] renders problematic our easy assumptions about the singular nature of Horatian iambic. I largely restrict my observations to the first, metrically similar part of the book, because that is where the publicly critical aspect of Horace's iambics would seem to be at its height, before what is arguably a tumble into amorousness.[8] Also, if *Satires* 1 and Virgil's *Eclogues* are any guide, ten poems would seem to be a respectable number for a poetry book.

Complicated, too, is our judgement of Lucilius' work and achievement, since from a total of thirty books only about thirteen hundred lines remain, the great majority of which come from the obscure and possibly quite corrupt dictionary of Republican Latin words by Nonius Marcellus. But Lucilius gained himself a reputation as a purveyor of what the grammarian Diomedes calls *carmen maledicum*, and, if we believe his testimony (*GL* 1 p. 45 Keil), Lucilius also wrote iambics:

> iambus est carmen maledicum plerumque trimetro uersu et epodo sequente compositum . . . appellatum est autem παρὰ τὸ ἰαμβίζειν, quod est maledicere. cuius carminis praecipui scriptores apud Graecos Archilochus et Hipponax, apud Romanos Lucilius et Catullus et Horatius et Bibaculus.
>
> *Iambus* is an abusive poem mostly composed of a trimeter and a following epode . . . it is named from *iambizein*, which means to abuse. Prominent writers of this kind of poem are, among the Greeks, Archilochus and Hipponax, and among the Romans, Lucilius, Catullus, Horace, and Bibaculus.

[4] This paper therefore responds to Cucchiarelli (2001) 119–43, a major argument of whom is that the public censure supposedly typical of Lucilius has been leached from Horace's *Satires* and lavished on the *Epodes*.

[5] Oliensis (1998) 92–3.

[6] It is an important irony in view of my focus on Lucilius—a poet (largely) of dactylic hexameters—that, as Morgan (2010) 159 notes, poems 11–16 admit more dactyls into their metrical schemes.

[7] With this, however, I should also provide a disclaimer that I am not fully on board with the structural analysis of (most recently) Mankin (2010) 102–3, that the poems would have been read sequentially and represent a (year-long) chronological progression.

[8] Barchiesi (1994).

Now, Quintilian does not include Lucilius in his list of Latin iambicists (10.1.46), and while Lucilius' Books 26–9 seem to be in mixed metres, including septenarii and senarii, the debt owed seems to be more to comedy,[9] than to the iambic works of Greek poets such as Archilochus, Semonides, Hipponax, and Callimachus.

In fact, it has been argued that the few allusions to Archilochus observed in the fragments, including what seems to be a mention by name,[10] show that the only knowledge Lucilius would have had of the works of Archilochus was from a compendium of quotations.[11] The question is important for a book of poems (Horace's *Epodes*) that takes on the mantle of Archilochean iambic. I argue below that Lucilius did deal with something Archilochean, and that Horace shows awareness of this. On the other hand, I will not add to the guesses about whether Lucilian fragments other than those previously identified allude to Archilochus.[12] I will also skate over the possibility that Hipponax is an influence on Lucilian or Horatian invective, perhaps via his cameo appearance in the first of Callimachus' *Iambi*.[13]

[9] See recently Muecke (2013).

[10] Typical of responses is Miller (2005) 15: 'It is difficult to deduce much from this one-line fragment.' I will attempt to do a bit more with it in what follows.

[11] Mankin (1987).

[12] Apart from the three discussed in this chapter, Marx (1905) 167 claims that *cui parilem fortuna locum fatumque tulit fors*, 'a man to whom fortune and chance have brought a similar position and destiny' (473 Warmington = 447 M.) refers to Archilochus fr. 16 W. This latter fragment seems to be a hexameter, perhaps from Archilochus' elegiacs, which would perhaps give its use enticing implications for Lucilian and Horatian generic mixing.

[13] I make no great claims for Lucilius' interaction with Hipponax, acknowledging the doubt of Coffey (1989) 57. The idea that Lucilius' Books 26–9 correspond to the first four (stichic) poems of Callimachus' *Iambi*, argued by Puelma Piwonka (1949) 366, has been demolished by Bagordo (2001) 24–7. At most, Lucilius' resurrection of Lupus (and perhaps Carneades) in Book 1 could be related to the way Callimachus brings Hipponax back from the dead. The closest we might get to a Roman Republican Hipponax may be via Calvus, who apparently wrote a 'Hipponactean auctioneer's announcement' (i.e. in scazons, 3 Courtney = 36 Hollis), according to Cic. *Fam.* 7.24.1. See also Vine (2009) on Cat. 44; Brown (1997) 80 on Catullus more generally. On Horace's sidelining of Hipponax, see Harrison (2001) 165, revised as Harrison (2007a) 105; cf. Morrison (Chapter 1 in this volume, p. 32).

What is certain is that Horace at least refers to Archilochus in his *Satires*, or rather Damasippus does in *Satire* 2.3, when at the beginning of his long Stoic sermon he castigates Horace for his laziness:

> quorsum pertinuit stipare Platona Menandro,
> Eupolin, Archilocho, comites educere tantos? (*Sat.* 2.3.11–12)

What was the use of packing in Plato with Menander, Eupolis with Archilochus, to take away such great companions on holiday?

Since Eupolis' name begins the famous opening line of *Satire* 1.4, a bravura list of Old Comedians (*Eupolis atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae*, *Sat.* 1.4.1), it seems possible that the reference here serves to encapsulate Horace's so-far completed works, *Satires* plus *Epodes*.[14] Of course, as is observed ad nauseam, Horace claims credit in *Epistle* 1.19 for having brought Archilochean iambic, or to be precise its metre and spirit, but not its subject matter and slander, to Rome:

> Parios ego primus iambos
> ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus
> Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben. (*Epist.* 1.19.23–5)

I was the first to show Parian iambs to Latium, following the metres and spirit of Archilochus, not his deeds and his words effective against Lycambes.

