them to his phallic power.'[9] The importance of aggression and the act of penetration for the metaphorical use of the terms, and the connections to broader conceptions of sexuality and masculinity that underlie these types of insults and threats, have been explored in depth in such works as A. Richlin's *The Garden of Priapus*.[10] Similarly, *irrumatio*, which is currently defined by the *OLD* as 'oral sex, fellatio', is in fact the act of requiring fellatio from another person, not of performing it. Curiously, *irrumator*, placed in between these two incorrectly defined words, is now more correctly defined as 'a person who receives fellatio', an improvement over the previous edition. However, both *irrumo* and *irrumatio* should be redefined in such a way as to clarify who is doing what part of the act, and all three definitions should suggest the aggression which is commonly implied by this set of terms in Latin texts.

Thorneloe University at Laurentian AVEN MCMASTER
amcmaster@laurentian.ca
doi:10.1017/S0009838818000459

WHEN ENOUGH IS ENOUGH: AN UNNOTICED TELESTICH IN HORACE (*SATIRES* 1.4.14–18)*

nam fuit hoc uitiosus: in hora saepe ducentos,
ut magnum, uersus dictabat stans pede in uno;
cum flueret lutulentus, erat quod tollere uelles;
garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem,
scribendi recte: nam ut multum, nil moror. ecce
Crispinus minimo me prouocat: 'accipe, si uis,
accipe iam tabulas; detur nobis locus, hora,
custodes; uideamus uter plus scribere possit.'
di bene fecerunt, inopis me quodque pusilli
finxerunt animi, raro et perpauca loquentis …[1]

For he [Lucilius] was in this regard faulty: he often dictated two hundred verses in an hour, standing on one foot, as if it were a great thing; since he flowed muddily, there would be something you would want to take out; he was chatty and too lazy to bear the labour of writing, of writing right; for as to his great amount I care not. But look! Crispinus challenges me with his little finger:[2] 'Get your tablets, if you wish, get your tablets already; let there be given to us a place, a time and referees; let us see which of us can write more.' The gods have done well,

[9] C.A. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality* (Oxford, 2010), 182. For more on Catullus' use of the word in poem 16, see K.F.B. Fletcher, 'Catullus' "ATM": the word order of *carmen* 16.1 and the Roman hierarchy of sexual humiliation', *CPh* 112 (2017), 487–92.

[10] A. Richlin, *The Garden of Priapus* (Oxford, 1992).

* I would like to thank *CQ*'s editor Bruce Gibson, the anonymous reviewer and Andrew Feldherr for their helpful comments and suggestions.

[1] Here and elsewhere I use the Latin text of E. Gowers (ed.), *Horace: Satires Book I* (Cambridge and New York, 2012), which is based on that of F. Klingner (ed.), *Q. Horati Flacci opera* (Leipzig, 1959). Translations are my own. Importantly for an argument about a telestich, the text of lines 1.4.14–18 is secure. Lambinus suggested *loquentem* for *loquentis* in line 18 (see the apparatus criticus of Klingner), but this is unnecessary and has not gained acceptance.

[2] The precise sense of *minimo* is unclear; see Gowers (n. 1), on 1.4.14–16.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000381 Published online by Cambridge University Press

because they have fashioned me of a mind that is paltry and meagre, one that speaks rarely and very little …

In these lines from the fourth poem of his first collection of satires (1.4.9–18), Horace defines his poetic identity against the figures of his satiric predecessor Lucilius and his contemporary Stoic rival Crispinus. Horace emerges as the poet of Callimachean[3] restraint and well-crafted writing in contrast to the chatty, unpolished prolixity of both Lucilius and Crispinus. A proponent of the highly wrought miniature over the sprawling scale of Lucilius, Horace knows when enough is enough. And, owing to a playful link between what is *satis* ('enough') and *satura* ('satire'), this makes Horace not only a skilful poet but also the consummate *sat*irist. I suggest that this programmatic message is both emphasized and illustrated by a piece of wordplay beginning in line 14. In a previously unnoticed[4] telestich, the last letters of lines 14–18 spell out the word *satis* ('enough').[5] Moreover, this hidden word—made possible only by the particular arrangement of words in all five of its lines—anticipates and deepens the poem's later interest in the matter of *compositio*, or artful word-arrangement. While this may be unique as an example of a Horatian telestich, Horace does engage in various forms of wordplay elsewhere,[6] and could look not only to Hellenistic poets but also to Lucretius as a predecessor in this regard.[7] In the *Satires*, a collection in which problems of *libertas* make forms of implication and veiled speech especially significant, a wide range of hidden words and wordplay has been detected and

[3] See Gowers (n. 1), on 1.4.11.

