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Maecenas as discoverer and supporter of the literary luminaries of his day achieved a name virtually synonymous with patronage. Less well known, however, even to many students of Augustan literature is Maecenas, prose stylist and poet. Explicably, the obscurity of his reputation as a writer is due in large part to the failure of most of his writing to survive, but fortunately the handful of fragments still extant is enough to afford an intriguing glimpse into one of the most colorful and contradictory figures of the Augustan Age. Though scanty, the nine fragments of prose and eight of poetry provide a coherent picture of Maecenas' literary output, and several are of importance to students of Vergil and Horace because they reveal the mutual influence from patron to poet and poet to patron. Furthermore, interesting as the fragments are in themselves, they are also valuable for the judgments passed upon them by Maecenas' own contemporaries and by ancient literary critics. Thus, the comments of contemporaries like Agrippa, Horace, and Augustus and the considered judgments of Seneca, Quintilian, and Tacitus form a significant page in the history of Roman literary criticism. This paper, besides aiming to provide an introduction to the fragments of Maecenas, will also suggest that many of the quotations, though dissected by grammarians and philologists into their syntactical and lexical components, stand in need of further illumination as to their tone and purpose. It will be argued that Maecenas' language, admittedly vexing and obscure, is in the main such because of the author's intentional efforts at humor and, in several instances, at self-parody.

The fragments themselves and the testimonia of commentators attest that Maecenas worked in a number of genres both in prose and in verse. In these

---

1 The most important recent studies of Maecenas as littérateur are: R. Avallone, Mecenate (Naples 1962), which incorporates the author's previous studies of Maecenas as well as discussions of other much earlier research; J.-M. André, Mécène. Essai de biographie spirituelle (Paris 1967), much of which material is reproduced and expanded in "Mécène écrivain (avec en appendice, les fragments de Mécène)," ANRW II 30.3 (1983) 1765-87. [This study will cite the former as "André, Mécène" and the latter as "André, Mécène écrivain." ] Earlier studies with still useful discussion include E. Norden, Die antike Kunstprosa, vol. 1 (Leipzig and Berlin 1909=5th edition Darmstadt 1958) 290-94; P. Lunderstedt, De Maecenatis Fragmentis (Leipzig 1911); A. Kappelmacher, "Maecenas" in RE XIV (1928); A. Fougnies, Mécène (Brussels 1947); and H. Bardon, La littérature laïne inconnue, vol. 2 (Paris 1956) 13-19.
fragments are discernible not only his extensive familiarity with the Graeco-Roman literary traditions antecedent to the Augustan age but also the influences at play in his own writings. In prose, for example, he authored a Prometheus, which seems to have been a Menippean satire modelled upon Varro, and according to Servius, a Symposium, a dialogue in the Platonic mode, featuring among the symposiasts Vergil, Horace, and Messala. In addition, he wrote an autobiographical work entitled De Cultu Suo and an In Octaviam, which may have been (certainty is impossible), an elogium on the sister of Augustus. This versatility in a wide range of prose genres finds parallel in Maecenas’ poetic endeavors, the tantalizing remains of which demonstrate skill in handling a variety of meters (hexameters, galliambics, hendecasyllables) as well as a variety of themes: addresses to protégés like Horace, poems of friendship in imitation of Catullus, musings on mortality, and perhaps even an epic.

A natural starting point for a consideration of Maecenas scriptor is Seneca's Moral Epistle 114 not only because it is our major source for prose fragments (all from the De cultu suo), but also because Seneca uses these very quotations for a double purpose: first, for a disquisition on literary criticism and, secondly, for an assessment of Maecenas the man. The theme of the letter is the inextricable link between a man’s morals and his writing style: "talis hominibus fuit oratio qualis vita" (1); life and prose style will necessarily mirror each other, and specifically, a decadent writing style will necessarily bespeak a decadent character. As the most egregious proof of his thesis Seneca adduces Maecenas, whose morals and personal habits are made to serve as a parallel for his writing style. Seneca's attack begins with:

For Seneca Maecenas represents the embodiment of that most un-Roman of vices, molitia, effeminacy or softness, and in Maecenas' case a vice so pervasive that it taints his morals, toilette, entourage, household, and marriage. Although Seneca’s reasons for his merciless caricature of Maecenas are unclear, the charges he levels find echoes in many an ancient writer including Velleius Paterculus, Juvenal, Pliny, and Tacitus. The key words in Seneca’s diatribe are distinctus and solutus, the

2 Servius ad Verg. G. 2.41 says "Maecenatem fuisses litterarum peritum et plura composuisse carmina." This, of course, echoes Horace Ode 3.8.5: "docte sermones utriusque linguae."