The word he uses, *secutus*, is the same that he uses in *Satire* 1.4 to demean Lucilius' innovation:

> hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus
> mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque; facetus,
> emunctae naris, durus componere versus:
> nam fuit hoc vitiosus. in hora saepe ducentos,
> ut magnum, versus dictabat stans pede in uno;
> cum flueret lutulentus, erat quod tollere velles;
> garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem,
> scribendi recte: nam ut multum, nil moror. (*Sat.* 1.4.6–13)

On these authors Lucilius depends entirely, following them with only their metres and rhythms changed; he was witty, with a cleaned-out nose, but rough in composing his verses: in this he was at fault. He would often dictate two hundred verses in an hour standing on one leg: what a big deal; when he flowed muddily along, there was stuff you would want to remove.

[14] Cf. Cucchiarelli (2001) 169, who contrasts Plato and Menander (satire) with Eupolis and Archilochus (iambic), though earlier (120) Eupolis had been lumped in with satire. Gowers (Chapter 4 in this volume, p. 114) has a nuanced view.

A chatterbox and lazy at carrying out the work of writing—writing properly, for I don't care about his quantity.

He supposedly depends entirely on them—except in the case of the *Satires* it is metres that Lucilius changes, whereas in the *Epodes* it is metres that Horace follows. We should therefore be wary of Horace's claim of iambic primacy, and its erasure of Lucilius in turn should be as difficult to parse as the dismissal of Catullus' sapphics in Horace's *Odes*.[15] Yet there is another important facet of the denigration of Lucilius in the *Satires* which is important for our study of the *Epodes*. Horace's ascription of 'freedom of speech' (*libertas*) to Lucilius after the model of the Old Comedians who all 'branded with great liberty' (*multa cum libertate notabant*, *Sat.* 1.4.5) is striking because it is Horace's *Epodes*—not the explicitly Lucilian *Satires* 1—which contain more iambic aggression towards individual contemporaries. Regardless of whether Horace is telling the truth about Lucilius' aggression, or indeed his own, we must consider this act of displacement seriously: Lucilius was a participant and chronicler of some great factional controversies of his time, and Horace takes up this role in earnest in the *Epodes* while downplaying his satiric predecessor's contribution. Then again, fairness is never an issue for Horace when self-presentation—or should that be self-preservation?—is at stake.

2.1. ARCHILOCHEAN SIDE-SWITCHING

The *Epodes* are suffused with civil war politics, and I begin with the celebration of victory at the battle of Actium in *Epode* 9. This is a poem which refers to an *Africanus* (9.25) than whom Caesar is greater, who is perhaps an amalgam of both Scipios, Africanus Maior and Minor.[16] Amidst the public politicking, the personal holds sway in *Epode* 9, as the heir to Archilochus is unfit for battle: he is sick with worry, or maybe seasick, and suffering from *fluentem*

[15] Recent explanations for Horace's self-appraisal, *princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos / deduxisse modos* (*Carm.* 3.30.13–14): Woodman (2002) posits imitation of a 'super-poet' Sappho + Alcaeus; Nisbet-Rudd (2004) 375 consider two poems insignificant; Tarrant (2007) 70–1 stresses Horace's concerted body of work.

[16] See Giusti in this volume (Chapter 5) for a different view; I merely anticipate her detailed treatment of *Ep.* 9.

nauseam, 'liquid sickness' (9.35). Much debate has raged over whether the poem is set at Actium, and if so whether Horace and Maecenas are depicted as being present on-board a ship;[17] let us take the dramatic context of the poem at face value. An underlying reason for Horatian discontent is his history as a turncoat, which would lead him naturally to beat the drum louder for his new masters, the Caesarian side. A Lucilian complication follows: if the hunch of Anderson (1963) is right,[18] the satirist was a subject for study by a Pompeian literary coterie. Lucilius was, we are told, the great-uncle of Pompey the Great, whose mother was named Lucilia, and from a 'senatorial family'.[19] Hence Horace's queasiness could be occasioned by the reminder of 'what might have been' had he stayed on the wrong side as he had been at Philippi. He threatens to flow just as Lucilius had spewed out his two hundred verses before and after dinner;[20] Lucilius for his part referred to *vomitum* in what seems to be a political moment, given what seems to be the presence of a name, Trebellius.[21]

The suspicion that a switch of sides has occurred in *Epode* 9 is heightened by the appearance earlier in the same poem of the two thousand Galatian cavalry who deserted Antony for Octavian a week before the battle:[22]

> at huc frementis verterunt bis mille equos
> Galli canentes Caesarem. (*Epod.* 9.17–18)

But to here[23] the two thousand Gauls turned their raging horses, singing the praises of Caesar.

[17] See Watson (2003) 310–11, against e.g. Slater (1976) 168–9.
[18] Restated more soberly with qualifications by Du Quesnay (1984) 31.
[19] Porph. *ad* Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.75; Vell. Pat. 2.29.2. Cichorius (1908) 6 produces a basic family tree.
[20] Watson (2003) 336, although *fluo* in ancient medical contexts may have been more suggestive of diarrhoea than vomiting: see Hunink & van den Broek (2010), who reappear later in this chapter.
[21] 531 Warmington = 493–4 M.: *in numero quorum nunc primus Trebellius multost / Lucius, nam arcessit febris senium vomitum pus* ('in this crowd now Lucius Trebellius is first by far, for he summons fevers, senility, nausea, pus'); the second line is rather broken and I print Warmington's reading, but *vomitum* seems secure.
[22] For the Horatian precision here, see Cairns (1983) 82.
[23] I agree with Nisbet (1984) 13 on the importance of this reading, rather than *hunc* or other much-discussed alternatives, for the poem's interpretation.