[4] Because this is a telestich, rather than an acrostic, it has escaped the industrious lists of I. Hilberg, 'Ist die Ilias Latina von einem Italicus verfasst oder einem Italicus gewidmet?', *WS* 21 (1899), 264–305 and id., 'Nachtrag zur Abhandlung "Ist die Ilias Latina von einem Italicus verfasst oder einem Italicus gewidmet?"', *WS* 22 (1900), 317–18. It is also not to be found in J.A. Simon, *Akrosticha bei den augustischen Dichtern. Exoterische Studien. Zweiter Teil, mit einem Anhang: akrostichische und telestichische Texte aus der Zeit von Plautus bis auf Crestien von Troies und Wolfram von Eschenbach* (Cologne and Leipzig, 1899); J.A. Simon, *Ein neuentdecktes Geheimschriftsystem der Alten. Mit Proben aus Nikander, Tibull, Properz, Ovid, Vergil, Horaz, Phaedrus, Val. Flaccus, Martial und andern mit einem Nachwort über akrostichisches bei den klassischen Dichtern der Griechen und Römer* (Leipzig, 1901); or J.A. Simon, *Horatius acrostichicus. Akrostichisches bei Horaz, Vergil, Ovid, Catull, Tibull, Properz, Plautus, Terenz, Lucrez, Homer, Hesiod, Sophocles und anderen* (Cologne, 1923).

[5] Numerous acrostics and other instances of wordplay have been noted and suggested for Latin poets, who took the practice up from Hellenistic poets, particularly Aratus. See J.T. Katz, 'The Muse at play: an introduction', in J. Kwapisz, D. Petrain and M. Szymanski (edd.), *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry* (Berlin and Boston, 2013), 1–30, at 5–10 for an overview. Gregor Damschen maintains a helpful online bibliography on ancient acrostics at http://www.telemachos.hu-berlin.de/esterni/akrostichon.html.

[6] Horace is especially fond of puns and often plays on personal names (including his own, at *Epod.* 15.12). See in general M. Paschalis, 'Names and death in Horace's *Odes*', *CW* 88 (1995), 181–90 and K.J. Reckford, 'Horatius: the man and the hour', *AJPh* 118 (1997), 583–612, esp. 593–5 and 599–606. For some particular examples of Horatian wordplay, see L. Monte, '*Mena mane venit*: an unnoticed pun in Horace *Epist.* 1.7.61ff.', *CW* 60 (1966), 8–10; W. Kofler, '*Mena mane ad cenam venit*: zu Horaz *Ep.* 7.60–76', *Mnemosyne* 50 (1997), 342–6; R. Cowan, 'Land of King Mane. A pun at Horace, *Odes* 1.22.15', *CQ* 56 (2006), 322–4; J.T. Katz, '*Dux reget examen* (*Epistle* 1.19.23): Horace's Archilochean signature', *MD* 59 (2008), 207–13; and R. Cowan, 'Alas, poor Io! Bilingual wordplay in Horace *Epode* 11', *Mnemosyne* 65 (2012), 753–63.

[7] On puns and wordplay in Lucretius, see P. Friedländer, 'Pattern of sound and atomistic theory in Lucretius', *AJPh* 62 (1941), 16–34; J.M. Snyder, *Puns and Poetry in Lucretius' De Rerum Natura* (Amsterdam, 1980); and M. Gale, 'Etymological wordplay and poetic succession in Lucretius', *CPh* 96 (2001), 168–72.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000381 Published online by Cambridge University Press

suggested.[8] The instance observed here reaffirms Horace's interest in wordplay, while its uniqueness as a telestich is, as I hope to show, particularly suited to its context in this poem.

This particular poem is, in a number of ways, a suitable place for Horace to include a telestich. This is Horace's 'first overtly programmatic poem',[9] where he fashions his identity as a poet, explores the status of satire as poetry, and questions what it is that defines poetry at all. This use of erudite wordplay associates Horace with the learnedness of Hellenistic poetry, furthering his Callimachean credentials and belying his apparent disavowal of the title of poet later in this poem (1.4.39–40). Aratus' famous λεπτή acrostic[10] even provides a precedent for Horace in enclosing a stylistic and metapoetic word (rather than a poet's name) in an acrostic. The mere fact of Horace's having a telestich marks his humble *sermo* as, in fact, learned poetry.