3 It may be that the De cultu suo was a personal apologia akin in genre to Marc Antony’s De ebrietate sua. From the In Octaviam a sole quotation survives, preserved by Priscianus, Inst. 10 (Gramm. Lat. II 356, 6-7 Keil): "pexit capillum naturae muneribus gratum." Kappelmacher (above, note 1, 219) notes the vulgar perfect form of the verb used in place of pexuisti, while Bardon (above, note 1, 17) sees the quotation as indicative of Maecenas’ obsessive interest in matters of personal grooming.

4 Servius ad Verg. G. 2.42 attests that Maecenas wrote an epic; also Horace’s words at Ode 2.12.9-12 (tuque pedestribus / dices historis proelia Caesaris, / Maecenas) have been taken to support this view. Modern scholarship is not convinced. See Avallone (above, note 1) 124-26.

5 Seneca’s especial hostility to Maecenas has been variously explained. Roland Mayer ("Neronian Classicism," AJP 103 [1982] 305-18) thinks that Maecenas’ works may just have been published shortly before the composition of Seneca’s letters and speculates that Seneca may have viewed himself as literary patron in emulation rather than in imitation of Maecenas. Avallone
image being that of an unmanly looseness in dress that finds its mirror in looseness of style. The climax of the tirade is Seneca's vignette, one worthy of Juvenal, of Maecenas' antics on the eve of the civil war, when while all Rome was hanging in suspense, awaiting the end of the world, an unfazed Maecenas paraded himself through the metropolis in women's clothes in the company of two eunuchs who were more men than their master (6)!

The attack moves from the sartorial to the stylistic as Seneca charges mollitia in the realm of diction and style. Maecenas' vitia, as Seneca sees them, are:

haec verba tam improbe structa, tam neglegenter abiecta, tam contra consuetudinem omnium posita ostendunt mores quoque non minus novos et pravos et singulares fuisses. ... hoc istae ambages compositionis, hoc verba transversa hoc sensus miri, magni quidem saepe, sed enervati dum exeunt, cuivis manifestum facient: motum illi felicitate nimia caput.

(7-8)

For Seneca the hallmarks of literary mollitia are willful obscurantism, syntactic liberties, eccentric word-order, neologisms, self-indulgent preciosity, and deviations from the norms of standard Latinity, all of it apparently motivated by an exhibitionistic desire to, as it were, épater la bourgeoisie. Notable, however, is the grudging admission that Maecenas at least had the potential for producing something great and admirable, but in the end stands Seneca's summation of a boozy, wandering eloquence full of self-indulgence, eloquentia ebria and oratio portentosissima.

Heading the catalogue of Maecenetae mala exempla is the question (5): "quid turpius'amne silvisque ripa comantibus ...• "What is more disgusting than 'a river and woods on the bank sprouting tresses'?" As Seneca quotes it, the line with its string of ablative is at first sight puzzling, but the original form of the quotation must have been "amnis silvaeque ripa comantur" or perhaps "amnis silvaeque ripa comari videtur." Even so, immediately obvious in the sentence are a number of anomalies in syntax and content. First, the word comantur is a hapax legomenon and,

(above, note 1, 136 n. 5) thinks Seneca's quarrel with Maecenas had many levels and terms it a "vendetta di grande scrittore contro il mediocre dilettante, di stoico contra l'epicureo, di sfortunato ministro di Nerone contra il fortunato ministro di Augusto." D. Gagliardi ("Quintiliano e Seneca. Una nota di lettura," RFIC 90 [1982] 78-79) posits that Seneca's judgment, like Quintilian's, is based on aesthetics and attributes his harsh judgment to differences in taste for styles of prose.