Their horses take up the fervour of their masters, who 'sing Caesar's praises' as they go into combat—much as Horace is doing here. In this context it might be worth considering horses in satire and iambic and what they mean to Horace and Lucilius, both famously equestrians. A potted summary is all I have space for:[24] Horace in *Satire* 1.6 claims that the choice of transport most appropriate for him is a mule that would take him all the way to Tarentum (*nunc mihi curto / ire licet mulo vel si libet usque Tarentum*, *Sat.* 1.6.104–5); in contrast, Lucilius possessed a noble steed which he rode around his estates:

> ut veni coram, singultim pauca locutus,
> infans namque pudor prohibebat plura profari,
> non ego me claro natum patre, non ego circum
> me Satureiano vectari rura caballo,
> sed quod eram narro. (Hor. *Sat.* 1.6.56–60)

When I came face to face with you, I gulped out a few words (because childish shame prevented me from speaking further), and I told you not that I was the son of a distinguished father, not that I rode around the country on a Satureian steed, but what I was.

Now, Archilochus famously disapproved of a general whose looks and bearing were reminiscent of a horse, whereas his preferred commander seems to resemble a mule with his imperfect body:[25]

> *οὐ φιλ<έω> μέγαν στρατηγὸν οὐδὲ διαπεπλιγμένον*
> *οὐδὲ βοστρύχοισι γαῦρον οὐδ᾽ ὑπεξυρημένον,*
> *ἀλλά μοι σμικρός τις εἴη καὶ περὶ κνήμας ἰδεῖν*
> *ῥοικός, ἀσφαλ<έω>ς βεβηκὼς ποσσί, καρδίης πλέως.* (fr. 114 W.)

I do not love a general who is tall, who walks with a swagger, who rejoices in his curls and is partly shaven. But may mine be short, have a bent look to his shins, stand steady on his feet, be full of courage.

This is a text (though it is in trochaic tetrameters) that has been deemed influential for *Epode* 1.[26] If we consider again the one Lucilian line that apparently name-checks Archilochus—*metuo ut fieri possit; ergo <anti>quo ab Arciloco excido*, 'I am afraid it can't be done; therefore I fall off from old Archilochus' (786 Warmington = 698 M.)—we might notice a pun: the speaker is depicted falling off

[24] See further Goh (2015).
[25] Griffith (2006) 314–15.
[26] Andrisano (2012) 288.

(*excidere*, *OLD s.v.* 1) the Greek writer as if from a chariot.[27] I would speculate that Horace in the *Epodes* takes Lucilius at his word, and disconnects him from Archilochus, with a similar sense of irony to that of Catullus, who only employs the term *iambus* in hendecasyllabic (and not necessarily invective) lines.[28]

There is a broader point to draw here, which involves the supposed truly Roman nature of Lucilius, set against his Greek antecedents in Old Comedy and his mixing of languages as condemned by Horace in *Satire* 1.10.[29] The question to be asked of the defecting Galatians is this: in what language do they sing about Caesar?[30] The word for their conduct, *vertere*, is as it happens the right word for translation into another language:[31] not just side-switching, but code-switching too. So too we may suspect that Horace's closing order, that some wine should be not poured but 'measured', has some poetic resonance: *vel, quod fluentem nauseam coerceat, | metire nobis Caecubum*, 'or something to quell my heaving stomach, measure out some Caecuban for us' (9.35–6). If we recall that the choice of metre in Horace's *Epodes* 1–10 is distinctly Archilochean because the Greek poet was supposed to have invented the epodic structure with its signature alternation of lines, it is possible that the idea of 'changing sides' refers back to the form of Horace's *Epodes* as well, in contrast to Lucilius' poetry, which is for the most part unchangingly stichic.

2.2. WOLVES AND DAUGHTERS

The issue of the ideal commander's stature brings me to a second example of how Lucilius hovers in the background of Horatian iambic: *Epode* 4, set (it would seem) even earlier, in the wars between

[27] Cf. Sen. *Her. O.* 1163, Ov. *Fast.* 6.743, V. Fl. 5.133, Juv. 4.127. Wijsman (1996) 83–4 notes that 'excidere is exclusively associated with chariots'. See Juv. 1.19–20 where Lucilius rides horses, but a chariot is implied.

[28] Newman (1990) 48–9; Heyworth (2001) 125–6.

[29] Specifically *Sat.* 1.10.20–35; just before this a slavish adherent of the Neoteric poets is labelled a *simius*, 'ape' (1.10.18). I want to add fr. 187 W., which seems to be from the fable of the fox and ape, to the parallels presented by Gowers (2012) 316–17.

[30] Nisbet (1984) 13 notes the reminder of Julius Caesar's conquest of Gaul in their name; I am less convinced by the uncovering of the pun in *galli/canere*, 'cock/cockcrow' (199 n. 43).

[31] *OLD s.v. verto* 24a.

Caesar and Sextus Pompeius. The target of this poem is compared to a wolf—a suggestive animal, given Archilochus' run-ins with the 'wolf-walker' (or so his name suggests) Lycambes. But surely one needs to think of Lucilius' most prominent target, the consular Lentulus Lupus, whose last name is, literally, 'Wolf' (*lupus*). Arguments have been made about the similarities between Archilochus and Lycambes, and the hints of competitive poetic composition that inform their rivalry,[32] and the issue surely flares up elsewhere in Horace, where wolves have specific poetic, or even iambic, import.[33] The result, for *Epode* 4, will be that the reference to the wolf in proverbial vein encompasses not just epic,[34] but satire as well.