But the content of the hidden word is perhaps more significant. The lines surrounding the telestich are concerned with the issue of poetic self-restraint and satiety, a common theme throughout Horace's first book of satires. In line 18, Horace modestly claims that he only speaks 'very little' (*perpauca*), but, if we read this line along with the telestich that is completed at its end, we see that Horace's very little is just enough. The wordplay thus reinforces the passage's emphasis on quality over quantity in verse. Moreover, *satis* does not merely refer to a knowing poetic self-restraint, but in fact enacts it. The fact that *satis* is here a telestich, rather than an acrostic, means that the word imposes a kind of end-stopping visual closure on Crispinus' quoted speech, which runs breathlessly over two line ends. In reading Horace's hidden *satis*, we must look to the ends of lines, the place where, with each new hexameter, the struggle between boundlessly flowing speech and artful closure is decided. But the telestich does not merely show that Horace speaks enough, for within Horatian satire *satis* has generic force.[11] In this agonistic context, Horace reinvents satire as defined by being just enough rather than over-stuffed—more *satis* than *satur*. If we read *satis* in the telestich as a metonym for the genre of satire, it encapsulates this shift, subtly hinting that in speaking enough Horace utters true *sat*ire.

This hidden word also gains significance through a tension in these lines between speech and writing, and through play with the practice of quotation. Lines 14–16 contain the words of Crispinus, but they are of course quoted by Horace and incorporated into his poem. In using Crispinus' own words to fashion a retort to his poetic challenge, Horace wrests Crispinus' language away from him. His all-consuming satire cannibalizes Crispinus' words for its own purposes, as it will those of Ennius later in this poem (60–1).[12] In doing so, Horace also crucially transforms Crispinus' speech

[8] See, for example, Reckford (n. 6), 595 with n. 22; K. Freudenburg, *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal* (Cambridge, 2001), 40; E. Gowers, 'Blind eyes and cut throats: amnesia and silence in Horace *Satires* 1.7', *CPh* 97 (2002), 145–61; S. Sharland, 'Ghostly guests and venomous snakes: traces of civil war in Horace, *Satires* 2.8', *AClass* 54 (2011), 79–100, at 95 n. 55; Gowers (n. 1), on 1.121 on Crispinus' name; and R. Cowan, 'Tall, pale, and noble: beauty, rank, and wordplay at Horace, *Satires* 1.2.123–126', *Latomus* 73 (2014), 1012–28.

[9] Gowers (n. 1), 147.

[10] At *Phaen.* 783–7, on which see J.-M. Jacques, 'Sur un acrostiche d'Aratos (Phén., 738–787)', *REA* 62 (1960), 48–61; W. Levitan, 'Plexed artistry: Aratean acrostics', *Glyph* 5 (1979), 55–68; and most recently M. Hanses, 'The pun and the moon in the sky: Aratus' ΛΕΠΤΗ acrostic', *CQ* 64 (2014), 609–14.

[11] This is certainly the case at 1.1.120. See Gowers (n. 1), ad loc. and K. Freudenburg, *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire* (Princeton, 1993), 112.

[12] Cf. Gowers (n. 1), 150 on Horace's satire as able to 'absorb anything alien into its flexible hexameters'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000381 Published online by Cambridge University Press

into writing. A play with satire as both spoken conversation and written poetry pervades Horace's *Satires*, visible in the very (oxymoronic) concept of a *liber Sermonum*.[13] Additionally, in these lines Horace characterizes both Lucilius and Crispinus as writers who fundamentally misunderstand what writing is. Lucilius is *garrulus* and pictured, ridiculously, as dictating while balancing on one foot. He is, according to Horace, too lazy to bear the labour of real writing (1.4.12–13), which Horace elsewhere tells us involves much editing and careful revision (*Sat.* 1.10.72–3). Meanwhile, Crispinus challenges Horace to the spectacle of a writing competition that resembles an oral performance more than studied composition. In addition to careful craft, Horace's telestich provides another example of something writing can offer that oral bluster cannot. His hidden *satis* is, of course, only visible in writing. Only when Crispinus' oral outburst has been put into Horace's writing can satiety emerge.

Finally, the telestich contributes to this poem's interest in the issue of word arrangement in poetry. As has been shown, Horace's *Satires* were written in a context of rich debate over whether poetry was, at its core, defined by lofty content or by the artful arrangement of its words.[14] This literary question in fact keyed into larger philosophical disputes: the theory of poetry as defined by arrangement was linked to Epicurean ideas of atomism and comparisons between the arrangement of letters into words and of atoms into things.[15] Horace gestures toward these disputes early in this poem, when he calls Lucilius *durus componere uersus* (1.4.8),[16] and he wades further into the debate as the poem continues. In claiming that his satire is not really poetry, Horace (apparently) asserts that arranging a line into verse does not constitute poetry (1.4.40–1) and quotes Ennius (1.4.60–1), suggesting that even when metathesized his epic words retain their poetic quality. Recent critics have rightly stressed that we should not take Horace at his word on this matter. Horace pretends not to aspire to the title of poet (1.4.39–40), but at the beginning of this poem associates his satire with Greek comic playwrights he unambiguously calls *poetae* (1.4.1). Moreover, while his quotation of Ennius claims to show that word arrangement does not define poetry, it in fact cleverly demonstrates the crucial importance of word arrangement for poetry.[17] In creating a telestich early in this poem, Horace further demonstrates his skill in artful *compositio*, and makes it such that his words cannot be rearranged without completely destroying part of their meaning.

