

**Zeitschrift:** Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique  
**Herausgeber:** Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique  
**Band:** 9 (1963)  
  
**Artikel:** Horace and Varro  
**Autor:** Brink, C.O.  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660635>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

**Download PDF:** 17.05.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

VI

C. O. BRINK

Horace and Varro



## HORACE AND VARRO

In the first half of the last century, and a little later, Theodor Bergk and Otto Jahn raised the topic « Horace and Varro »<sup>1</sup>. About the turn of the century F. Leo and G. L. Hendrickson explored it further<sup>2</sup>. The matter has been debated often since. Other Augustan writers have been brought into the discussion and opinions have differed sharply. The problem is now rarely approached from the Horatian angle and that is what I propose to do in my paper.

In the first part of the letter to Augustus, Horace offers some instructive specimens of practical literary criticism. The specimens are not his; he is citing contemporary critics (in the plural): *ut critici dicunt*<sup>3</sup>; and probably, but not certainly, he is referring to more than one, *ambigitur*<sup>4</sup>. He is not purveying precious information nor indeed is he paying homage to the literary critics. His tone is sarcastic and polemical; how so and why so I shall have to consider later.

The citations purvey criticism in one of the settled, ancient, meanings of the word. So they are suitably introduced by the phrase, « as the critics say ». The word *critici* must still have sounded strange to Roman ears. It occurs only twice in recorded Republic and Augustan literature. Cicero uses it in a jocular reference to textual critics of the Alexandrian brand<sup>5</sup>. Horace, on the other hand, speaks of

<sup>1</sup> T. BERGK, *Comment. de reliq. comoediae Att. ant.*, 1838, 146-9, cf. F. RITSCHL, *Opusc.*, III, 431 n.; O. JAHN, *Rhein. Mus.*, IX (1854), 629-30b, *Hermes*, II (1866), 255-6. <sup>2</sup> F. LEO, *Varro und die Satire*, *Hermes*, XXIV (1889), 67 (*Ausg. Kl. Schr.*, I, 283), *Livius und Horaz*, etc., *Hermes*, XXXIX (1904), 63; G. L. HENDRICKSON, *The dramatic satira and the old comedy at Rome*, *AJP*, XV (1894), 1, *A pre-Varronian chapter of Roman literary history*, *AJP*, XIX (1898), 285. <sup>3</sup> Hor., *Ep.* II, 1, 51. <sup>4</sup> *Ib.*, 55, *ambigitur quotiens uter utro sit prior*. <sup>5</sup> Cic., *Ad Fam.*, IX, 10, 1, *profert alter, opinor, duobus versiculis expensum Niciae, alter Aristarchus has ὀβελλίζει; ego tamquam criticus antiquus indicaturus sum utrum sint τοῦ ποιητοῦ an παρεμβεβλημένοι*.



men passing judgement on poets; this activity, not alien to the Alexandrians, was the especial preserve of the School of Pergamum. Horace then is talking of professionals in the field of literary judgement.

Among the scanty remains of Varro's literary criticism there are some that show a certain resemblance to the judgements of the *critici* whom Horace opposes. Is the resemblance sufficient to establish the equations, Horace's opponent = Varro, or else, Horace's opponents = Varro and his followers? That is the question to which I now address myself.

Varro said this in the fifth book of the *De sermone Latino*. «No one apart from Titinius, Terence, and Atta succeeded in paying attention to characters, ἥθη, but Trabea, Atilius, and Caecilius showed facility in rousing emotions, πάθη.»<sup>1</sup> He also said this in the Menippean Satire *Parmeno*. «In these departments of poetry (or drama) Caecilius carries off the prize in the shaping of the plot, *in argumentis*, Terence in the drawing of the characters, *in ethesin*, and Plautus in speech (or style) *in sermonibus*»<sup>2</sup>. Any reader of these bits and pieces who is also a reader of Aristotle's *Poetics* will notice at once that these are the distinctions of (originally) Peripatetic poetics; plot or subject matter, *argumentum*, character, *ethos*, conversation or diction, *sermo*; add, from the other Varronian item, emotion, *pathos*. That in fact (to my knowledge) no one before Mr. Dahlmann pointed this out clearly is only a matter for congratulation to him<sup>3</sup>. It is not surprising that these distinctions were utilized by Varro; they are traditional. It needs to be noted though that the two sentences come from two different books of Varro; they tell us little about the layout of his literary criticism. What is more to the point

<sup>1</sup> Varro ap. Char., p. 241, 27 (Keil) = *Fr.* 40 Fun. = *Fr.* 60 G.-S.

<sup>2</sup> Varro, *Men.*, *Fr.* 399 (Buecheler). <sup>3</sup> H. DAHLMANN, *Varros Schrift «De poematis» und die hellenistisch-röm. Poetik*, AA, Mainz, 1953, 116-18, 146.

(my subject being Horace and Varro) is that the two writers do not perform the same operation.

Varro assigns top marks to all the standard dramatists, either grouped under various headings, or one each under a heading special to him. But the marks are given for different achievements, and the achievements are assessed according to the well-worn clichés of the Aristotelian school — either plot, character and diction or character and emotion. That the Alexandrians employed these criteria for their textual criticism is established; that they employed them for their literary criticism (which for Dionysius Thrax was the finest part of γραμματική although it came rather late in the syllabus) is at least likely. That the Pergamenians did likewise is possible but not proven.

Now Horace does not talk in terms of either plot-character-diction or character-emotion. The critics (says he) call Ennius « wise » and « brave » and « second Homer »<sup>1</sup>. They disagree (he continues) as to who should be assigned higher marks, Pacuvius or Accius. Apparently they win both, but for different achievements; Pacuvius carries off the label « learned old man » and Accius that of the « sublime old man », the one *docti senis*, and the other *alti*<sup>2</sup>. Afranius gets his status because he is in a class with Menander, Plautus with Epicharmus<sup>3</sup>. Caecilius gains his victory through weight, Terence through technique — the one *gravitate*, the other *arte*<sup>4</sup>. These criteria clearly represent a different type from the (originally) Aristotelian ones which we have earlier considered; and it only muddles the issue if Kiessling and Heinze remind us of Varro's references to plot-character-diction and character-emotion.

<sup>1</sup> Hor., *Ep.*, II, 1, 50. <sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, 56. <sup>3</sup> *Ib.*, 57-8, *dicitur Afrani toga convenisse Menandro, Plautus ad exemplar Siculi properare Epicharmi*; for a possible allusion to Varro's remark on Plautus (*De Poetis*, Book I *Fr.* 60 *Fun.*), *deinde ad Siculos se adplicavit*, cf. DAHLMANN, *op. cit.*, 118.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.*, 59.

Other qualities count here. The sole agreement with Varro is that *one* quality only decides the issue in each *case*. But the labels are *doctus*, *altus*, *gravitas*, and *ars*. Of these, «learning» and «art» represent one type: sublimity and weight another. Both types are used for labelling poets according to *one* feature that is believed to be the man. It is either a quality like learning or art; imagery like high-flown, or pedestrian; metaphors often based on a sense impression: of taste such as sweet-bitter; visual such as fast-slow, heavy or weighty, light or graceful; auditory like strident or harmonious. Judgements of this kind are bound to be metaphorical, and tend to be facile — two grave drawbacks. They are still to be found in aesthetic criticism. This procedure pervades most of ancient literary criticism; rhetorical and literary critics use it alike. I do not know why Mr. Klingner describes it as «out of date» in the time of Horace<sup>1</sup>. It was employed before as much as after Horace. Had it been out of date Horace would have been less ready to poke fun at it.

Now two of these four labels remind one of the fact that this aesthetic procedure had been put in a system whose ultimate origin is certain to be rhetorical although little else is certain about its origin. The two labels I have in mind are sublime, *altus*, and weighty, *gravis*; and the rhetorical system I am alluding to is of course that known as the types of speaking or *genera dicendi*, in Greek χαρακτῆρες τῆς λέξεως. Horace is far from offering the traditional *genera*; what he does offer are some criteria which happen to play a part in that doctrine of style.