Among the ancients moral outrage was not the universal reaction to Maecenas' foppery. There were those whose reaction was humor, among them Augustus, who quipped about his minister's myrorechis concinnos (Suet. Aug. 86), and Horace who could smile at his patron's entourage (Sat. 2.3) and even make an allusion to the scandalous liaison with Bathyllus. For a similar poetic reaction on the part of Vergil, see J.F. Makowski, "Georgic 3.41: A Vergilian Word-Play at the Expense of Maecenas," Vergilius 31 (1985) 57-58. Still, on the other side, of course, stood Agrippa, who in the words of Ronald Syme (The Roman Revolution [Oxford 1939] 341-42): "loathed the effeminate and sinister descendant of Etruscan kings who flaunted in public the luxury and the vices in which his tortured inconstant soul found refuge—silks, gems, and the ambiguous charms of the actor Bathyllus; he despised the vile epicure who sought to introduce a novel delicacy to the banquets of Rome, the flesh of young donkeys." If it is true (cf. Zonaras 10.34) that Maecenas advised Augustus that his alternatives concerning Agrippa were limited to execution or to marriage with Julia, Agrippa's hostility was grounded in more than matters of personal taste. See also J. Griffin, Latin Poets and Roman Life (London 1985) 13 and 25-26.

Seneca's criticism of Maecenas echoes what was said of Ovid's own writing: "non ignoravit sua vitia sed amavit" (Sen. Controv. 2.2.12). For a discussion of Seneca's rhetorical theory in Ep. 114, see G. Kennedy, The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World (Princeton 1972) 477-81.

This is the suggestion of Avallone (above, note 1) 231.
apparently, one of Maecenas' own coining. For while the adjective *comans* meaning "hairy" or "leafy" is common in Latin, the verb form *comari* is a novelty. We see here a trademark of Maecenas' style, a fondness for neologisms, especially the coinage of deponent verbs of the first conjugation. Another feature unusual for prose is the omission of the preposition *in* before *ripa*, causing the reader to puzzle as to the case of the noun and as to whether *ripa* refers to both *amnis* and *silvae* or only to the latter alone. In other words, is the word *comantibus* made to serve a double function, describing simultaneously the woods with their literal foliage and then the river with its reflected foliage? This is an ambiguity perhaps welcome in the realm of poetry, but in prose it may well substantiate Seneca's charge of _ambages compositionis_.

Seneca next bids the reader: "vide ut 'alveum lintribus arent versoque vado remittant hortos.'" "See how 'they [sc. the oarsmen] plow the channel with boats and with shoal upturned push back the gardens.'" Since Seneca offers no specifics of analysis, we can only surmise what features of style or syntax so offend him. It has been suggested that *vertere*, normally used of soil, is unusual here in its application to water, but such usage has parallel in other writers. A more tangible difficulty may be the ambiguity of the case of *vado*, which might at first sight be taken to be a nonsensical dative with *remittant*, then proving to be an ablative absolute—in Senecan terms, "verba neglegenter abjecta, contra consuetudinem posita." A more serious problem lies in the phraseology of the men on the water who "send back" or "push back" gardens, when, in fact, it is the gardens that are receding from the men. Defenders of the image often cite a parallel to Vergil's _Aeneid_ 3.72 *(provehimur portu terraeque urbesquerecedunt)*, but it is clear that Maecenas' usage of *remittere* is a much bolder manipulation of language and an illogical inversion of an optic phenomenon.

A line follows that often makes even apologists for Maecenas concur with Seneca's censure: "si quis 'feminae cinno crispat et labris columbatur incipitque suspirans, ut cervice lassa fanantur nemoris tyranni.'" The quotation has perplexed many, and with good reason. For one thing, the sentence contains three *hapax legomena* (*cinno, columbatur, fanantur*), two of them yet again neologistic deponent verbs of the first declension. The case of *feminae* is ambiguous, dative according to some, genitive to others. *Cinnus* is a rare word, probably denoting some sort of facial expression, a wink or a nod, on the part of the *femina*. *Columbatur* from *columba* must mean to act like a dove, that is, to bill and coo, while *fanantur* (related to *fanaticus*) denotes some wild or bestial behavior. The quotation then describes the reaction of a man to the look of a *meretrix* or *lupa*, the customer being compared to the tyrants of the forest, who have variously been interpreted to be forest animals or the Galli, the fanatical eunuch priests of Cybele. My (intentionally tortured) rendering is: "at the wink of the wench he starts a-quivering and with his lips he gets all lovey-dovey and begins heavy breathing, just as with drooping neck they go..."
beserk, the tyrants of the forest.”