Horace's target in this *Epode* is an *arriviste* type, whose similarities with Horace are conspicuous: one an ex-slave, the other a freedman's son, one the owner of estates, the other of a Sabine farm; both sitting in the rows for *equites*; both military tribunes.[35] Like Horace in *Satire* 1.9, the enemy struts down the *Via Sacra*, plausibly a Lucilian locus if we believe Ferriss-Hill (2011). And the ex-slave shows the evidence of having worn hard shackles on his ankles (*crura dura compede*, *Epod.* 4.4). Now, things that are *durus* in early Horace inevitably remind one of Lucilius, because of the famous description of the older poet as *durus componere versus* (*Sat.* 1.4.8, previously cited); just so the sorrel alleviates blockages in *Satire* 2.4, the problems of a *dura*... *alvus* (*Sat.* 2.4.27, to be discussed).[36] What especially marks out the opening of *Epode* 4 as harking back to *Satire* 1.4, though, may be the mention of *discordia*, which in the *Satire* was the subject of an infamous quotation from Ennius' *Annales* (*Sat.* 1.4.60–1). There, in the exemplary poetic sentence which actually resembles prose,[37] *Discordia taetra*, 'horrible Discord', broke open the Gates of War; here, the conflict is more personal.

[32] Hawkins (2008); Gagné (2009).

[33] On the iambic *lupus* of *Carm.* 1.22, see Davis (1987) 69–78, *contra* Yardley (1979) who considers that animal Tibullan. The wolf is the proverbial symbol of the cunning outsider-poet figure: Miralles (1983).

[34] Schmitzer (1994) 31–5. Cf. Morrison Chapter 1 in this volume p. 52 on Lyciscus as a 'little wolf'.

[35] Morgan (2010) 154 is eloquent on the intersection with the seemingly iambic topos of criticism of the parvenu.

[36] Gowers (1993a) 150.

[37] Oberhelman-Armstrong (1995) 242–4; see now Gowers (2012) 167–9.

The dangerous femininity of *Discordia* leads me to a major point of contact, so far unmentioned, between Horace's *Satires*, both books, and his *Epodes*: namely the presence in all these collections of the witch Canidia. Controversy rages over whether Canidia had children, and if so whether she had a daughter:[38] the aristocratic boy begging for his life in that same poem pleads 'by your children', *per liberos te*, but then qualifies, 'if Lucina ever answered your prayer and attended when you gave birth', *si vocata partubus | Lucina veris affuit* (5.5–6); soon afterwards he compares Canidia to a stepmother (*noverca*, 5.9). The uncertainty here reflects Horace's problems with inheritance, both Archilochean and Lucilian. It is curious that there are not more fathers and daughters in Horace's *Epodes*—there are none apart from Creon's daughter, Medea's love-rival, in *Epode* 5 (62–4)—if Archilochus was such an influence;[39] the Archilochean quotation, to which Lucilius is thought to be alluding in his rejection of the older poet previously discussed, features, it seems, a father saying to his daughter, χρημάτων ἄελπτον οὐδέν ἐστιν οὐδ' ἀπώμοτον, 'nothing is unexpected nor declared impossible on oath' (fr. 122.1 W.), and it is usually assumed that the speaker is Neoboule's father Lycambes. Where Lucilius is concerned, however, there is at least one tantalizing fragment about a daughter: *cohibet domi | maestus se Albinus, repudium quod filiae | remisit*, 'Albinus shuts himself up at home in mourning, because his son-in-law sent back a divorce contract to his daughter' (931–3 Warmington = 848–50 M.). This scenario seems to recapitulate in part the Archilochean situation with Neobule and her family—except a little later down the road.

Another such stretch takes us to Lucilius and his sister, Pompey's aunt, but the second putative use of Archilochus by Lucilius is relevant too (333 Warmington = 305 M.; 334 Warmington = 306 M.):

> tum latus conponit lateri et cum pectore pectus.
> . . . et cruribus crura diallaxon.
>
> then she placed her side by my side, and her breast by my chest
> . . . and I'll change up my legs with hers

[38] A full discussion at Johnson (2012) 103 n. 51. *Carm.* 1.16 is part of the puzzle, but I will not discuss that poem here.

[39] See Gowers (Chapter 4 in this volume) for warped images of birth and midwifery, including Horace's role in the odd mother-bird simile of *Epod.* 1.19–22.

Under the plausible assumption that this really is an adaptation of fr. 119 W. (καὶ πεσεῖν δρήστην ἐπ' ἀσκόν, κἀπὶ γαστρὶ γαστέρα | προσβαλεῖν μηρούς τε μηροῖς, 'and to fall hard at work on the wineskin, and to thrust belly against belly, thighs against thighs'), my strictly limited observation here is that even from what little we have in the Lucilian lines, missing words and all, it is clear that the end result is a static tableau. Indeed, the repetitive jingle of *pectore pectus* and *cruribus crura* is enhanced, for my purposes, by the possibility that a clever point is being made, one which stems from transplantation of the Greek invective into a Roman context: *diallaxon*, probably the future participle of the Greek διαλλάσσω ('to change'), is a malapropism for ἐπαλλάσσω ('to cross').[40] This focus on the slippery meaning of a prefix foreshadows my argument below about the ambiguous force of ἐπί in the title *Epodes*.

2.3. BELTS

The next two sections aim to disinter the way in which the *Epodes* position themselves as a continuation of the *Satires*, pursuing the argument through two individual symbols, belts and sorrel. Belts are cued up near the end of *Epode* 1 where Horace uses the word *discinctus*, 'with loosened belt', to describe how as a spendthrift heir (*discinctus . . . nepos*, *Epod.* 1.34) he would lose any further rewards Maecenas gave him for being his follower.[41] In *Satire* 1.5, Horace had contrasted his band of travellers with those who are *altius praecincti* ('higher-belted'), travelling from Rome to Appius' Market in one day without a stopover or a detour:

> hoc iter ignavi divisimus, altius ac nos
> praecinctis unum: minus est gravis Appia tardis. (*Sat.* 1.5.5–6)

We lazy ones divided this journey, while those girded up higher than us could take it in one: the Appian Way's less troublesome for the tardy.

[40] Chahoud (2004) 10–11.