Aulus Gellius describes the three characters in what turns out to be Varronian terms<sup>2</sup>. They are, he maintains, full,

<sup>1</sup> F. KLINGNER, *Horazens Brief an Augustus*, SB Bayer. Ak., 1950, V, 11; E. FRAENKEL, *Horace*, 1957, 387, n. 3, rightly takes exception to Klingner's view as to the comic nature of these epithets.

<sup>2</sup> Gell., VI, 14, Varro, *Fr.* 322 Fun.; GOETZ and SCHOELL assigned

fine, and intermediate — ἀδρόν-ἰσχνόν-μέσον. The distinguishing feature of the first which he calls *uber* is *dignitas* and *amplitudo*; the other extreme, *gracilis*, is *venustas* and *subtilitas*; that of the intermediate has some of both. «M. Varro (he continues) says that the true and characteristic specimens in the Latin language of these types are Pacuvius in the full style, Lucilius in the slender, and Terence in the intermediate»<sup>1</sup>. Here is the full doctrine of the rhetorical types adapted by Varro to Roman poets. But it must be noted too that Varro is not here restricting himself to dramatists as he is in the other two passages. Also the passage is like Horace's only in that both writers use traditional and rhetorical metaphors drawn from sense impressions; but Horace just alludes to two of them whilst Varro exemplifies the doctrine of the rhetorical types *in toto*.

Our first *sortie* into Varronian country has been remarkably unsuccessful. It all depends however on what it is intended to achieve. According to Heinze and his predecessors the assessments of the older poets recorded by Horace are too close to Varronian pronouncements not to refer to them. Horace, Heinze concludes, is alluding to the «old man of Reate who died as late as 27 B. C.», that is, about 13 years before the letter to Augustus was written<sup>2</sup>. To this suggestion I would not subscribe.

It is true, the extracts from Varro share two important features with the pronouncements ridiculed by Horace. They regard archaic Roman as exemplary and they so regard them on the basis of Greek literary theory, presumably also in comparison with Greek poets equally assessed. If it is

this fragment to the *De sermone Latino*, Book V (Fr. 59), without good reason, despite their claims, p. 296. In the first paper of these *Entretiens* Mr DAHLMANN has considered the possibility of assigning the fragment to the Περὶ χαρακτήρων.

<sup>1</sup> Ib., § 6, *vera autem et propria huiusce modi formarum exempla in Latina lingua M. Varro esse dicit ubertatis Pacuvium, gracilitatis Lucilium, mediocritatis Terentium.* <sup>2</sup> R. HEINZE, n. on Hor., *Ep.*, II, 1, 50.



argued that Horace must be thinking of Varro because he expressed common concepts most effectively, there is perhaps something in this contention <sup>1</sup>.

On the other hand the Varronian extracts come from various writings and differ from one another. Each of them represents *one* context: the *Parmeno* fragment the context of subject matter, diction, ethos; the other (from the *De sermone Latino*) of ethos and emotion; the third the rhetorical concept of the types of speech. The Horatian pieces on the other hand do not represent one such context. They ridicule snap judgements that were then in vogue however diverse they may be. Learned Pacuvius and high-flown Accius, *doctus* and *altus*, may or may not represent one context. (As Heinze very pertinently remarks, Quintilian, X. 1. 97 alludes to these two epithets, but does not see how the two are related). They need not be related and they need not be borrowed from one man only, Varro, a Varronian, or anyone.

For that reason I am also chary of accepting the sequence of Horace's strictures as evidence for the layout of Varro's literary criticism. This I think our colleague Dahlmann tends to do, in his learned essay on Varro's *De poematis* to which I have made reference already. Of course Horace alludes to the main genres, epic and dramatic; for in this letter he is concerned with them anyway. Of course he mentions the main figures, Ennius and Naevius, Pacuvius and Accius, Afranius (later also Atta), and Plautus, Caecilius and Terence. Some but not many more were there to be mentioned. So I find it easy to agree when Mr. Dahlmann says that those were the chief genres of archaic Roman verse. I find it less easy to see how in spite of that anything at all can be inferred from Horace as to the layout of Varro's

<sup>1</sup> There is perhaps even more in H. NETTLESHIP's suggestion (*Lectures and Essays*, II, 52), cited by FRAENKEL, *op. cit.*, 387, n. 4, that this is the kind of criticism Horace « was made to swallow in his boyhood ».

criticism, which in any case may have differed in various writings of his <sup>1</sup>.

So far I have been negative. Somewhat better things are in store however. Horace states clearly, not so much whom but what he is attacking in this part of the letter to Augustus. He is tilting at what some people call classicism, others archaism. Call it what you will, there is no doubt that Varro propagated just that view — which is not to say that others did not likewise propagate it when Horace was writing. Two men above all gave it currency about the middle of the century — Varro and Cicero. The remains of Varro's literary criticism bear out what Horace sarcastically alleges — to be considered a great Roman poet you must be dead. In the *Parmeno* fragment the prizes are awarded to Caecilius and Terence, in two others the big third and second century figures are the only that qualify; one or two may reach the present century by a few years. Livius and Naevius apart, here and elsewhere the names are Ennius, Pacuvius, Accius, Plautus, Terence, Caecilius, Lucilius, and such secondary figures as Titinius, Atta, Trabea, and Atilius. Again these or some of these are the poets for ever on Cicero's lips. Horace's butt is then the doctrine that counted for a whole generation of men, Varro's and Cicero's *a fortiori*, but of many others as well. And how could it be otherwise, for nothing had appeared that could rival the early performances in the genres that mattered? That it could or should be otherwise when Horace looks back to the early Augustan age is the burden of his message. But the message comes home only to whom it may concern if the critics of Horace's day, or their public, were still propagating outworn clichés. That the clichés would remind readers of Varro if his writings on poetry were preserved, that is one side of the coin; that Horace's attack is not primarily directed against Varro

<sup>1</sup> DAHLMANN, *op. cit.*, 147.

but against those who perpetuated Varro and Cicero where Varro and Cicero made sense no longer (if ever they did), that is the other side of the coin. The second aspect was seen by the young Theodor Bergk, in the book to which I made reference at the beginning.

The patriotic tendency of much of Varro's work requires no comment. Cicero found just the right emotional tone in the *Second Academics*, when he complimented Varro that they all had been strangers in their own city when Varro's books had come to see them home, *nam nos in nostra urbe peregrinantis errantisque tamquam hospites tui libri quaei donum deduxerunt*<sup>1</sup>. There are at least indications that a similar tendency pervaded Varro's literary criticism as indeed it pervaded Cicero's own writings on rhetoric and philosophy. It is at this point that the relationship «Greek-Roman» comes into play. Along with Roman archaism it is the claim that the archaic Romans can face their Greek counterparts which makes Horace show his hackles.

Here arises another much-discussed conundrum in which Horace and Varro again figure largely. The conundrum concerns the origins of Roman drama, or rather what the Romans themselves thought the origins were. The evidence for it however differs from any that has been debated so far. It is true, just as before we have a passage, or passages, of Horace and some citations in later grammarians purporting, or likely to purport, Varronian provenance<sup>2</sup>. But this time we can draw also on contemporary evidence, that is, other Augustans, certainly Virgil and Livy, perhaps Tibullus<sup>3</sup>. A close examination would take much time — and take it unnecessarily because the outcome would

<sup>1</sup> Cic., *Ac. Post.*, 9. <sup>2</sup> The certainly established citations of Varro's *De scaenicis originibus* were set out clearly by C. CICHORIUS, *Comm. phil.* O. Ribbeck, 1888, 415 ff. Research has since shown that other late sources have to be considered as well. Nor should enquiry be restricted to one work of Varro. <sup>3</sup> Virgil, *G.*, II, 380-96; Livy, VII, 2; Tib., II, 1, 50-8.

contribute little to my topic, Horace and Varro. Assessment has oscillated a great deal: from confident assertions of Varronian theories in all the passages to less confident assertions as regards some of them, and denial as regards others, back again to Varro with better arguments and more evidence. I believe that a case for Varro has been made but that there is no case for fitting the details from the different writers into a single picture which is then ascribed to Varro. I only ask and seek to answer two questions: may Horace's account of the origins of drama, in the letter to Augustus<sup>1</sup>, be described as Varronian; and if it may what does Horace make of this piece of antiquarianism?

