THREE ORATORS AND A FLAWED ARGUMENT
(HOR. SAT. 1.10.27-30)

scilicet oblitus patriaque patrique Latinus,
cum Pedius causae exsudet Publicola atque
Corvinus, patris intermiscere petit
verba foris malis, Canusini more bilinguis.

In a much-discussed passage of his programmatic Tenth Satire, Horace rejects the use of Greek words in his Latin satires by pointing to contemporary Roman orators who were well-known champions of Latinitas, pure idiomatic Latin. The exact meaning of these lines, Satires 1.10.27-30, has baffled readers since late antiquity. In particular, the precise name and identity of the orators Horace mentions have been the subject of an intense debate that started with the ancient scholiasts and is still in full swing. Is Horace speaking of a certain Pedius Publicola and Corvinus, or is he talking about Pedius and Publicola Corvinus? In this paper, I will show that Horace, first of all, does not list two, but three eminent orators of his time: Q. Pedius, M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus, and the hitherto overlooked L. Gellius Publicola, thereby adding to our scant information on two of the three. Secondly, the satirist's reference to Messalla Corvinus subtly hints that his entire argument against the use of Greek is seriously flawed.

The interpretation of the passage turns on the correct understanding of atque. Most commentators, including the ancient scholiasts, have read line 28 as a series of two names that are linked by the conjunction atque, Pedius Publicola and (Messalla) Corvinus.1 This is problematic, however, because the gentilicium Pedius is nowhere else connected with the cognomen Publicola.2

Accordingly, some scholars, notably Münzer and most recently Fedeli, take atque as a postpositive atque, a not infrequent phenomenon in Latin poetry.3 The two orators are not Pedius Publicola and Corvinus, they argue, but Pedius and Publicola.

2 See RE 19 (1938): 38-43 s.v. "Pedius 1-7" (F. Münzer et al.).
3 Cf. for example, Hor. Sat. 1.5.4; 1.6.111.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL 100.4 (2005) 393-400
Corvinus. Here too, the problem is that the friend of Horace who is clearly meant by the name Corvinus, the famous orator M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus (cf. Sat. 1.6.42; 1.10.85), seems not to have used the cognomen Publicola as a part of his name.

The only apparent exception occurs in a panegyric elegy, composed on the occasion of Messalla’s triumph in 27 B.C.E., which has been preserved under Vergil’s name. There, the unknown poet writes ([Verg.] Catid. 9.39-40):

multa nec immernis tonarit (sc. Roma) praeclaria alumnus, praeclaria Messaliae maxima Publicola.

(Rome) bestowed many rewards upon her sons, who certainly deserved (them), (and) the greatest rewards on the Messallae Publicole (or rather: men like Messalla Publicola).

These lines come immediately after an allusion to the expulsion of the last Roman king. A certain P. Valerius Messalla Publicola had played an important role in the overthrowing of the king, and he was rewarded with a consulship in the first year of the Roman republic. The verses serve to connect the contemporary triumphator Messalla with the fame of this mythical ancestor. The poet’s use of the plural Messallae Publicole does not prove, however, that M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus himself ever took up the name Publicola.

The evidence to the contrary, in fact, is overwhelming. Messalla’s name appears in a number of inscriptions, and it is quoted numerous times by contemporary and later authors. Wherever these sources list Messalla’s full name, it always takes the form M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus, as, for example, in CIL 6.1375, 5.2039, 9.4191, and Cass. Dio ind. 38.5. Our sources also attest that Messalla had adopted the agnomen Corvinus by 43 B.C.E. at the latest (Cic. ad Brut. 1.12.1). In addition, the Fasti Amaterrini (CIL 9.4191, from the