[41] For the details of changes to the meaning of *nepos* to carry the sense of 'wastrel', see Du Quesnay (2002) 209 n. 139. The argument, which rests on an obscure passage of Festus, seems to involve an Etruscan word for 'scorpion' (*nepa*) used to describe those who lived luxuriously, via the phonetic similarity with *nepos*. Cf. perhaps Cicero's (*Fin.* 5.42) use of *nepa* (African, again according to Festus), meaning 'star', in reference to the constellation Scorpio (as also in his *Aratea* 406). Lucilius seems to have called himself a scorpion (1079–80 Warmington = 1022–3 M.).

It could be argued that these 'high-belted' individuals who did that stretch in one day might have included Lucilius,[42] even though as a whole his *Iter Siculum* was surely, as mentioned before, a voyage longer and more leisurely than Horace's, despite the later poet's repeated professions of insouciance (which coexist paradoxically with the infamous brevity of his account).[43] Yet if Lucilius was 'high-belted' and on the move, he could be visualized as a marching soldier girded for a kind of epic conflict (in a foreshadowing of his Juvenalian incarnation at Juv. 1.165–7). Now, Lucilius apparently standardized the metre of satire as hexameter, the metre also of epic, and hexameters could be called *versus longi* (in, apparently, Ennius' phrase):[44] so is Horace slower or faster than Lucilius? I shall return to this question below.[45]

Certainly Horace sees himself as lower-register, which brings us to another Lucilian belt in *Satire* 2.8. The preparations for Nasidienus' dinner-party involve a slave who is 'high-belted' (*alte cinctus*, v. 10), whose job it is to wipe down the table with a purple cloth (*gausape purpureo mensam pertersit*, in v. 11). A very similar Lucilian line is cited by the grammarian Priscian, and has been seen since Dousa to be in conjunction with Horace's version: *purpureo tersit tunc latas gausape mensas*, 'he then wiped the broad tables with a rough purple cloth' (598 Warmington = 568 M.). But there are overtones of effeminacy in that scene,[46] and likewise in the mere presence of the term *gausape* in a passage of Petronius (21.2).[47] The implications for the poetic genres in whose tradition Horace

[42] Morgan (2010) 342–3. [43] See e.g. Gowers (2009b) 55–9.

[44] Gowers (1993b) 55; cf. Cic. *Leg.* 2.68 (*herois versibus, quos longos appellat Ennius*, 'in heroic verses, which Ennius calls long'); Gell. 18.15.1. Skutsch makes this *Op. Inc.* 20: see Courtney (1993) 365; Morgan (2010) 98. As Morgan (2000) 114–19 comments on Stat. *Sil.* 4.3, which is almost a visual representation of Domitian's newly constructed coastal road, straight hendecasyllabics would be faster.

[45] We might also consider a possible metrical implication of 'loosening belts'; cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 4.2.11–12, *numerisque ... lege solutis*, 'released from metrical law', which refers to the supposed loose construction of the Pindaric dithyramb. See also, a little beyond the purview of this chapter, Harrison (2001) 184 on the analogy with *Epod.* 14.12, which is argued to refer back to the stichic *Anacreontea.*

[46] Gowers (1993a) 171.

[47] There it describes a cloak worn by a *cinaedus*, whereupon Vout (2009) 103–4 compares Trimalchio's attire (also a *gausapa*, 28.4) as feminine, though see Schmeling (2011) 62. Armisen-Marchetti (2006), via the appearance of the term at Pers. 4.37, has an unexpected interpretation of the related term *gausapatus*, which she thinks is slang for 'completely naked'.

was writing, which tend towards the homo-social, are surely troubling. I think it is not too much to read Horace as pointing out that Lucilian masculinity, both the slave-wear and the military uniform mentioned above, is a sham to cover up actual impotence and femininity.

In one of the quasi-sympotic settings painted by Horace in *Satire* 2.1, the belts of some notable individuals were, in contrast, undone:

> quin ubi se a vulgo et scaena secreta remorant
> virtus Scipiadae et mitis sapientia Laeli,
> nugari cum illo et discincti ludere, donec
> decoqueretur holus, soliti. (*Sat.* 2.1.71–4)

In fact, when the brave Scipionic scion and gentle, wise Laelius had withdrawn from the crowd and left the stage for a private place, they were accustomed to fool about with him, and to play with their belts loosened, while the cabbage cooked down.

In this famous episode, Scipio Aemilianus and Laelius are described as going backstage with Lucilius from the *scaena*—the stage, or maybe just the public scene?[48]—and horsing about in casual clothes, *discincti*, while their cabbage cooks down. Yet it is often commented that the term *discinctus* has a disapproving moral edge. It also describes the hastily grabbed clothing of the fleeing adulterer caught *in flagrante* (*discincta tunica*, *Sat.* 1.2.132), and will be part of the charge against Horace's current master Maecenas in Seneca's condemnatory screed, *Epistle* 114.[49] Dio 43.43 reports that Caesar attracted opprobrium for wearing his tunic ungirt, and the implications of effeminacy are well known.[50] Moreover, belts could be used as purses (i.e. money-belts), as in the self-righteous speech of Gaius Gracchus, speaking of his quaestorship in Sardinia in 126–124 BC: 'So, Quirites, when *I* set out from Rome I took with me belts full of silver (*zonas, quas plenas argenti extuli*) which I brought back empty from my province; as for others, the amphorae full of wine which they took out with them *they* brought back filled with silver' (*ORF*^{3} Malcovati 28).[51]

[48] Wiseman (2009) 136.

[49] Du Quesnay (2002) 32–4. For Maecenas, see Graver (1998); Byrne (1999).

[50] See Richlin (1993) 542. For Caesar, see e.g. Edwards (1993) 90; Kraus (2005).

[51] This extract is preserved at Gell. 15.12.4; cf. also Plut. *Gai. Gracch.* 2.