The grammarian Diomedes in his chapter on the various poetic genres rehearses three familiar derivations of the word tragedy<sup>2</sup>. The first only is relevant here, from *tragos* and *ode*, so named since tragic actors were rewarded with a he-goat that had been sacrificed to *Liber pater* at a festival called *Liberalia* because, *ut Varro ait*, they browse on the vine<sup>3</sup>. Although Varro's name comes only at the tail-end of the sentence it clearly applies to the whole of this derivation to which his remark offers an explanation. (This does not of course exclude the possibility that he had offered other derivations as well; the *De lingua Latina* shows how that could have been done). There follows one reference to Horace's *Ars Poetica* and another to Virgil's *Georgics*;<sup>4</sup> Diomedes, for what it is worth, apparently believed that the three authors put forward this derivation.

In the next chapter Diomedes busies himself with the history of comedy<sup>5</sup>. Again he offers various derivations of the word. The first two are much alike, both from

<sup>1</sup> Hor., *Ep.*, II, 1, 139 ff. <sup>2</sup> Diomedes, *Ars Gram.*, III, *caput de poematibus*, 8 (*G. L.*, I, p. 487, Keil) ed. LEO, ap. KAIBEL, *Com. Gr. Fr.*, vol. I, p. 57: Varro, *Fr.* 304 Fun. <sup>3</sup> *Ib.*, 8, 2, *quia depascunt vitem*. <sup>4</sup> Hor., *A. P.*, 220-1, Virg.; *G.*, II, 380-1. <sup>5</sup> Diomedes, *op. cit.*, 9, pp. 57-9: Varro, *Fr.* 305 Fun.



κῶμαι, hamlets or villages; he says, *pagi*, that is *conventicula rusticorum*. He then expatiates on this derivation. For, *ut ait Varro*, the young men of Attica used to go about the villages, *circum vicos*, delivering this kind of song for the sake of profit. Diomedes then moves on to the second derivation, *aut certe a ludis vicinalibus*. At first sight this looks like a different account. But the underlying *etymon* is still the same, *vicus*, and the connexion is so close that this is more likely to be the next stage in a coherent account from the same source. « Or certainly, says Diomedes, from the rustic games, for after removal from the country to Athens and the founding of these games, as of the games of the cross roads, *compitalicii*, at Rome, they came forth to sing, and comedy was named *ab urbana κῶμῃ καὶ ᾠδῇ*. »

Now in the pieces labelled Varronian there are two elements that are essential also to the Augustans — I mean, (a) the rural character of original drama, and (b) a close comparison between prehistoric Greek and prehistoric Roman drama. Diomedes tells us nothing about the Varronian works on which he drew: the *compiti* occurred in the *De scaenicis originibus*, but several other titles would also qualify, specially the 10th book of the *Antiquitates rerum divinarum* in which scenic games were discussed.

Another matter deserves equal attention and has occasionally been noted. In the introduction to his commentary on Terence, Donatus provides general information on comedy. He draws the same Graeco-Roman parallel at greater length and he spells out the same items<sup>2</sup>. Although he fails to mention Varro's name, the resemblance to Diomedes is so striking that Varronian origin has long been suspected.

<sup>1</sup> Varro, *De scaenicis orig.* (Book III), Fr. 75 Fun., *ubi compitus erat aliquis*. Cf. *L. L.*, VI, 25, on the derivation of *Compitalia*. <sup>2</sup> Donatus, *excerpta de com.*, ch. V, ed. LEO, ap. KAIBEL, *op. cit.*, pp. 67-8; ed. WESSNER, I, pp. 23-4.

In two respects however Donatus does more than just spell out the Varronian account of Diomedes. One of the points has been noted, the other (to my knowledge) has not. What has been noted, in Mr. K. Meuli's important paper on *Altrömischer Maskenbrauch*<sup>1</sup>, is this. Donatus is really concerned with comedy. Yet in reporting Varro's (and Virgil's) information he so conflates comedy and tragedy as to make them appear indistinct. Now it appears that certain Hellenistic critics, notably Eratosthenes, departed from Aristotle in deriving the three standard genres (tragedy, comedy and satyric drama) from one rough and rustic *ludus*. Meuli has suggested that the indistinct nature of Donatus' (Varronian) account reflects this Hellenistic doctrine. Varro then adopted a speculative Hellenistic account according to which the three Greek dramatic genres were preceded by an indistinct type of rustic drama. He asserted a like but independent rustic performance on the Roman side. As for Varro, this is an hypothesis; but it is a reasonable one. Its bearing on Horace will soon appear.

The second matter on which Donatus offers more than Diomedes also requires notice. It concerns the content of those sacred rural amusements. When the Athenians full of joy and vigour assembled at the *vici* and *compita* their concern was to « brand evil livers », *male viventes notare*, because they wished to preserve Attic propriety, *Atticam elegantiam*<sup>2</sup>. Now one's first reaction on hearing this is to remember that Donatus is of course talking of comedy, of which this is a well-known feature. Any implication that this public criticism was part of the early rustic performances would be put down not even to Donatus but to his excerptor. And yet the possibility remains that this was an integral part of the Varronian picture of the early dramatic performances;

<sup>1</sup> MEULI, *Mus. Helv.*, XII (1955), 206-35; for Eratosthenes, see *ib.*, 210-12; for Diomedes, Donatus, and Varro, *ib.*, 228-9. <sup>2</sup> Donatus, *op. cit.*, para. 6.

it fits them without any strain. Why it is important to bear this possibility in mind will also appear when the Augustan accounts are reviewed. I have now sorted out four matters which I regard as fundamental to the Varronian doctrine as far as it can be ascertained from sources other than the Augustans. They are the following: (a) the rustic character of the earliest drama, (b) a similar but independent origin of Greek and Roman drama, (c) a mixture of religious observance and rustic jollification in pre-tragic, pre-comic, and pre-satyrical Greek drama, (d) an element of social censure in early drama. I regard the first two matters as certain, the third as probable, and the fourth as doubtful. With this proviso I now turn to the Augustan accounts of the origin of drama, and Horace's in particular.

The four Augustan writers whom I have mentioned are not literary historians. They do not speculate on the origin of drama for its own sake. They all have their own diverse purposes in making reference to this topic and in consequence select different matters, and shape differently what they select. In *Georgics*, Book II, Virgil does not enlarge on the grape harvest but uses the Bacchic context for a display of learned verse; he inserts an elaborate poetic aetiology concerning the Bacchic origins of drama. Horace is giving his views on the important contemporary genres of poetic art, drama and epic; he is interested in the rustic origins of drama because he sees only too many *vestigia ruris* in the contemporary products. Livy is prompted by the historian's desire to trace the beginnings of institutions; he uses what he believed to be the earliest Roman occasion when an epidemic called for drama as a religious observance. Finally Tibullus, a civilized lover of archaic simplicity, sings the country and the country's gods; his poem on the Ambarvalia offers an opportunity similar to Virgil's to mention the Bacchic art of drama in its original setting.