What, we may ask, is the tone of the passage? Even though the sentence is studded with neologisms, even though exact meanings and referents are open to question and the reconstruction of a context impossible, one thing is unmistakable: the sentence stands as a success. As for an evaluation of the content, neither ancient moralist nor modern philologist need be outraged at either the stylistic or moral looseness of these words. The sentence is a signal that when dealing with Maecenas the reader should come equipped with a sense of humor and be aware of the possibility that some and perhaps most of the extant quotations originally were intended to elicit laughter. On this point, Horace’s *Odes*, *Epodes*, and *Satires* are a constant reminder that the patron who made them possible was himself a thoroughly *iocosus* Maecenas (*Epode* 3.20).

Seneca’s next quotation takes us into yet another fantastical conceit: “*inremediabilis facio rimantur epulis lagonaque temptant domos et spe mortem exigunt*.” The loss of the quotation’s context makes both the punctuation and meaning of the line problematical. Two explanations have been offered for the identity of the *inremediabilis facio*, the one traditional and accepted by most scholars and one recent—and to this author plausible—advanced by Heurgon.\(^13\)

Traditionally, the sentence has been taken as referring to *delatores*, “an irremediable lot who rummage through banquets and with wine-bottle assail homes and by means of hope exact death.” Understood this way, the lines exhibit stylistic boldness in a number of ways: the adjective *inremediabilis* is rare,\(^14\) while the sentence’s opening words suggest the literal action of rummaging for food and drink but then take on a metaphorical meaning in that the banquets are only the “occasion” for *delatores* to hunt out victims. Also, the next image suggests the physical action of hurling a bottle as a weapon against houses but then turns into an elaborate conceit again for the action of *delatio*, with the *domos* standing for *dominos*.\(^15\) This is a difficult explanation of a difficult line. A much simpler interpretation is that of Heurgon who argues that the *factio* is not *delatores* but rather ghosts or Manes, who haunt ritual funerary banquets such as those of the Lemuria. His rereading involves a repunctuation of the text: “rimantur epulis lagonaque, temptant domos et spe mortem exigunt.” This solves the problem of *lagona*, as the description then is that of ghosts hungry and thirsty poking through banquet and wine bottle;\(^16\) *temptant domos* is self-

---

12 Avallone (above, note 1, 240) offers two alternate translations: “E che? se qualcuno ‘al cenno di una mala femmina strizza l’occhio e colombeggia con le labbra e comincia sospirando, come, stanco il collo, infuriano i tiranni della foresta (cioè le fiere)” and as the less preferred alternate, “se qualcuno scherza coi riccioli di una donna e colombeggia con le labbra e comincia sospirando, perché i tiranni della selva infuriano con il collo stanco.” In addition to the quotation’s eccentricities already noted by Avallone and others, there may be several others, for example, the incongruity of the etymology of *columbatur* set along side the imagery of forest animal and perhaps an even greater incongruity if the oversexed subject of the sentence is indeed being compared to Galli; furthermore, the simile contains the disjunction of number as a man (singular) is compared to other creatures (plural), while the *ut* clause raises the possibility of a purpose clause only to be followed by a verb whose meaning, mood, and even conjugation are in question.


14 Again, defenders of the neologism cite Vergil.

15 Avallone (above, note 1, 242-43) finds the quotation a successful evocation of the devious ways of the *delatores*.

16 This solution has the further neatness in obviating a problem with the plural *epulae* and the singular *lagona*.
explanatory, while mortem exigunt is explained as a clever para prosdokian playing on the phrase vitam exigunt and one particularly apt for Manes. Accordingly, the line rendered in English (neologism and all) might be: "an unmedicable lot they [sc. the Manes] poke through the banquet and the wine bottle, they make trial of houses and spend their death in hope." Although the subject is funereal, it would not be implausible to see humor in the inverted expression of ghosts spending their death in the way the living spend their lives. In the end, no matter what the interpretation, Maecenas' boldness in language is undeniable, and whether describing delatores or Manes, the words exert a macabre, and perhaps funny, effectiveness. It will be seen below that on the subject of death Maecenas was not above black comedy in at least two other fragments.