4 Thus Fritzschie 1875: 218; Rohden and Dessau 1898: 20 nr. 147 (= Rohden); Münzer 1938: 42; Wiseman 1974: 123; Fedell 1999: 316.
6 An anonymous referee of The Classical Journal makes the interesting observation that 27 B.C.E., the year of Messala Corvinus’ triumph, was also the first year of Augustus’ "Restored Republic". By giving the contemporary triumphator Messala the cognomen of his ancestor Messalla Publicola, the unknown poet of the 3rd elegy created a suggestive parallel to another first year of the Republic, the one in which Messala Publicola served as one of Rome’s first consuls. While Horace, in theory, could have done the same, the parallel, as the referee also mentions, would have made far less sense in 35 B.C.E., when the first book of Horace’s Satires was published, and in the context of Sat. 1.10.
7 Listed by Rohden and Dessau 1898: 365 nr. 90. See also the testimonia and fragments regarding Messala’s work as an orator in Malcovi 1979: 529-534.
8 Cass. Dio ind. 51 offers the same names in a slightly different order.

Tiberian period) record his name as M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus in an entry that refers to the years 31 B.C.E. There is, thus, no indication in our sources that Messalla Corvinus himself ever used Publicola as part of his name, neither at the time of the publication of Horace’s first book of Satires (35 B.C.E.) nor at any other time.

There is, however, one contemporary who is often referred to simply as Publicola. This is the politician L. Gellius Publicola, who seems to have been, if we can trust Livy (Ep. 122) and Cassius Dio (47.24.5), a brother of Messalla Corvinus. Horace clearly refers to him a couple of lines further down in our Tenth Satire where the poet counts Messalla and his brother among the addressees of his satiric poetry (te, Messalla, tuo cum fratre, Sat. 1.10.85). Publicola / atque Corvinus in Sat. 1.10.28-29 points to the same pair of brothers.

T.P. Wiseman is the only scholar who in recent times has seriously considered the possibility that Horace could speak of three, not two men in our passage. He felt, however, compelled to reject this interpretation out of hand on the grounds that "the Latin is against this." Yet Leumann, Hofmann, and Szantyr would disagree with him on this point. According to their standard Latinische

9 It has been suggested to me that Messalla could, in theory, have adopted the name Publicola for a short time in the thirties, only to drop it again almost immediately thereafter. This seems highly unlikely. It is true that it was a practice of the time to revive older family cognomina. M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus himself, for example, appropriated the agnomen of a M. Valerius Maximus who consuls three times, in 312, 289, and 236 B.C.E., cf. Skidmore 1996: 116. Yet despite a relative wealth of sources concerning Messalla, there is simply no evidence that the orator himself ever associated himself with the agnomen Publicola.
10 Cf., for example, Liv. Ep. 122 (Publicolaem), Veil. Pat. 2.852 (Publicolae), Plut. Ant. 65.1 and 66.2 (Πολυκλάδις). Once, Dio also refers to him as Γάλλος Πολυκλάδιος (47.24.3).
11 Since L. Gellius Publicola was a son of L. Gellius (cos. 72 B.C.E.), it is generally assumed that he was only Messalla’s half-brother (his mother must have had two husbands, the elder Gellius and Messalla’s father, M. Valerius Messalla, cos. 61 or 53 B.C.E.), cf. Münzer 1912: 1004, II. 20-26 and see the family tree in Wiseman 1974: 178. Badlum 1983: 8 and 11 has suggested a better explanation for the fact that Gellius is called Messalla’s brother and bears a cognomen that is more commonly associated with the Valerii. Badlum speculates that L. Gellius Publicola was in fact Messalla’s brother by birth and only later adopted by the older L. Gellius.
12 Only Hanulik 1955: 133, II. 1-3 identifies this brother as M. Valerius Messalla Potitus (cos. 29 B.C.E.), in contrast to Horace’s other addressees, was not a writer himself.
13 Wiseman 1974: 123. Before him, Karl Nipperdey, in a University of Jens Program from 1857, also interpreted our passage as talking about three, not two orators, cf. Nipperdey 1877: 494-95. He failed, however, to name any parallels for the use of atque except for Hor. Sat. 1.5.4, wherein clearly is postpositive (Bibl., 392-83). In 1872, based on the erroneous reading of an Acropolis inscription, Nipperdey even dissociated himself from his earlier identification of Publicola with L. Gellius Publicola (Nipperdey 1877: 539-60). Hermann Dessau opted either to take Publicola separately, with Nipperdey’s earlier publication, or to connect it with Pedius, cf. Rohden and Dessau 1898: 364.
Grammatik, *atque* can introduce the last member of a longer, otherwise asyndetic list. This usage is especially common in Archaic Latin, but the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* article *atque* cites numerous later examples as well.