Now it seems to me impossible either to prove or to

disprove Varronian provenance of what is said by these four writers so long as scholars are content to compare them with one another and embellish the comparison with the few chance remains of Varro's doctrine. For the four writers differ even more than they agree. If by hypothesis their accounts are derived from Varro and yet differ considerably, then no comparison will tell us which differences and which agreements are derived from their (reputed) source unless we have a criterion for Varronian provenance.

Nearly half a century ago Mr. O. Weinreich argued that the chief features of this part of Livy's narrative are likely, though not certain, to be Varronian. He then confronted Horace with Livy and finding them very different from each other concluded that Horace had followed a different authority<sup>1</sup>. Unfortunately he failed to ascertain how relevant are the differences to the problem he was debating.

More recently research into these matters has flourished because Mr. Waszink and Mr. Meuli have begun to assemble a body of evidence that is external to the Augustans — I mean such late sources as Diomedes, Donatus, and Tertullian<sup>2</sup>. It is on this basis that the two scholars have made a good case for the Varronian character of Virgil's and Livy's narratives while allowing for their differences. Further assistance may be expected from a critical study of the scanty but important remains of the Hellenistic doctrines on which presumably Varro and his Roman predecessors had drawn. It may then become clearer than it is now what were the decisive features of Varro's doctrine (or doctrines) and conversely what were the Augustan variations on the Varronian theme. It is time now to revert to Horace.

The letter to Augustus has the celebrated account of the rustic fête at which the old Roman farmers in their sturdy

<sup>1</sup> O. WEINREICH, *Zur römischen Satire*, I, *Hermes*, LI (1916), 386-411.

<sup>2</sup> J. H. WASZINK, *Varro, Livy and Tertullian on the hist. of Roman dramatic art*, *Vig. Christ.*, II (1948), 224-42; K. MEULI, *op. cit.*, p. 13 n. 1.



and simple ways, with their households including their wives and children, relax after the hard toil of the harvest, and propitiate the rural deities. This custom gave rise to *Fescennina licentia*, that is, they would assail each other with boorish jests in alternate verses. But gaiety in time turned to abuse and libellous attacks on innocent men of status in the community. Hence the law forbidding *describere*, abuse by name; and hence a return to « good speaking and enjoyment ». It was at a later stage that *Graecia capta* captured the *victor* and the arts were introduced into Latium. The time alleged for the disappearance of the Saturnian metre and for the influence of « Sophocles, Thespis and Aeschylus » are the peaceful conditions « after the Punic wars ». How does this account stand with regard to Varro's sketch, as far as it is known from Diomedes and (probably) Donatus? Which of our four Varronian claimants can be identified in the letter to Augustus?

There is no difficulty at all about the first claimant. A rural origin of drama is asserted by all — with a fine romantic colouring by Virgil and Tibullus, with a historical gloss by Livy, and with a compliment to the farmers of old by Horace, who then turns admiration for pristine simplicity into sarcastic indictment of the *vestigia ruris* that remain in the contemporary drama.

Over the second point however the Augustans diverge. It is only Virgil who spells out the equation Greek — Roman in what is likely to be the Varronian manner. This is brought out by the balance in the length of the two descriptions — the Greek festival and the Roman <sup>1</sup>. The Greek aspect is abandoned by Horace, Livy, and Tibullus. Horace in particular could not easily have accommodated the Greek aspect without impairing the purpose and the poetic tenor of this passage.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. MEULI, *op. cit.*, 207, noting the same number of lines in each description: 380-4, 385-9.

For its purpose is to bring home to his contemporaries that

*in longum tamen aevum  
manserunt hodieque manent vestigia ruris :  
serus enim Graecis admovit acumina chartis* <sup>1</sup>.

Hence the natural stages for Horace are, (1) the rustic home-grown product, (2) improvement by the import of Greek strains. The Varronian sequence (1) Greek rusticity, followed by Greek literary artifice, (2) Roman rusticity, followed by Roman literary artifice, assisted by Greek, is precisely what Horace is attacking because it may imply equality or near-equality of the old Roman products with the Greek. He is not then concerned with the resemblance of two archaic civilisations. Rather what seems to interest him is the different reaction of the Greeks to artistic pursuits at a later stage of their development <sup>2</sup>. Horace's description of the rural scene is not entirely unlike Virgil's although it lacks its poetic overtones. The resemblance suggests — what is anyway likely on general grounds — that Horace did not only remember his Varro when he was composing this part of the letter: he also had in mind the passage of the *Georgics*. If this be so the difference in detail gains even greater interest. Virgil's Greek farmers are inspired by the Greek Bacchus, his Roman farmers not by Liber but again by Bacchus <sup>3</sup>. Horace has ignored the Greek aspect; the deities are Roman and rural — not even *Liber pater* but Tellus Silvanus Genius.

My third claimant was a Hellenistic doctrine adopted (probably) by Varro — I mean, the mixture of elements suggesting either tragedy or comedy in the early performances

<sup>1</sup> Hor. *Ep.*, II, 1, 159-61. <sup>2</sup> So ll. 93-102, earlier in Horace's letter, in contrast to the Roman reaction 103 ff. Various remarks on early Greek drama, in the *Ars Poetica*, reveal that Horace was well aware of the archaic Greek aspect. Compare also *A. P.*, 405-6, *ludusque repertus et longorum operum finis*, which applies to Greek drama, with l. 141 in the present letter, *animum spe finis dura ferentem*, which describes the Roman scene.

<sup>3</sup> For the controversial question which festivals and deities Varro and Virgil had in mind, see WASZINK, *op. cit.*, 230 ff., MEULI, 212-13, 229.

that preceded the dramatic genres proper. The Augustan narratives support this claimant. One of the intractable difficulties in these accounts of early drama is thus seen to be a difficulty no more, for they all contain jumbled together some elements pointing to tragedy and others pointing to comedy. On this assumption readers — and commentators — need no longer be puzzled when they find at *Georgics*, II, 380, a reference to *caper* (and thus an implied derivation of tragedy) and two lines below *pagos* (and thus an implied derivation of comedy, ἀπὸ τῶν κωμῶν)<sup>1</sup>. Likewise in Horace's letter. The dice seem to be heavily loaded in favour of comedy so long as the poet describes the earliest *ludus*<sup>2</sup>. What is ushered in however is not comedy, but tragedy; the comic variety follows thereafter; no suggestion here that its early stages had been discussed before<sup>3</sup>.

My fourth and last point concerned moral censure by name, *describere*, which I have doubtfully ascribed to Varro on the strength of its setting in Donatus<sup>4</sup>. Two of the Augustans, Horace and Livy, further strengthen this suspicion. Virgil only remarks that the Ausonian colonists *versibus incomptis ludunt risuque soluto*<sup>5</sup>. But Livy who is interested in the evolution of Roman drama keeps track of an element of verbal combat (in verse) between two parties: first, *inconditis inter se iocularia fundentes versibus*, later *ab risu ac soluto ioco res avocabatur*, and when drama had developed as an art, *iuventus... inter se more antiquo ridicula intexta versibus iactitare coepit*<sup>6</sup>. Horace goes even farther; but he is on the same tack. Most of his description of the rustic stage is really a description of *Fescennina licentia* and its evil consequences:

*per hunc... morem  
versibus alternis opprobria rustica fudit,*

and jocularities getting out of hand led to libellous attacks

<sup>1</sup> This was observed by MEULI, *op. cit.*, 210. <sup>2</sup> Hor., *Ep.*, II, 1, 139-55. <sup>3</sup> Tragedy, *ib.*, 161-7, comedy, 168. <sup>4</sup> Above, pp. 184 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Virgil, *G.*, II, 385-6. <sup>6</sup> Livy, VII, 2, 5 and 11.