For Seneca Maecenas is no laughing matter but rather a torturer of the Latin language fashioning his words, as it were, on a veritable rack (eculeus). Thus in Epistle 19.9 we hear:

\[
volo tibi hoc loco referre dictum Maecenatis vera in ipso eculeo elocuti: "ipsa enim altitudo attonat summa"; si quaeris in quo libro dixerit: in eo, qui Prometheus inscribitur. hoc voluit dicere: "attonita habet summa."
\]

Seneca's objection has been explained as the bold use of attonare to mean "to blast with thunder," as if height itself were blasting peaks or summits. But an additional source of irritation to the Stoic thinker may be that the quotation is a syntactically twisted version of a locus communis that is a particular favorite of his in both the tragedies and the philosophical writings. Hence the graphic image of an instrument of torture and the climactic charge of something worse than effeminacy:

\[
est ergo tanti ulla potentia, ut sit tibi tam ebrius sermo? Ingeniosus vir irle fuit, magnum exemplum Romanae eloquentiae datums, nisi illum enervasset felicitas, immo castrasse.
\]

Seneca is not alone in his condemnation of Maecenas' prose. Even the dispassionate Quintilian indicts Maecenas' self-indulgence and as proof quotes three sentences:

\[
sole et aurora rubent plurima; 
inter sacra movit aqua fraxinos; 
ne exsequias quidem unus inter miserrimos viderem meas. (9.4.28)
\]
In all cases probably the object of Quintilian's censure is what Seneca called "verba contra consuetudinem posita." The first fragment, describing a landscape reddening at dawn, has the strange separation of plurima from aurora, the adjective being a feminine ablative but not apparently so on first reading. Similar syntactical looseness marks the next quotation where the separation of sacra from aqua opens the possibility of at first taking sacra as the object of inter. Also unusual is the intransitive use of the verb. Quintilian singles out the last quotation for especial blame because of Maecenas' inability to restrain his verbal frivolity on the topic of death and says of it: "quod inter haec pessimum est, quia in re tristi ludit compositio." The structure of the sentence is certainly loose with its separation of noun and modifier, and in this case the separation is truly misleading; for the opening words seduce the reader into expecting a statement about Maecenas witnessing someone's funeral only to have the final meas express the absurdity of Maecenas witnessing his own funeral. West, who reads the line as expressing a typical Epicurean attitude toward death, translates: "I would not be one of the gloomiest people even at my own funeral." Be that as it may, Quintilian's use of the word ludit to describe the line is an indication of the tone of the passage, and even though the rhetor is not amused, the original intention behind the words was certainly to treat death in terms of lusus.

One fragment may perhaps balance all the negative assessments of Maecenas. Servius, commenting on the phrase faciles oculos in Aeneid 8.310, says that Vergil's inspiration for the phrase was his patron's Symposium, with its description of the power of wine: "idem umor ministrat faciles oculos, pulchriora reddit omnia et dulcis iuventae reducit bona." Certainly, these lines with their sympotic warmth, metonymy, and graceful rhythm do prove the veracity of Seneca's statement that Maecenas was, in fact, capable of eloquence and genius, had he only also been capable of self-discipline. Finally, Vergil's application of Maecenas' phrase to the eyes of his hero can only be regarded as a compliment of the highest order.

While Maecenas' prose will probably always stand in need of an apologist or at least an elucidator, the remains of poetry exhibit a more immediate accessibility and have in some measure won the approval of critics both ancient and modern. Even Seneca found something good to say about at least one hexameter. If the poetic fragments strike the modern reader as successful, one reason may be Maecenas' choice of model, Catullus. Most obviously Catullan in inspiration are three lines preserved by Caesius Bassus (de metris 4.8-17; Gramm. Lat. VI 262, 6-19 Keil):

---

21 D. West, "Cur Me Querelis (Horace, Odes 2.17)," AJP 112 (1991) 45-52; Avallone (above, note 1, 270-75) like earlier commentators, has noted the Epicureanism of the line. Very different in tone and meaning from the version above is that of H.E. Butler's Loeb translation (1922): "May I never, alone amidst the most miserable of men, behold my own funeral rites." Kappelmacher (above, note 1, 224), who also sees humor in the line, adduces a parallel from Horace Ode 2. 20, 21-24: "absint inani funere neniae / luctusque turpes et querimoniae; / compesce clamorem et sepulcri / mitte supervacuos honores." It has been suggested that Seneca parodied this line in the Apocolocyntosis where the dead Claudius does indeed witness his own obsequies. On this point see André, Mécène écrivain (above, note 1) 1774 note 104.

22 Kappelmacher (above, note 1, 222-23) pointing out the striking rhythm of the sentence, comments on its poetic qualities: "Es ist also eine Prosar in der die Grenze zwischen Poesie und Prosas sehr verschiwist ist."