In the remainder of the *Epodes* there are other figurations which remind us of the belts here discussed. In particular, twice more Horace will at or near the end of a poem—just as with *Epode* 1—alight upon the image of binding.[52] So *Epode* 11, which is (as previously outlined) a new beginning after ten poems in the same metre, concludes with Horace intending to relieve his passion for Lyciscus by falling in turn for 'a slender boy with his long hair tied up behind in a knot' (*teretis pueri longam renodatis comam*, *Ep.* 11.28). And the speech of Canidia which cuts short the entire book reaches a pitch of invective with the threat that Horace, her interlocutor, will soon want to kill himself: 'to tie a noose around your neck—to no avail' (*frustraque vincla gutturi nectes tuo*, *Ep.* 17.72).

Other examples of the binding motif can be adduced. Canidia—so often a foil for the poet in Horace's early poetry, as I previously mentioned—has in *Epode* 5 already been presented with unkempt hair, because it is braided with snakes (*Canidia, brevibus illigata viperis | crinis et incomptum caput*, 5.15–16).[53] So, too, the hypothetical invading Briton in *Epode* 7 is *catenatus* ('enchained', 7.8)—and again on the *Via Sacra*, like his counterpart in *Epode* 4, as was Horace in *Satire* 1.9 (see the preceding, p. 71). And it is worth mentioning that the visibility of scars on the *Epode* 4 *arriviste* ex-slave's side, caused by whips as well as chains on his feet (4.3–4), reflects his refusal to wear a tunic under his toga, in olden style.[54] This practice foreshadows the habitual belt-wearing (in the place of a tunic) of the Cethegi in Horace's *Ars poetica* (50), with the link there to Cato and Ennius, and their supposed strictures on speaking correctly (*Ars* 56).[55] The parvenu's billowing toga certainly takes us straight back to the *discinctus* of *Epode* 1, but, if such was the practice of Cato and Ennius, are older, supposedly more dignified generations being denigrated too? At the very least, all of these examples fit in to the studied ambiguity of the *Epodes* with regard to the divide between matters public and private. And all of them have something to do with Horace or stand-ins for him.

[52] This paragraph is indebted to—and extends a little—Oliensis (2002), esp. 100 on the end of *Ep.* 11.

[53] Oliensis (2002) 94.

[54] Mankin (1995) 102.

[55] Cf. *Epist.* 2.2.117: *Catonibus atque Cethegis.* Ennius called, or claims that contemporaries called, M. Cornelius Cethegus 'the chosen flower of the people and the marrow of Persuasion' (*Ann.* 308 Skutsch): is *flos* unqualified masculine praise? More on belts in what follows.

In particular, in *Epode* 1 Horace is claiming not to be the dissolute heir: so who was that? The question hinges on how chaste the playtime of Lucilius and his influential friends had been. Scipio (minus a money-belt), we know, was famous for his moral seriousness.[56] But it is not too fanciful to note that *decoquere*, used of the cabbage boiling away, can mean 'to squander one's inheritance', just as the *discinctus nepos* does.[57] If we view literary allusion as a form of inheritance, the reference in *Epodes* 1 to an heir who is unenviably *discinctus* may become an act of dissociation (undoing the tie that binds): a hint that Horace is overtly trying but failing to write Lucilius out of the *Epodes*.

2.4. SORREL

The discredit to Lucilius and his associates continues, in my view, in the following poem in the *Epodes*.[58] Here Horace activates the country/city divide in moralizing fashion, with a brilliant twist: an exposure of the narrator as ethically compromised, a hypocritical moneylender. Among the rural ruminations of Alfius features the advice at *Epode* 2.57 to eat sorrel, a home-style vegetable, like the cabbage of the extract from *Satire* 2.1 (cited in section 2.3), typical of simple country living. This vegetable is the star of a famous Lucilian passage that enacts a similar ventriloquism to Horace's in *Epode* 2—in this case, the speaker is not the author Lucilius but Laelius, who produces shouts of enthusiasm in verse about the vegetable, as Cicero retells it in *De finibus*. The passage, though long, is worth quoting in full:

> nec ille, qui Diogenem Stoicum adolescens, post autem Panaetium audierat, Laelius, eo dictus est 'sapiens', quod non intellegeret quid

[56] Cf. Polyb. 31.25.2–29.12, a much discussed account. See e.g. Astin (1967) 26, who elides Polybius' reporting of Scipio's self-assessment to create the near-oxymoronic 'liberality and integrity in financial matters'; Champion (2004) 158; McGing (2010) 37.

[57] Crook (1967) 375; see further Gowers (1994). With that same verb Horace may also be exploiting a Lucilian obscenity, *paedicum iam excoquit omne*, 'now he cooks out all his lust for boys' (63 Warmington = 74 M.). Cf. also Cat. 41.4, 43.5, where Ameana's boyfriend (Mamurra?) is described as a *decoctor* from Formiae.

[58] On the links between the two opening poems, see Mankin (2010) 98.

suavissimum esset—nec enim sequitur, ut, cui cor sapiat, ei non sapiat palatum—, sed quia parvi id duceret—

> o lapathe, ut iactare, nec es satis cognitus qui sis.
> in quo Laelius clamores sophos ille solebat
> edere, compellans gumias ex ordine nostros
> (200–2 Warmington = 1235–7 M.)

praeclare Laelius, et recte sophos. illudque vere:

> 'o Publii, o gurges Galloni, es homo miser' inquit,
> 'cenasti in vita numquam bene, cum omnia in ista
> consumis squilla atque acupensere cum decimano'
> (203–5 Warmington = 1238–40 M.)

is haec loquitur, qui in voluptate nihil ponens negat eum bene cenare, qui omnia ponat in voluptate. (Cic. *Fin.* 2.24)

Our friend Laelius, who as a young man heard lectures given by Diogenes the Stoic, and after that by Panaetius, did not get called 'wise' because he did not understand what was most delicious—for it does not follow that a wise heart means a foolish palate—but because he considered it of little importance:

'Sorrel, they dismiss you and don't know enough who you are. Laelius the Wise used to sing your praises, and rebuke our gluttons one by one.'