*mala carmina* and legal redress <sup>1</sup>. The very fact that Horace and Livy so differ in what they wish to convey draws attention to the underlying similarity of their material. Earlier on I cited Donatus' observations on moral censure in the earliest Attic plays <sup>2</sup>. Donatus knew and cited Horace. At the same time he offers more detail than Horace, and that detail fits his own story. If his account is rightly ascribed to Varro, then *opprobria rustica* with their subsequent development in Attic comedy may have been a feature of Varro's history of drama. Does the concurrence of Horace and Livy, such as it is, point to a similar story on the Roman side? This at any rate is a reasonable question to ask.

So much for Horace and Varro on the origins of drama. I submit that the argument while not equally conclusive in all details is conclusive enough to challenge current scholarly opinion on this topic. Current opinion, in spite of occasional doubts, still persists in denying the presence of Varronian features in this part of the letter to Augustus. One difficulty apart, I do not see why; and that exception does not touch the fundamentals of the theory, either Varronian or Horatian. The difficulty is of course Horace's alleged date for Livius Andronicus and the first Roman drama under Greek influence <sup>3</sup>. I say «alleged» because I am not at all sure that Horace is attempting to give a date for the first performance of a play by Livius Andronicus or anyone. To recall the familiar words —

*serus enim Graecis admovit acumina chartis  
et post Punica bella quietus quaerere coepit  
quid Sophocles et Thespis et Aeschylus utile ferrent.*

<sup>1</sup> Hor., *Ep.* II, 1, 145-55.    <sup>2</sup> Above, p.    <sup>3</sup> Hor., *Ep.*, II, 1, 156-67. Horace's (alleged) date is said to be indicated by *Graecia capta* (l. 156) and *post Punica bella* (l. 162). If that refers to the time after the second Punic War, the (alleged) date for Andronicus would be in agreement with that advanced by Accius and perhaps alluded to by Porcius Licinus and refuted by Varro. Hence HENDRICKSON asserted, *op. cit.*, that Horace offered a pre-Varronian account, and LEO followed suit.



This does not sound to me like the talk of an historian determining a date of literary history; the relevant name of the Roman dramatist is not even mentioned. Rather it sounds like the talk of a poet and critic who hints at a period of civilisation when the standards of taste which he approved began to be formed — a post-war period such as the Greek one mentioned earlier in the letter<sup>1</sup>. That would mean discussing a tendency rather than a date. Varro had proved that the first performance of a drama by Livius Andronicus had been much earlier than Accius and others had assumed<sup>2</sup>. It is hard to believe that Horace did not possess that information; but, if he possessed it, the information would not necessarily make a date of literary history relevant to his argument<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Ib.*, 93. <sup>2</sup> Cf. Cic., *Brutus*, 72; Gell., XVII, 21, 42-5; Varro (*De Poetis*), *Fr.* 55-6 Fun. HENDRICKSON, *op. cit.*; LEO, *Plaut. Forsch.*, 2nd ed., 66-9, and elsewhere. For the Gellius chapter, see O. LEUZE, *Rh. Mus.* LXVI (1911), 237. <sup>3</sup> Acceptance of Accius' date for Livius Andronicus' first performance is rendered unlikely by Horace's known erudition—and prejudice; so far I would agree with F. MARX, *Ber. Sächs. Ak.*, LXIII (1911), 49. But I would not agree that the words cited above in the text point only or chiefly to the literary criticism of the second century. Horace is unlikely to refer to Accius' dating of Andronicus; so far I would agree with W. HUPPERTH, to whose Cologne thesis Mr. Dahlmann has kindly drawn my attention — *Horaz über die scaenicae origines der Römer etc.*, Düsseldorf 1961. But I would not agree that Horace is alluding to the date of any particular performance, or that Horace's *Punica bella* denote the first Punic War (*op. cit.*, 36 ff.), or that *Graecia capta* is meant specially to refer to the conquest of *Magna Graecia* (*op. cit.* 32, 39, 40 ff.). I would agree with G. D'ANNA, *Rend. dell' Ist. Lomb.*, LXXXVII (1954) 124-8, that from l. 157 onward Horace is not commenting on Andronicus but on those of his successors who could be said «to profit (poetically) from Greek tragedy», though I doubt if that applies only to Ennius.

[C. BECKER's book, *Das Spätwerk des Horaz*, appeared in 1963, some months after these *Entretiens*. The writer devotes a chapter to the letter to Augustus. He believes (as I do myself) that *post Punica bella quietus* is not meant to indicate Andronicus' first performance, although Horace may well have accepted Varro's dating (*op. cit.*, 215-6). BECKER has not however persuaded me that «there is here no literary theory in the background» (*op. cit.* 216).]

There are then many features in these accounts in which the Augustans differ both from one another and (presumably) from Varro. What matters is whether there are certain basic principles of Varro's theory (or theories) on which they agree. Those are the principles which I have sought to clarify.

I must now mention the remaining bit of controversial evidence — the origin of Roman Satire. Every reader of Latin (Varronian or no) is aware that Horace derives the satire of Lucilius, and consequently his own, from the Old Attic comedy. So the beginning of the fourth satire of Book I—

*Eupolis atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae  
atque alii quorum comoedia prisca virorum est,  
si quis erat dignus describi...*

*...multa cum libertate notabant.  
hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus  
mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque.*

So too, I, 10, and by implication II, 1 — Horace's three literary satires. In his celebrated paper on *Varro und die Satire*, Friedrich Leo ascribed this odd theory to Varro, thus reviving an older ascription of Otto Jahn's<sup>1</sup>. Let it be admitted, direct testimony for this is pretty thin. It is our friend Diomedes again whose chapter on *satura* leads off with a relevant definition. *Satura*, says Diomedes, in the now current Roman meaning of the word is a libellous poem criticizing people's vices *archaeae comodiae caractere*, such as those written by Lucilius, Horace, and Persius<sup>2</sup>. By ill luck the reference to Old Comedy has not the name of an authority attached to it. As Jahn and Leo pointed out, two of the authorities mentioned in the section « On poetic genres » are Varro and Suetonius; and it is not unreasonable

<sup>1</sup> Above, p. 175, notes 1 and 2. <sup>2</sup> Diomedes, *op. cit.*, p. 485 (Keil), ed. LEO, ap. KAIBEL, *Com. Gr. Fr.*, pp. 55-6.

to guess that here as elsewhere Diomedes got his material from Varro by way of Suetonius<sup>1</sup>. An argument from silence was also adduced at any rate on Suetonius' behalf: Juvenal does not figure in the list of satirists. This would be explained by the date of Suetonius; it could also be explained on other grounds, and one understands that others were dissatisfied with this ascription.

Now I wonder if here should not be recalled what Donatus says about prehistoric Attic drama and what Horace says about prehistoric Roman drama. I have remarked on this point before<sup>2</sup>. If it is agreed that Donatus represents Varro, then it would be fair to conclude that criticism by name of evil livers was thought by Varro to have had its origin in the gay repartees at the festivals of the Attic κῶμαι. One would recall Donatus saying *Athenienses namque Atticam custodientes elegantiam cum vellent male viventes notare, in vicos et compita ex omnibus locis laeti alacresque veniebant ibique cum nominibus singulorum vitia publicabant*<sup>3</sup>; and Horace saying that *Fescennina licentia* and *opprobria rustica* amounted to an innocent game:

*donec iam saevus apertam  
in rabiem coepit verti iocus et per honestas  
ire domos impune minax.*

Hence the law forbidding *malo... carmine quemquam describi*. Thus fear of punishment led the Romans back *ad bene dicendum delectandumque*<sup>4</sup>.

Horace's wording in the letter to Augustus recalls, and is probably meant to recall, his earlier references in the literary satires to the assumed connexion between Roman Satire

<sup>1</sup> JAHN, *op. cit.*, compared the pairing of the two names in Servius' note on *Georgics*, III, 24 (on stage properties), *quod Varro et Suetonius commemorant*. But Diomedes does not likewise juxtapose the names.

