

# Howard University Studies in History

---

Volume 3  
Issue 1 *The Question of the Origin of the Roman  
Satire*

Article 6

---

3-1-1923

## IV Prospectus of Theories

George Morton Lightfoot

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dh.howard.edu/hush>



Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Lightfoot, George Morton (1923) "IV Prospectus of Theories," *Howard University Studies in History*. Vol. 3: Iss. 1, Article 6.

Available at: <https://dh.howard.edu/hush/vol3/iss1/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Howard @ Howard University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Howard University Studies in History by an authorized editor of Digital Howard @ Howard University. For more information, please contact [digitalservices@howard.edu](mailto:digitalservices@howard.edu).

ferre, itaque in sanctione legum adscribitur, neve per saturam abrogato aut derogato."

#### IV. PROSPECTUS OF THEORIES.

Since 1867 the long accepted tradition, claiming that the satire is indigenous to Italian soil, has been both ruthlessly attacked and strongly supported. In spite of the voluminous mass of literature which has been produced by those who have made and continued the assault upon the tradition, as well as by those who have essayed to defend it, the present writer will attempt under this division of the subject to present the substance of the main theories that have been advanced by those European and American scholars who have taken a leading part in the criticism of the Roman claim.

Discussing the account of the development of the Roman drama as set forth in Livy VII, 2, O. Jahn in *Hermes* II (1867), 225-226, in an article entitled *Satura* declares that it cannot be doubted that this condensed survey, which Livy gives concerning the gradual development of the drama among the Romans, is not authenticated history, resting upon personal investigation, but the résumé of the combinations of a philologist.<sup>17</sup> He further says (225) that, if, in the sketch of the drama, everything is worked out step by step, it is to be attributed to the method employed in the philological combination rather than to a complete and unquestioned statement of the actual facts. He regrets that Livy does not mention his authority (Gewährsmann), but is irresistibly led to think of Varro's *De Originibus Scenicis*. He claims that the philological origin of this review is revealed by the aetiological character of the presentation on account of (1) the *canticum* (9-10), (2) the privileged position of the actors of the Atellane farces. He regards the phenomena as two astounding uses established in still later time (Zwei noch in späterer Zeit festgehaltene, auffallende Gebrauche).

Throughout this brief discussion he subjects the entire survey to critical historical scrutiny to show that it is purely a series of combinations by some philologist. His main objections to the genuineness of Livy's account then are, (1) it is too clean-cut to be the reflex of fact, (2) the aetiological character of the sketch. In this connection he sounds the note of parallelism to the Greek Satyr-drama which was later taken up and extended by many of his followers. He makes a sharp distinction between the unregulated performance (*freies spiel*) of the native youth and the artistic

<sup>17</sup> Das die gedrängte Uebersicht, welche Livius über die allmähliche Ausbildung des Dramas bei den Römern giebt, keine auf eigener Forschung Veruhende urkundliche Geschichte sei, sondern das Resume der Combinationen eines Grammatikers, ist gewiss nicht zu bezweifeln (225).

drama (kunstmässiges drama) of the foreign professionals and concludes that the parallelism with the Greek Satyr-drama is unmistakable (wobei die Parallele mit dem griechischen Satyr-drama, wiewohl sie hier nicht ausgesprochen wird, unverkennbar ist). Jahn confidently assures us that the entire account of Livy concerning the drama is only a hypothetical construction, made by ancient critics and philologists for the purpose of explaining certain obscure problems.

A. Kiessling,<sup>18</sup> in 1886, wrote: "It is entirely doubtful whether the designation, *satura*, to indicate the old and coarse improvisation of the Roman stage, has ever existed elsewhere except in the heads of those writers of historical literature, who, in comparing the dramatic poetry of the Romans with that of the Greeks, regretted that they could not find, on the side of tragedy and of comedy, a primitive form of Roman dramatic poetry which corresponded to the Satyr-drama,—that is to say, in the head of Varro or of the authority who was followed by Livy in his famous account of the origin of the Roman drama."

O. Keller<sup>19</sup> in discussing the word *satura* comes to the conclusion that the Greek Satyr-drama, in a somewhat crude variation, was imported to Rome under the title of *satura* and that this title was preferred to *saturi* ( *σάτυροι* ), because among the Romans a substantive *satura* was already in current use, and because to the Romans, Greek demi-gods were strange. These undoubtedly took the place of the *fabula*. These satyr-like *saturae* disappeared after Livius Andronicus (391). Commenting upon Livy's description of *saturae*, he says that, generally speaking, the principal passage in this chapter (VII. 2) is unfortunately lacking in clearness, but it cannot be denied that there is a striking similarity between these ancient Roman farcical plays and the Greek Satyr-drama (390).