23 Another fragment cited by Caesius Bassus, De metris 4.8-17 (Gramm. Lat. VI 262, 25-263, 3 Keil): "hic nympha cingit omnis Achetolum senem" may or may not be connected to these gallimacies. For fuller discussion see Avallone (above, note 1) 319.
'ades' inquit 'o Cybebe, fera montium dea, 
ades et sonante tympano quate flexible caput.'

An invocation to Cybele in galliambics, the lines clearly recall Catullus 63 in meter, content, and vocabulary. Further evidence of Catullan influence is to be found in two very similar addresses to Horace. The first of these is cited by Suetonius in his life of Horace:

ni te visceribus meis, Horati
plus iam diligo, tu tuum sodalem
{ninnio} videas strigosiorem. (11-13, Rostagni)

This, the traditional reading of the text, may be rendered: "Horace, if I do not love you more than my inmost being, may you see your friend scrawnier than a nag(?)." Recently, W. Noetzel has argued that for the vexed ninnio we read Tithono, since Tithonus was poetically proverbial for emaciation. This yields excellent sense (being metrically apt also), though, whatever the correct version, the poem exhibits both a certain charm and a facility with hendecasyllables. Its Catullan echoes are unmistakable, as is the self-deprecating humor lent by the usage of strigus, a term normally applied to cattle or livestock. Amusing too is the poem's oscillation between the literal and the metaphorical, as the word viscera in the first line stands for Maecenas himself but then with the mention of the homely physical adjective strigosoiorem suggests literally "guts." Finally, if Tithono is the correct reading, the...
lines have an additional touch of Alexandrian erudition, comically incongruous with the rest of the diction.

The same tone of humor, again with a touch of self-parody, runs through the other poetic address to Horace:

\[
\text{lucentes, mea vita, nec smaragdos}
\]
\[
\text{beryllos mihi, Pl ace, nec nitentes}
\]
\[
\text{nec percandida margarita quaero}
\]
\[
\text{nec quos Thy nica lima perpolivit}
\]
\[
\text{anulos neque iaspios lapillos.}
\]  
\[\text{(Isid., Etym. XIX 32, 6)}\]

"O my life, not glimmering emeralds, not, Flaccus, sparkling beryls, not bright shining pearls do I seek, and not rings polished by Bithynian files and not jaspary gemlets." The subject is certainly luxuriating and so is the tone with its abundance of Greek names, the eccentric placement of "nee" between noun and modifier, the chiasmus in the first two lines, the unconventional neuter plural of margarita, the diminutive lapillos, and finally the neologism in iaspios, making these not mere jaspers but "jaspary gemlets." The poem is an exercise in excess and clearly meant as another instance of self-parody. For Maecenas's gaudy display of gems was notorious and elicited a famous jibe from Augustus himself who connected the passion for jewels with Maecenas' "stilus mollis et dissolutus."  

Two fragments are often cited by moderns as indications of Maecenas' more serious preoccupation with mortality and of the connection between his poetry and his spiritual dimension. The majestic hexameter "nee tumulum curo: sepelit natura relictos" quoted in Ep. Mor. 92.35 is one Vergil could have been proud of, and it is the sole fragment either in prose or in poetry to win Seneca's praise, no doubt because it accords with the philosopher's own views on the nothingness of death. Another fragment, also from Seneca, cited this time with a paroxysm of outrage is:

\[
\text{debilem facito manu, debilem pede, coxa}
\]
\[
\text{tuber adstrue gibberum, lubricos quote dentes;}
\]
\[
\text{vita dum superest, bene est; hanc mihi, vel acuta}
\]
\[
\text{si sedeam cruce, sustine.}
\]  
\[\text{(Ep. Mor. 101.11)}\]

While Seneca has an axe to grind over the content of the verses, specifically, the sentiment, unacceptable to a Stoic, of life at any cost, modern commentators have focussed on the stylistic eccentricities of the verses as, for example, the periphrasis of debilemjacere for debilitare and the odd word coxa used in place of femur, or they have found the lines to contain a philosophical or spiritual statement on the part of

30 Macrobius Sat. 2.4.12: "Idem Augustus quia Maecnatem suum noverat stilto esse remisso, moll et dissoluto, talem se in epistulis quas ad eum scribbat saepius exhibebat, et contra castigationem loquendi, quam alias ille scribendo servabat, in epistula ad Maecenatem familiaris plura in locos effusa subtextuit: 'vale mi eburnum Medulliae, ebur ex Etruria, lasar Arretinan, adamas Supernas, Tiberinum margaritum, Ciniorum smaragde, iaspi Iguvinorum, berulle Porsenae, carbunculum Hadriae,' etc. B. Baldwin ("Maecenas and Trimalchio," Latomus 43 [1984] 402-03) believes that Petronius has Trimalchio parody Maecenas at Sat. 34 and 55.5.