<sup>2</sup> Above, pp. 185-6. <sup>3</sup> Above, p. 185. <sup>4</sup> Hor., *Ep.*, II, 1, 145-55. Cf. above, p. 188.

and Old Attic comedy. His mention of the Roman Law forbidding *malo... carmine quemquam describi* is of course paralleled by the humorous warning of the lawyer Trebatius in *Satira*, II, 1, *sanctarum inscitia legum* might get Horace into trouble<sup>1</sup>. The return from fear of punishment to «good speech and enjoyment», *ad bene dicendum delectandumque*, recalls the pun on *mala* and *bona carmina* at the end of the same satire. And finally it may be recalled that the same Horace shows himself aware of a like phenomenon on the Greek side. In the *Ars Poetica* in discussing Old Attic comedy he remarks in very similar terms: its freedom of speech has led to legal redress:

*sed in vitium libertas excidit et vim  
dignam lege regi; lex est accepta chorusque  
turpiter obticuit sublato iure nocendi*<sup>2</sup>.

Horace the satirist has his own personal reasons for stressing the feature called ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν. Without the independent witness of Donatus it would have been an unfounded (though not an improbable) guess to assert on the strength of Horace and Diomedes that Varro had thus connected Greek and Roman drama as well as Greek comedy and Lucilian satire. Donatus could not have taken this from Horace because Horace expresses himself differently. He is an independent witness. Even so this still remains an inference, although perhaps no longer an unfounded one.

Here then is a little more, not much more, evidence than there used to be. Varro, it may be surmised, considered *carmine describere* or *notare* as a feature independently (one presumes) present in native drama, Greek and Roman; he also seems to have considered Lucilian satire influenced by just that feature of Old Attic comedy. The details of the derivation are still unknown.

<sup>1</sup> Hor., *Sat.*, II, 1, 80-1.    <sup>2</sup> Hor., *A. P.*, 282-4.



If that is the Varronian side, what, so far as satire is concerned, is the Horatian side of the picture? If we are to believe Leo's suggestions in *Varro und die Satire*, the matter is quite simple<sup>1</sup>. In the thirties B. C., we are told, when Horace wrote *Satires* Book I, Varro was the Grand Old Man of Roman scholarship. Horace, although conscious already of his disagreement with Varronian ideas, was yet careful not to extend his criticism of Lucilius to a general attack on the whole of old Roman poetry. He puts forward Varro's general notion of Lucilius as a follower of the moral criticism of *Eupolis atque Cratinus* and their fellows. This citation of Varro (*more antiquo* in his words but without his name) was a prudent and tactful compliment paid by the rising young poet to the old gentleman. It was only some years after Varro's death (in 27; the letter to Augustus is dated to c. 14) that Horace felt sufficiently strong to assault the whole of that archaic poetry which had been so carefully guarded by Varro and the *Varroniani*.

The general implications of this view (not necessarily however Leo's implication) have become part of our accepted picture of literary history. One feature of the literary scene in Horace's time was archaism. Another feature is said to be the modernism of Valerius Cato and later Catullus and Calvus. One more step is then required. If there is archaism on the right, and modernism on the left, why there must be something in the middle which comprises both and is not identical with either — the Augustan attitudes of Horace, Virgil, Varius, to which the label «classicism» has been affixed. What could be tidier and more pleasing? It seems to me however that Horace's own statements make against this schematism, justified though it may be in some respects. In particular Horace's qualified polemic against Lucilius suggest certain doubts and queries.

<sup>1</sup> LEO, *op. cit.*, 79-81 (*Ausg. Kl. Schr.*, I, 296-7).

In the first place I see no reason why Horace must be paying a tactful compliment to Varro because he accepted his derivation from Old Attic comedy of Lucilian satire (if we are satisfied that it was Varro's derivation). There is nothing remarkable in the fact that Horace talked only of satire and not of archaic poetry as a whole. Why should Horace *the satirist* talk of anything but satire (*plus* comedy) if satire (*plus* comedy) was his chosen subject? Nor can I find anything complimentary in the further fact that Horace denied the very foundation on which rested the Varronian comparison between Old Attic comedy and Lucilius — I mean equal or comparable poetic worth. What Horace did was to recall Varro's comparison between the two, and then to admit it as far as the moral criticism of comedy and satire is concerned, but wholly to deny it with regard to their poetic quality.

Thirdly I wonder whether the separation between Varro and the archaists on the one hand and the νεώτεροι on the other is as true as it is convenient — so far as Lucilius is concerned. It is certainly not borne out by the second literary satire (I, 10, that is). For who are the men according to Horace who had attacked his own satires, or indeed his critique of Lucilius? They are not the avowed archaists, Varro and his followers, but *soi-disant* modernists who do not even know the great model, Old Attic comedy; all they can do is to recite Calvus and Catullus <sup>1</sup>. Whether or no this remark is made in depreciation of Calvus and Catullus is irrelevant to the point I am making. What is relevant however is some information concerning the inspirer of the modernist movement, Valerius Cato. In the spurious but probably contemporary lines prefixed to Horace's tenth satire, he is called the «defender» of Lucilius, *qui male factos emendare parat*

<sup>1</sup> Hor., *Sat.*, I, 10, 16-19, with obvious reference to the beginning of *Sat.*, I, 4.

*versus*<sup>1</sup>. Valerius Cato busying himself with the text of Lucilius fits in well with the evidence of the genuine portion of the tenth satire to which I have made reference. The νεώτεροι did not disdain Lucilius. Yet in the same poem Horace can voice *his* disdain of the contemporary writers of the «non-neoteric» forms of epic and drama, and his praise of others who successfully handled those large and difficult forms. Thus «schools» criss-cross to the despair of the tidy-minded.

What Horace has in mind are his own creative experiments and those of his friends. These experiments, at any rate in the literary satires, and the epistles to Augustus and Florus, constitute the point of departure for his literary criticism; they also constitute the principle of selection of literary theories. That increases the value of his literary criticism because it tells us a great deal about Horace as a poet. But it diminishes the value of Horace as a source for other men's theories because he takes only what suits his hand and takes it in the manner that suits it.

To sum up. The first extant writers showing the impact of Varro's literary theories (after Atticus and Cicero) are the great Augustans, Virgil, Horace, Livy, possibly too Tibullus. Of these Horace offers most of the evidence. Varronian material however cannot be recovered mechanically, for Horace was not a professional literary critic but a poet using professional literary criticism for his own, poetic, ends. He selects the theories that suit his purpose; if we knew more about the literary scene of the time, we would prob-

<sup>1</sup> *Male factos* is the construction that the writer puts on Valerius Cato's editorial activity — *emendare* in another sense. For the contemporary date, see E. FRAENKEL, *Lucili quam sis mendosus*, *Hermes*, LXVIII (1933), 398. Suetonius, *De gram.*, 2, comments on the explanation of *carmina parum adhuc divulgata* inspired in Rome by Crates of Mallos. He specifies Ennius *Annals*, Naevius' *Punic War*, and Lucilius' *Satires*, *quas legisse se apud Archelaum Pompeius Lenaeus, apud Philocomum Valerius Cato praedicant*.

ably find that he selects them from more than one writer; and he presents them in the manner best suited not to the theories but to his purpose. Being more interested in poetic tendencies than in literary critics and their doctrines he uses the doctrines to indicate tendencies. This may be one of the reasons why he is so sparing in the use of names of critics; Varro's for example is not mentioned. The same remarks relate to more than one.

It follows that Horace's remarks need to be used with due caution even if there is the indispensable extraneous evidence suggesting a Varronian source. On this basis I submit the following conclusions.