Thus, the content of Horace's telestich is thematically significant, but also the very existence of this carefully arranged piece of wordplay is proof of the literary-critical point Horace's poem will make about *compositio*.[18] This hidden word emphasizes Horace's poetics of satiety, encapsulates his project of restrained satire and enacts a powerful transformation of Crispinus' language. Crispinus' spoken excess becomes Horace's written sufficiency. His haphazard (lack of) arrangement becomes Horace's subtly artful composition. And the hidden wordplay further suggests that the apparently

[13] Gowers (n. 1), 14.
[14] Freudenburg (n. 8), 109–84.
[15] See Freudenburg (n. 8), 142–5.
[16] On *componere* in this context, see Gowers (n. 1), on 1.4.8.
[17] See Freudenberg (n. 8), 144–9, and S. Oberhelman and D. Armstrong, 'Satire as poetry and the impossibility of metathesis in Horace's *Satires*', in D. Obbink (ed.), *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace* (New York, 1995), 233–54.
[18] A telestich is of course an extreme example of the atomistic view of poetry, and it may be that the highly mannered wordplay contributes to a comically exaggerated, stylized Epicurean position as much as it offers 'evidence' for Epicurean claims.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000381 Published online by Cambridge University Press

humble Horace, who disavows the title of poet, in fact considers himself part of a learned poetic tradition stretching back to Hellenistic poets such as Aratus. For five letters, *satis* accomplishes quite a lot. But did Horace intend this obscure wordplay, or is it mere coincidence? (Acrostics and telestichs may be—not without good reason—a last preserve of authorial intentionality in literary studies.) At a broad level, the facts that this poem is concerned with word arrangement and that the hidden word in question is arguably the most thematically important word in Horace's *Satires* suggest that this is no accident. But there are further possible hints that this is a genuine example of deliberate Horatian wordplay.

At the very end of line 13, directly before the telestich begins, Horace places the word *ecce*. Look here, Horace tells his reader—but where is here? In context, the word calls attention to Crispinus' interrupting speech that follows, asking the reader to visualize it as a miniature scene. However, its deictic quality may also direct the reader to pay attention visually to the written text one is looking at, perhaps allowing the letters that form *satis* to come into notice. At the very least, the ambiguity of *ecce* highlights the disjuncture between Crispinus' speech and Horace's written text. And, in case *ecce* does not point one to the telestich, another remark of Horace later in the poem can be read self-referentially. In response to an anonymous interlocutor, Horace teasingly claims that he would not consider himself a poet, because 'you would not say that it is enough to close off a verse', *neque enim concludere uersum | dixeris esse satis* (1.4.40–1). Given that *concludere* refers to confining or closing off a verse, it is tempting to read the line in light of Horace's earlier play with the closing of verses: here, he suggests what an anonymous 'you' might think constitutes poetry, but just less than thirty lines earlier Horace himself demonstrated through his telestich that closing off verses can be enough to define one's work as (a certain kind of) poetry. Moreover, we could even read these lines playfully as something like 'nor indeed would you say that to close off a verse is *satis*'. Again, Horace's interlocutor who underestimates word arrangement would not say that finishing off verses is enough, but a reader who has picked up on Horace's telestich would know that, above, it was precisely the conclusions of consecutive verses that constituted *satis*.

Some years ago, Don Fowler ended a short note arguing for the existence of an intentional acrostic in the *Aeneid* by saying: 'I await the men in white coats.'[19] It is unclear whether searching in Horace's poem for self-referential hints that the telestich I have identified was deliberate should keep the men in white coats at bay, or only hasten their arrival. Perhaps not every reader will be satisfied that Horace really hid *satis* in these lines, but I hope that the great thematic significance of the word in a poem that is very concerned with the topic of artful word-arrangement makes the telestich plausible *enough*.

Princeton University ERIK FREDERICKSEN
erikf@princeton.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838818000381

[19] D.P. Fowler, 'An acrostic in Vergil (*Aeneid* 7.601–4)', *CQ* 33 (1983), 298. D. Feeney and D. Nelis, 'Two Virgilian acrostics: *certissima signa*?', *CQ* 55 (2005), 644–6 find evidence for the legitimacy of the same acrostic.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000381 Published online by Cambridge University Press