31 One other hexameter, again exhibiting a measure of sonority, is extant from Charisius, Inst. gramm. 1 (Gramm. Lat. I 79, 23-80, 1 Keil): "ingeritur fumans calido cum farre catinus." Identification is, of course, highly speculative, most scholars thinking the source to be bucolic.

32 See Avallone (above, note 1) 287-95 for a complete analysis of philological oddities.
Maecenas. Recently, however, D. West has advanced a compelling argument that the verses are and can only be satirical. Pointing out "the anaphora of debilem, the assonance of tub- and lub-, the pleonasm of tuber and gibberum, the internal echo of superest and est in line 5, the climactic resolution of the basis of si sedeam ... the general coarseness of the language and the meter," West concludes that the lines are an intentional piece of doggerel that only a philosopher could misread as serious.

This author can do no better than to quote his translation:

- Maim my hand and
- lame my foot,
- stick a hump upon my back,
- rot my teeth and make them slack,
- but one thing give—just let me live.
- Give me that and I don't give a toss
- if you make me sit on the prong of the cross.

This rereading of a passage often taken in the past as a serious philosophical pronouncement or personal manifesto on death is further indication of how much of Maecenas' poetry is shot through with humor and parody. What is true of the poetry holds also for at least some of the prose fragments, whose linguistic and syntactical oddities need not be attributed to decadent morals but rather to verbal playfulness.

How are we to evaluate Maecenas as a writer? A definitive answer will always be as elusive as the remains are fragmentary. Contemporaries like Agrippa viewed him with contempt and dismissed his writing as cacozelia, even tarring his protégé Vergil with the same brush, while Tacitus, echoing Seneca, was no less harsh in his judgment on Maecenas' style which he pronounced to be as whorish and gaudily colored as his clothes. Modern critical judgment, though more generous than that of the ancients, has been widely divided. Some modern critics have shared Seneca's judgment of Maecenas as flaunter of bad taste, while apologists have gone so far as to read into the fragments a serious preoccupation with matters mystic or philosophical, and he has been variously labeled Alexandrian, Asianist, impotent baroque, classisant, or precursor of Silver Age mannerism. The loss of almost all he wrote, whether regrettable or not, will make all judgment tentative, but it has been one aim of this study to show that when it comes to analyzing the tone of many of the fragments a sense of humor can abet philology's dissection. In the end, however,

33 So André, Mécène écrivain (above, note 1, 1771) who sees the prayer as directed to the Fortuna, gubernans of the Epicurean school. I do not agree that the quotation exhibits what he calls a "plus grande sobriété de vocabulaire et d'architecture."

34 D. West (above, note 21) 47-48.

35 Donatus tells us (44): "M. Vipsanius a Maecenate eum suppositum appellabat novae cacozelae repertorem, non tumidae nec exilis, sed ex commibus verbis, atque ideo latentis." Of cacozelia Quintilian (Inst. 8.3.56) gives the following definition: "kakozelon, id est mala affectatio, per omne dicendi genus peccat; nam et tumida et pusilla et praedulcia et abundancia et arcessita et exsultantia sub idem nomen cadunt. denique kakozelon vocatur qui quies est ultra virtutem, quotiens ingenium judicio caret et specie boni fallitur, omnium in eloquentia vitiorum pessimum. non cetera parum vitantur, hoc petitur." Tacitus's (Dial. 26.1) critique is: "malum hercul C. Gracchi impetum aut L. Crassi maturitatem quam calamistros Maecenatis aut tinnitus Gallionis: adeo melius est orationem vel hirta toga induere quam fucatis et meretriciis vestibus insignire."

36 For a survey of modern critical opinion of Maecenas as writer see André, Mécène écrivain (above, note 1) 1776-82.
Maecenas remains, in the words of Horace, the *candidus iudex*—the discerning spirit that first recognized Propertius, Horace, and Vergil.\(^{37}\)
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\(^{37}\) This paper was originally presented on 4 April 1991 at a meeting of CAMWS, and I am grateful for the encouraging reception it received from listeners. Words of thanks go also to Professor Edwin Menes of Loyola University of Chicago for valuable suggestions and to Mr. James Kellerman for keen proofreading.