1. There is some evidence apart from Horace for the family tree « Old Attic comedy — Lucilian Satire », but its origin is uncertain. I have sought to strengthen the case for ultimately Varronian origin. The characteristic features of the family tree appear to be three in number: the Graeco-Roman tradition; archaism; and moral criticism in humorous verse. In *Satires*, I, 4 and 10, Horace accepts the premisses but employs them for the contrary conclusion, as an argument against archaism. The comparison with the Greek poets is used to deny equality of poetic status to the old Roman satirist. Whether or no the « neoteric » defenders of Lucilius in *Sat.* I, 10, also used Varronian arguments must remain doubtful.

2. There is some independent evidence for a Varronian account, or more than one, of the origin of drama, Greek and Roman. Recent research has strengthened the suspicion that in spite of important differences the Augustans utilized such an account, although it may not necessarily derive directly from Varro. I have argued that this is true of the relevant passage in the letter to Augustus. The same features may be observed again — the pair Greek-Roman; archaism; and moral criticism. Moreover there is also a notable stress on rustic origins — *Urbäuerlichkeit*. Horace



too reacts in the same manner as before. He accepts some select premisses but arrives at the opposite conclusion. The pair Greek-Roman implies an artistic ideal that is still to be attained in the future. Archaism is obnoxious. Rusticity has still to be overcome.

3. The stylistic discussion of the old dramatists, in the letter to Augustus, also offers some striking resemblances with bits and pieces from Varro. But this time Horace is not making use of a Varronian theory while reversing its tendency. This time he is chiefly combatting tendencies and procedures. The tendency he is opposing is, again, archaism; thus it involves Varro as well as others. The formalistic procedure he is ridiculing pervades the doctrine of the « types of style », Varro's included. The combination of Roman archaism and formalism may suggest Varro. But if Horace has one particular book or context in mind, he has taken some care not to make it evident.

4. I have not mentioned the letter to Florus in spite of some resemblances with Varro<sup>1</sup>, for the topics are traditional, but Horace's application is not.

5. I have not discussed the *Ars Poetica*, for I believe it to be irrelevant to my subject. A lengthy discussion would be required to establish that it is irrelevant. I believe the celebrated triad, *poema-poesis-poeta*, was used by Horace as a convenient means of arranging his material. But although the former two members of the triad also occur in Varro<sup>2</sup>, I believe there is no evidence that Horace had this in mind when he composed the *Ars Poetica*, and some evidence that he did not. Students of Varro must regret this, for were it otherwise they would here be on firmer ground than elsewhere, the *Ars Poetica* being a more systematic piece of criticism than the rest of Horace's literary satires and letters.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. DAHLMANN, *op. cit.*, 145. <sup>2</sup> Varro, ap. Non, p. 428, i. e. *Men.*, Fr. 398 (Buecheler).

## DISCUSSION

*M. Collart:* Hier nous avons tous apprécié la perspicacité avec laquelle M. Della Corte, à partir de textes fragmentaires, a su nous montrer la place de Varron dans l'histoire de la métrique. Aujourd'hui M. Brink, à partir de textes tout aussi fragmentaires (tel est le destin de notre auteur) nous révèle de façon frappante la place privilégiée de Varron dans l'histoire de la critique littéraire. Mais, en dehors même de l'aspect littéraire de l'enquête, il faut noter la rigueur avec laquelle notre collègue a analysé et utilisé les termes techniques. *Altus, doctus, gravis, describere* sont des mots de si grande banalité qu'on les traduit souvent de façon brutale et simpliste, même lorsqu'il s'agit de textes techniques. On oublie alors d'en cerner les contours exacts et, par conséquent, ils demeurent historiquement inexploitable. Grâce à M. Brink nous avons vu tout ce vocabulaire s'éclairer fructueusement. Ces résultats d'une méthode efficace, M. Brink, par modestie, n'a pas voulu en faire le sixième point de sa conclusion.

*M. Brink:* I am grateful to M. Collart, especially for stressing the importance of the terminology used by the literary critics in general and by Horace in particular.

*M. Della Corte:* Vorrei sapere se l'espressione varroniana *hodieque manent* risponde realmente a una situazione storica.

*M. Dahlmann:* Im Passus *Epist.* II, 1, 159 f. *sed in longum tamen aevum | manserunt hodieque manent vestigia ruris* liegt ein polemischer Hieb Horazens gegen die literarische Lehre Varros und seiner Schule (der *critici, fautores veterum*) von der schon lange erreichten Perfektion (ἀκμὴ) der römischen Poesie in archaischer Zeit. Horaz sagt im Gegensatz dazu: « wir befinden uns heute noch in manchem in der alten Rustizität: *hodie manent vestigia ruris* ». Von der Erreichung des *flos* kann nicht im mindesten die Rede sein. Vielleicht liegt darin auch etwas von Kritik an des Kaisers eigenem literarischem Geschmack, der wie der *populus* dem von Varro festgelegten Urteil von der τελειότης der Alten gefolgt ist.

*M. Brink:* Yes, I agree, that is the answer to Mr. Della Corte's question. The same point I have tried to bring out in my paper. Moreover one should probably remember that Horace's implied polemic against Varro's doctrines makes only sense if in c. 14 B.C. there was no Augustan literary criticism, or literary history, which could rival the impact of that of Varro. Otherwise Horace (and the other Augustans) would have had no reason for noticing these antiquated doctrines. I believe, Mr. Dahlmann very justly drew attention to this argument in his own paper.

*M. Schröter:* Nach Herrn Dahlmanns Vortrag schien es mir fraglich, dass Varro mit seinem Lob des Ennius und der archaischen Poesie insgesamt in *De poetis* eine so grosse Wirkung auf das Publikum ausübte. Nun erinnert Herr Brink uns aber mit Recht daran, dass Varro die archaische Literatur nicht nur in *De poetis*, sondern in verschiedenen Schriften und von verschiedenen Aspekten her immer wieder als Muster hingestellt hat, was diesen Einfluss ja viel verständlicher macht.

*M. Della Corte:* L'inciso *ut critici dicunt* (*Epist.* II, 1, 51), si riferisce a una scuola pergamena romana oppure alla κρίσις ποιημάτων della dottrina alessandrina?

*M. Brink:* My feeling is rather that the word *criticus* in Horace's time carries no longer the marks of a particular school of critics. As I said in my paper, Cicero even talks of a *criticus* and has in mind a *textual* critic (cf. p. 175). In this passage, on the other hand, *critici* are literary critics.

*M. Dahlmann:* In seiner Darstellung der Entwicklung der dramatischen Poesie in Rom (138 ff.) gibt Horaz in dem praeartistischen, vor der Einführung der wirklichen *ars poetica* liegenden Abschnitt (138-155) eine Vorgeschichte, die autochthone Wurzeln nur eines der Komödie entsprechenden lateinischen dramatischen Spieles bringt, ehe mit *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis intulit agresti Latio* die Einführung wirklicher von den Griechen erlernter Kunstpoesie einsetzt, und zwar durch die Transposition des tragischen Schauspiels *post Punica bella quietus*

— in der Ruhe nach dem ersten punischen Krieg, d. h. durch die sekundäre *inventio* des Livius Andronicus im Jahre 240. Zu dieser führt das im praeartistischen Stadium über die *inventi Fescennina licentia*, über *opprobria rustica*, *iocus*, *rabies* Ausgeführte nicht, sondern das *quaerere incipere quid Sophocles et Thespis et Aeschylus utile ferrent* ist bei Horaz ein später (*serus*) mit einem einzigen bestimmten Anfang (*quaerere coepit*) einsetzender Akt des Livius Andronicus. So war es auch, will es scheinen, in der Darlegung Varros von dem *primum inferre* der Tragödie in Rom durch Livius in seinem Werk *De poetis*. Was Horaz (138-155) und dann 156 ff. frei schaltend, wie immer, darlegt, entspricht der Darlegung der Entwicklung der Poesie vom praeartistischen Stadium bis zum *primum inferre* wirklicher *ars*, wie sie in seiner Vorlage, einer technitologischen Schrift, erörtert gewesen sein muss: das *inferre* der *artes* aus Griechenland nach Latium (156 f.) ist ganz topisch in solcherart Technitographie.