Bravo, Laelius, bravo. The following also rings true:

'Publius Gallonius, he cried, you're a wretch, you glutton, you've never dined well in your life, when you spend all you've got on lobster and sturgeon ten hands in length.'

The man who says these things places no value on pleasure, and affirms that one who makes pleasure the be-all and end-all does not dine well.

Note Laelius'/Lucilius' phrasing: 'they don't know enough who you are'. This is a question of identity, sent perhaps in a satirical direction by Lucilius' word *satis*.[59] The untrustworthy narrative persona of *Epode* 2 speaks to the same issue, which puts me in mind of the difficulty of parsing vegetables: 'are they simple and commonplace or rare and luxuriantly delicious?'[60] What happens, for instance, if we momentarily identify Laelius with the moneylender Alfius, lusting

[59] That said, Lucilius may not have referred to his poems as *satira*, and we have no fragment that does so; although Coffey (1989) 39 is sure that such a title did appear in lines no longer extant, Martyn (1972) vigorously argues against such a guess.

[60] Purcell (2003) 338.

after a rustic lifestyle? The Ciceronian source for the Lucilian locus makes Laelius a committed Stoic—who then can be assimilated to the Stoic blowhards, Chrysippus and the like, who populate Horatian satire. Again, an affinity between the genres devoted to mockery seems to hold, if we recall one when reading the other. Remember, at any rate, that Laelius was called 'The Wise' not because of his good taste, as might be expected from the relevant meaning of *sapiens*, but because he chose not to meddle in political reform.[61] Maybe he was too busy at symposia instead.

The sorrel may also remind us of Horace's *Satire* 2.4, in which that vegetable features together with cheap shellfish as a cure for constipation:[62]

> si dura morabitur alvus,
> mitulus et viles pellent obstantia conchae
> et lapathi brevis herba, sed albo non sine Coo. (*Sat.* 2.4.27–9)

If your bowels are stodgy with constipation, the limpet and cheap cockles will remove the obstructions, and the small herb sorrel—but not without Coan wine.

I am prepared to entertain in this context the possibility that the cute story told in Cicero about Laelius and Scipio picking seashells on the seashore is relevant. Crassus, allegedly quoting Scaevola, is made to say in Cicero's *De oratore* that the off-duty pair was accustomed to leave town for the country and collect shells (*conchas eos et umbilicos*) on the beach, as well as partake of all other kinds of play (*ad omnem animi remissionem ludumque descendere*), which made them feel young again (*repuerascere esse solitos, De orat.* 2.22). Cicero makes Crassus careful to say that 'I would be cautious in talking of such men' (*non audeo dicere de talibus viris*): why the reticence? The presence of the pair on the seashore, where villas were more brazenly grandiose than in the countryside, does not reflect well on their vaunted parsimony, which we saw earlier (on moneybags).[63] Still, shellfish may not

[61] Plut. *Tib. Gracch.* 8.4. I expand on this paragraph in other forthcoming work.

[62] Note also that Ofellus' precepts in *Satire* 2.2 are similarly concerned with the ability to 'parse' food. Cf. *Sat.* 2.35, writer's block, with Gowers (Chapter 4 in this volume pp. 112–13).

[63] Marzano (2007) 13: 'When ancient authors refer to coastal villas, it is usually to lament their ostentatious luxury and the conspicuous consumption that took place in them'. Ironically, cf. Cic. *Rep.* 2.7, where Scipio is made to decry maritime cities (praising Romulus' choice of the site of Rome): Feldherr (2003) 210–11.

yet have had the connotations of decorative luxury that would come with their identification with Tyrian purple dye and pearls.[64]

However, let us focus more fully on the relative *terra firma* of sorrel's laxative properties. One of the etymologies for the genre of *iambos* calls poison to mind (ἰὸν βάζειν, 'poisonous speech'); this derivation is not necessarily incompatible with curative qualities and cleansing function, although we should note that sorrel *is* poisonous in large quantities. And dirt lingers where Lucilius is concerned. I am inspired here by a tendentious interpretation, thanks to Hunink and van den Broek (2010), of Lucilius' position for dictation, standing on one leg (*stans pede in uno, Sat.* 1.4.10),[65] as a depiction of the first satirist in the throes of diarrhoea, which (we are meant to imagine) runs down his leg. Now, while I do not agree with this reading—why would one defecate in such a posture?—it directs us to consider the way in which Lucilius *is* said to flow: muddily (*lutulentus, Sat.* 1.4.11 as previously cited). Moreover, the echoes of Callimachus' Assyrian river filled with disgusting refuse (*h.* 2.108–9) are equally clear. Morrison (in this volume, Chapter 1) has already considered some ways in which Horace's *Epodes* are indebted to Callimachus' *Iambi*.[66] As an addendum, I want to focus attention on Horace's construction of Lucilius in *Satire* 1.4 as static: a muddy flow is stagnant; the satirist stands on one foot.[67] In contrast, in the *Epodes* movement is key:[68] the first word of the *Epodes* is *ibis*,[69] *Epode* 7 opens with *quo quo scelesti ruitis*, 'where, where are you wicked people rushing to?', and so on. The different meanings of ἐπί in the putative title, *Epodes*, may have

[64] Cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.124, where *concha* stands in for 'pearl'; also Pers. 2.67. The definitive note is Housman (1930) 52, on Manil. 5.404.

[65] The phrase is actually metaphorical, and means something like 'with ease': cf. Otto (1890) 275.

[66] I am especially sympathetic to the balanced reading of Barchiesi (2001) on this issue; the possibility that the 'muddy river' image is an iambographic trope whereby Horace links Lucilius with Archilochean literary rivalry in Old Comedy—for which see e.g. Gowers (2009a)—is an issue too big for this chapter, and something I intend to explore elsewhere. For the idea of *Epodes* 1–10 reflecting Callim. *Iamb.* 1–4 as representing a 'signature metre', see Clayman (1980) 73.