Most examples occur in Roman comedy. Plautus writes, for example, *advenio ex Selucia, Macedonia, Asia, atque Arabia* (Trin. 845); *me, te, atque hos omnes* (Cur. 74); and *ubi tibi sit lepide victibus, vino, atque uenguins* (Bac. 1131). Terence similarly offers *nestem, aurum, atque ancillas* (Hau. 893). An example from tragedy can be found in a fragment from the *Alcmeon* of Ennius, which contains the series, *morbo, exilio, atque inopia* (Act 2.21 Vahlen = fr. 14 Jocelyn).

The historian Sallust imitates many features of Archaic Latin. Accordingly, his writings contain numerous asyndetic lists whose last element is introduced by *atque*. A small sample may suffice: *Omnis homines ... ab odio, amicitia, ira, atque misericordia vacuos esse decest* (Cat. 51.1); *armis, cadaveribus, crucere, atque iuctu omnia compleri* (Cat. 51.9); *facies ... varia, incerta, foeda, atque miserabilis* (fug. 51.1); *virtus, gloria, atque alia optanda* (fug. 64.1).

Once in a while, the same use of *atque* can be observed in purely classical prose writers too. In a letter to Cato, for instance, Cicero writes, *mores, instituta, atque vitam* (Fam. 15.4.14), and in his *Gallic War*, Caesar has, *Eburones, Nervii, Adatuci, atque horum socii et clientes* (Gal. 5.39.3). The usage is not limited to prose, though. Examples from classical poetry include Lucretius, who writes, *odor, funus, vapor, atque aliae res* (Locr. 4.90), and even Horace himself. In one of his *Epistles*, Horace chooses *atque* to introduce an asyndetic list that only differs from the parallels mentioned above in that the last member of the list consists of two elements, the emotions *libido* and *ira*, which are connected by *et: seditione, dolis, scelere, atque libidinem et iram* (Epist. 2.2.15).

The fact that the verb, *exsudet* (28), is in the singular does not create a problem either. In connection with groups of several subjects, Kühner and Stegmann remark: "If a verb (or a part of it) is inserted after the first subject, it always refers to this alone." Therefore, nothing in the Latin prevents us from interpreting the list of names in *Sat. 1.10.28-29* as a list that contains three, not two members, Q. Pedius, L. Gallius Publicola, and M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus.

This insight is not insignificant. First of all, it removes longstanding prosopographical confusion by clarifying that there is no need to explain the otherwise un- or insufficiently documented combinations of the name Publicola with either Pedius or Corvinus.

Secondly, once we understand our passage correctly, it adds some interesting information about two major figures of the period about whom we know relatively little. We are only pretty well informed about M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus (ca. 64 B.C.E. - before 8 B.C.E.). The patron of poets like Tibullus, Sulpicia, and Ovid, he was considered to be one of the best speakers of his time and a notorious stickler for pure Latin. Seneca the Elder, for example, called him *Latini utique sermonis observator diligentissimus* (Contr. 2.4.8).