M. Waszink: Obwohl ich teilweise mit Herrn Dahlmann übereinstimme, möchte ich gern meine Ansicht über den Abschnitt des Horaz hier zusammenhängend vortragen. Wenn es richtig ist, dass sowohl Verg. *Georg.* II, 380 ff. als Diomedes S. 487, 11 ff. (Varro *Fr.* 304 *GRF*) wirklich auf Varro zurückgeht, so darf man es m. E. doch als höchstwahrscheinlich betrachten, erstens, dass Varro sowohl den volkstümlichen Ursprung auch der Tragödie, nicht nur der Komödie, in Rom beschrieben hat, zweitens, dass es ihm dabei darauf ankam, die Entwicklung in Rom in beiden Fällen als der Entwicklung der beiden attischen γένη analog darzustellen, und drittens, dass er annahm, dass sowohl die römische Tragödie als die Komödie auf dem Lande entstanden ist. Was nun aber die Beschreibung bei Horaz, *Epist.* II, 1, 139 ff., betrifft, so möchte ich betonen, dass diese nicht ohne weiteres als ein gleichwertiges Testimonium für die ganze Theorie Varros angeführt werden darf. Horaz betont allerdings stark den rustikalen Ursprung, wie schon aus dem ersten Wort der Beschreibung (*agricolae*) hervorgeht, was nun aber nach der Beschreibung des Erntefestes folgt, bis Vs. 155



einschliesslich, bezieht sich m. E. auf die Vorstufen der Komödie: die *opprobria* (146), der beherrschende Begriff bis Vs. 155, beziehen sich ja auf das ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν; die *Fescennina licentia*, die sich ja auch nach der livianischen Darstellung der varronischen Theorie des Saturniers bediente (VII, 2, 5 und 7), wie schon Reitzenstein nachgewiesen hat, und an die Horaz m. E. noch in Vss. 157-158 denkt, äusserte sich nach ihm eben besonders in *mala carmina*. Erst in Vs. 156 geht Horaz zu der späteren Entwicklungsphase über, und erst dort ist *disertis verbis* die Rede von der Tragödie (162).

Also: der Passus von Vs. 145 bis Vs. 155 enthält nur die Vorstufen der Komödie. In diesem Zusammenhang frage ich mich, ob das Opfer eines Ferkels an Tellus (Vs. 143), das bekanntlich religionsgeschichtlich Schwierigkeiten macht, nicht zu erklären ist als eine bewusste Variation des von Varro und nach ihm von Vergil (*Georg.* II, 380-381) erwähnten Opfers eines Bocks, das ja zu der von Horaz übergangenen Tragödie gehört.

Ist diese Ausführung im allgemeinen richtig, so drängt sich die Frage auf, warum Horaz denn nur die Vorstufen der Komödie dort erwähnt, und somit der varronischen Theorie nur zum Teil folgt? Wenn ich nicht irre, spielt hierbei jedenfalls der Umstand eine Rolle, dass für Horaz als Satiriker die Komödie viel wichtiger war als die Tragödie, da ja nach der varronischen Theorie, die er auch selbst vertritt (*Sat.* I, 4, 1-6), *hinc omnis pendet Lucilius*.

*M. Cardauns*: Zur Abwesenheit jeden Hinweises auf die Tragödie in *Epist.* II, 1. 139-155 liesse sich folgendes erwägen:

Horaz will die Unvollkommenheit der römischen Literatur seiner Zeit hervorheben. Der Hauptgedanke steht Vs. 160: *hodieque manent vestigia ruris*. Darum betont er die rustikalen Ursprünge der römischen Literatur. Angenommen, ihm lag eine varronische Theorie von einem eigenen römischen Ursprung der Tragödie wie der Komödie vor, so war doch eine römische Vorstufe der Tragödie jedenfalls eine varronische Fiktion, die jeder Beziehung zur geschichtlichen Wirklichkeit und jeder Anschaulichkeit entbehrte. Was Horaz als Dichter aber an dieser Stelle brauchte,

war eine anschauliche Vorstellung von einem Frühstadium der Dichtung in Rom, und als solche bot sich nur die *Fescennina licentia* an. Es ging ihm primär nicht um eine bestimmte Gattung, sondern um die römische Dichtung überhaupt, und so wählte er das aus, was eine lebendige Darstellung ermöglichte.

*M. Della Corte*: Come il professore Dahlmann ha felicemente definito, Varrone ha voluto intellettualmente creare una storia nazionalistica della nascita del dramma. Ma mentre per la commedia può servirsi di precedenti oschi o etruschi, meno facilmente ha potuto inventare una tragedia romana in cui *introducuntur heroes duces reges*, di cui non aveva alcuna documentazione.

*M. Schröter*: Die Interpretation von Herrn Cardauns überzeugt. Wenn man Donat heranzieht, gibt das vielleicht auch etwas für Herrn Brink's Frage aus, ob und wie die Fassung des Donat mit der des Diomedes tatsächlich zu kombinieren sei. Auch Donat stellt ja (ähnlich wie Horaz im Augustus-Brief) bei seiner Ursprungsanalyse des römischen Dramas die Komödie zunächst sehr in den Vordergrund und berücksichtigt erst nach und nach die Tragödie. Dass es nicht erlaubt ist aus diesem Befund zu schliessen, dass Horaz eine dem Donat ähnliche Fassung einfach übernommen habe, hat Herr Cardauns gezeigt. Beide Autoren sind aus ganz verschiedenen Gründen (Donat schreibt eine Einleitung in die Komödie!) zu Darstellungen geführt worden, die in der Abfolge der Gedanken (äusserlich) ähnlich sind.

*M. Michel*: La différence entre les deux constructions de Varron et d'Horace s'explique peut-être dans une certaine mesure par la plus grande complexité de la doctrine du second.

Pour Varron, le théâtre s'est développé à Rome selon le progrès que postule son étymologie. Mais, chez Horace, deux tendances assez contradictoires se rencontrent et s'accordent avec difficulté. D'une part, il croit au progrès des arts et à l'amélioration progressive de la poésie; mais, d'autre part, il semble influencé par l'idée d'une décadence des mœurs qui aurait entraîné

selon la conception épicurienne une complication progressive de la littérature.

Les vers 139 sqq. dépeignent l'état ancien de l'art littéraire dans la Rome primitive, qui était encore paysanne et comme arcadienne; l'allusion aux *versibus alternis* des paysans ne pouvait guère manquer d'évoquer les *Bucoliques* pour les lecteurs du temps. Naturellement, par suite de ses tendances littéraires, Horace rapproche cette sorte de style de la satire.

Cette tendance est confirmée par l'autre grand texte où Horace esquisse une histoire du théâtre: il s'agit de l'*Art poétique*, 202 sqq. Là aussi, Horace décrit avec admiration les anciennes conditions morales du spectacle théâtral: le public en était austère, pur et *frugi castusque verecundusque coibat* (207). Puis vint le temps des guerres de conquête: alors apparut le luxe. On est bien tenté de penser à la *Graecia capta*, et à tout le contexte de ce passage.

*M. Waszink*: Ich bekomme nicht den Eindruck, dass, wenigstens in *Epist.* II, 1, 139-155, Horaz in irgendwelcher Weise in der Entwicklung der römischen Literatur eine Dekadenz annimmt, und ich kann daher nicht mit Herrn Michel bei ihm die Existenz von zwei entgegengesetzten Tendenzen annehmen. M. E. sieht Horaz in der älteren römischen Literatur nur eine unerwünschte *rusticitas*, und handelt es sich für ihn nur darum, die zu hohe Wertschätzung dieser *rusticitas*, besonders auch durch Augustus selbst, zu bestreiten.