[67] Ironic, then, the concentration on the implications of the individual iambic foot in Horatian theory on the true nature of the pure iambic line: Morgan (2010) 131–2, 144–5.

[68] Porter (1995) 108. Cf. Hawkins (Chapter 7 in this volume, pp. 177–81).

[69] And its last, slightly beyond the purview of this chapter, is *exitus* (17.81). See Heyworth (1993) for the proposal that *ibis* refers to Callimachus' invective poem, *Ibis*.

something to do with movement too;[70] compare, for instance, the implication of movement in an alternative derivation of the term *iambos* from ἰός meaning arrow.[71]

2.5. KEEPING REGULAR

I close with a return to Archilochus. A Lucilian fragment, *in bulgam penetrare pilosam*, 'to penetrate into a hairy bag' (61 Warmington = 73 M.), is thought to reflect the metaphor of a sack to describe female genitalia that Archilochus uses in fr. 119 W. (cited in section 2.2).[72] Now, Nonius reports that this Lucilian half-line comes from the satirist's Book 2. This book featured a trial, apparently an altercation between Mucius Scaevola and Albucius, and all commentators believe that this fragment was uttered as part of the trial. So must we believe on the strength of fragments such as this that obscenities beyond the regular level of public invective[73] were bandied about at the actual event in the court of law? While I am tempted to refer back to our discussion of belts, in order to reduce the impropriety of the phrase, since a wallet obviously is a less obscene hairy receptacle, this point is an important methodological one. Lucilius' representation, or even re-performance, of that trial, is analogous to the re-performance of Archilochus at Rome. For one, Archilochean concepts of blame essentially turn into the paraphernalia of a structured justice system in Lucilius. And yet, whereas Horace's *Satires* do feature a law-court scene (1.7), albeit a farcical mockery of a trial, in the *Epodes* we have a return to a retributive justice, as in *Epode* 4, the poems that concern Actium (1 and 9), and the anti-propempticon of 10, together with a focus on unverifiable, private scenes (3, 5, 8). The surprising result is

[70] While I, being less forthright than Morrison (in this volume, Chapter 1), am prepared to accept the warnings of Mankin (1995) 12, and now Watson (2007) 94, that this title is not original nor attested before Porphyrio, I too follow Harrison (2001) 166, restated at Harrison (2007a) 105, that *iambi*—as Horace refers to this book elsewhere—is merely a generic marker (cf. *satira* for *Sermones*); *Epodi* would have recreated the Archilochean title *Epodoi*, of which Horace must have been aware.

[71] Barchiesi (2002) 51–2 conveniently lists the derivations.

[72] Marx (1905) 35; Adams (1982) 87–8; Hass (2007) 134 reads this as a reference to a homosexual act.

[73] Which was admittedly high: see the potted summary at Corbeill (1996) 5.

that Lucilius, with his nod to the proper procedure of a trial, is accordingly less aggressive and belligerent than Archilochus, relying on independent revenge, had been in his heyday.

Moreover, Archilochus, in pseudo-Plutarch's words, was like Lucilius an innovator: apart from his metrical inventions, he introduced the practice of singing some iambics while others were spoken to musical accompaniment—the forerunner of dithyramb and tragedy—and of putting accompaniment under melody instead of in unison with the voice (ps.-Plut. *De mus.* 28.1140f–1141b). But this means that we should think about whether Horace's retrospective exclusion of Lucilius from the iambic genre had something to do with the regularizing feature for which the satirist was most renowned: the switch of satire to hexameter, which might be argued to have lacked musical accompaniment.[74] So the satirist's standardization goes against the jack-of-all-trades nature of Archilochus,[75] as well as the much-vaunted variety that his follower Horace wanted so much to ape.[76]

Indeed, the possibility should be entertained that Lucilius, with his literary-critical nous, knew that quotation of Archilochus from Aristotle's *Rhetoric* about how 'impossible is nothing', where only the first line (as I gave it previously, p. 72) is cited.[77] We note from the same work of Aristotle that iambic trimeter is good for speech, much better than the hexameter (*Rh.* 1408b32–1409a1).[78] But if Horace's hexameter *Sermones* are set up as, literally, 'conversations', then Horace disavows Aristotle in those poems just as surely as Lucilius turns away from Archilochus. So, one joke that we should not overlook is that

[74] Despite the volume of literature on the problems of the Latin verb *cano*, 'I sing', in epic, and the problems surrounding the possibility of performance for Hellenistic poetry, I simply want to refer to the idea that a rhapsode, who held a staff, will have sung less than a citharode: see e.g. West (1981) 114.

[75] Hutchinson (2012) 76 doubts Lucilius mixed his love poetry and satire in one book, and cites the perhaps elegiac Book 21; however, the arrangement of poetry by metre he identifies for Archilochus and Catullus (77) is probably how Lucilius' books were arranged too, and various fragments, for instance 567–73 Warmington = 540–6 M. on the opposition of mythical and contemporary women, seem to mix satire with amorous affairs.

[76] See Fedeli (1978) 104–10 on *ποικιλία* of various kinds in the *Epodes* as an Alexandrian trait.

[77] See Davis (2010a) 113–15 for uncertainty about the invective import of fr. 122 W. and the influence of its gnomic character on Hor. *Carm.* 1.34.

[78] For all this, especially Aristotle's use of the term *iambos*, see Rotstein (2010) 61–6.

two of the fragments of Lucilius quoted—that which mentions Archilochus and that which concerns the divorce handed to the daughter—are not in hexameters, but come from Books 27 and 29 respectively, according to Nonius who preserved them both. Nevertheless, as we have been dealing throughout this chapter with questions of status and regularity, it is my hunch that Lucilius was easy to shut out of the *Epodes* for being too regular—ironically enough, when Horace, using the same metre for the first ten of those poems (even with the shift of their iambic trimeter–dimeter lines), is pretty regular himself.