Regarding Messalla's cousin Pedius or his brother Publicola, however, our evidence is much more restricted. Pedius is probably identical with the *P. Pedius* who served as quaestor urbanus in 41 B.C.E.,20 his mother was Messalla's sister or half-sister.21 He may also be the glib orator in Persius' *First Satire* who counters the charges against him with "trim antitheses" and "clever figures" (Pers. 1.85-87, tr. Rudd).22 L. Gallius Publicola (cos. 36 B.C.E., the year before the publication of *Satires I*) is known primarily as a soldier and politician. *Satires* 1.10.27-30 now show us that both Pedius and Publicola must have enjoyed a certain reputation as orators with a preference for pure Latin. In the case of Publicola, this is our first

17 Cf. Klotz 1900-1906: 1055-58. Unfortunately, Klotz does not separate this particular usage of *atque* from those in which *atque* appears together with other conjunctions, such as *que* or *et*.
18 In the Bellum Catilinae, all asyndetic lists with *atque* consist of four elements, as implied by McGavin 1977: 14. In his other works, however, Sallust also uses similar lists of three elements, *sero, fama, atque copia* (fug. 14.17); *audacia, scelere, atque superbia* (fug. 14.11); *avaritiam, imperitiarum, atque superbium* (fug. 85.45); *insensissim exercitus, furibundus atque amnis* (Rep. 2.12.6).
19 Cf. the example from Caesar I have given, in which the last member of the list is itself divided into two synonyms connected by *et*.
and only evidence for his probably extensive experience in the Roman courts.

Another not unimportant detail that has been overlooked in the discussions of our passage so far is the fact that the satirist's entire argument is severely flawed. In particular, it has not been noticed that the reference to Messalla both supports and subverts the satirist's point against Greek in poetry.

The poet starts by rejecting an interlocutor's claim that the satires of his predecessor Lucilius are both a great achievement and sound "sweeter" because he mixes Latin with Greek words (Sat. 1.10.20-21). In refutation, Horace points to our three orators as known defenders of pure Latin and suggests that such a linguistic blend would be just as inappropriate in his poetry as it is in court speeches. Then, in a comic adaptation of Callimachus' dream from the prologue of his Aitia (fr. 1.21-30) that turns the Greek Apollo into the Roman Quirinus, he claims that divine command prevents him from writing any Greek poetry at all (Sat. 1.10.31-35).

Only Ruth Scodel seems to have noticed that the satirist's first argument, in which he compares apples to pears, the standards of oratory to those of poetry, "is not a strong one" because the "conclusion does not necessarily follow." Similarly, there is a clear logical leap from the occasional use of Greek in a Latin verse to the writing of entirely Greek poems even though the satirist acts as if there was no difference at all. Moreover, if there were indeed no difference, then Messalla would not be the best person to appeal to for support. Messalla insisted on pure Latin in his prose, but he had no qualms about writing Greek poetry himself. As contemporary readers will have known, Messalla composed both bucolic poetry in the style of Theocritus and amatory elegies in Greek, despite the fact that he, just like Horace, was natus mare citra.

Similarly ironic and self-contradictory arguments can be found elsewhere in Horace's Satires. In Satires 1.4, for example, Horace ironically denies his Satires the status of poetry, in a comic move to declare himself exempt from the hatred many people, as he has claimed earlier, feel toward poets (cf. omenes hi metuunti versus, odere poetas, 1.4.33). At the same time, however, the verses in which Horace advances this argument showcase the satirist's poetic craft in such a way that it is obvious that we are meant to consider Horace's 197 Satires not prose, but poetry. In Satires 2.1.12-15, Horace claims, in a ploy typical for poetic recusationes, that he is unable to write epic poetry, only to illustrate what he means by epic poetry with a couple of beautiful epic verses. And in Satires 1.10 itself, to give a final example, Horace pretends that he only playfully dabbles in poetry (haec ego iudo, 37), but he lists himself among the premier poets of contemporary Rome (40-49), and he expects that men of the most exacting literary standards, including Messalla and his brother Gellius Publicola, will enjoy what he has written (81-90). In conclusion, it appears that in Satire 1.10 Horace deliberately crafted a flawed argument against the use of Greek in satire. In fact, while Horace did indeed limit his use of Greek words in comparison to Lucilius, he felt free to use them wherever they were poetically effective. The self-contradictory reference to Messalla may be intended as a clue for his contemporary readers that the satirist is only speaking tongue-in-cheek.
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