Leo,<sup>20</sup> in 1889, in a study on *Varro und die Satire*, confirms the original views expressed by Jahn. Leo begins his discussion by saying that the Roman comedy knew no personal invective ( *δνομαστίκωμωδῆν* ). The first writers of Roman comedy were prohibited by law (Laws of the Twelve Tables) and by custom from attacking by name any living persons (67). Lucilius, however, by reason of his social standing and the influence of his friends, in his satires, indulged freely in personal abuse.

<sup>18</sup> Horace's *Sermones* (1886), Einleitung VII:

Ist es doch überhaupt sehr fraglich, ob diese Bezeichnung für die alten kunstlosen improvisationem der römischen Bühne je anderswo existiert hat, als in den Köpfen derjenigen Litteratur historiker, welche bei der Vergleichung der römischen Bühnendichtung mit ihren attischen Mustern, neben der Tragödie und comödie eine der Gattung *σάτυροι* entsprechende primitive Form römischen scenischer Dichtung Vermiften, also im Kopfe Varro oder wer sonst der Gewährsam von Livius berühmtem überblick die Anfänge des römischen Dramas (VII. 2) ist.

<sup>19</sup> Philologus 45 (1886), 389-392, über das Wort *satura*.

<sup>20</sup> Hermes 24 (1889). 67-84. *Varro und die Satire*.

He cites in proof of this assertion, the statement in Horace, *Sermones* I. 4, 1-6,<sup>21</sup> that Lucilius for his spirit and method depended wholly upon the writers of the old Attic comedy (68). The interpretation, is of course, that Lucilius, the accepted inventor of the Roman literary satire, except in the mere matter of metrical form, employed the substance and method of *Greek* dramatic writers and, therefore, the book satire is of Greek and not of Italian origin. In the opinion of Horace the old comedy and early satire were in substance and motive the same.

He next calls attention to the four etymologies given by Diomedes in his chapter entitled *περὶ ποιημάτων* (485), of the *satura* (69) and produces elaborate argument to show that they go back to Varro through the medium of Suetonius (71-74). He points out that these four etymologies are reducible to two, one Greek (*σάτυρος*), the other Latin (*satura*) (70).

The accounts of the *satura*, found in Horace, Livy, Diomedes, Euanthius, Donatus, according to Leo are in fact one account based in some essential features upon the description of the origin and development of the old Greek comedy which appears in Aristotle's *Poetics* (44-45) and Nichomachean *Ethics*, (4,14) and in the scholia *περὶ κωμῶδίας* of Aristophanes' comedies (74-75).

In his history of Roman literature, M. Schanz<sup>22</sup> observes that in Rome, as among other peoples, the beginnings of dramatic poetry are revealed in the celebrations of feasts (Festfreude). In his work on the origin of dramatic poetry, Varro had already found appendages to the drama in the several festivals, for example, in the Compitalia and the Lupercalia (17). He mentions the description of the harvest festival in Horace (Epist. II. 1. 139) and says that here we receive for a dramatic element a specific name, i. e., Fescennine license (18). It presents itself in those verses which have sport and banter for their content and are dialogue in form. The name "Fescennine" is derived from Fescennium in Etruria. One would have to assume, therefore, that the bantering verses were especially cultivated there, but much more probable is the relationship with *fascinum*, a symbol of procreative power. That the Fescennine license presents to us the beginning of the Italian drama cannot be doubted. The learned research of antiquity did not fail to recognize this, as is shown in the aetiological account in Livy (VII. 2.), that is to say, here especially a successive stage of development of the Fescennines is brought into use in connection with the stage. But the survey causes some doubt.

<sup>21</sup> Eupolis atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetæ, atque alii, quorum comœdia prisca virorum est, si quis erat dignus describi, quod malus ac fur, quod mœchus foret aut sicarius aut alioquî famosus, multa cum libertate notabant. Hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque.

<sup>22</sup> Geschichte der Römischen Litteratur, M. Schanz, München, 1898, Erster Teil, 17.

It is, according to Schanz, impossible that the song and dance were not added until later, for as we saw in the sacred songs, the employment of song and dance is the natural and, therefore, the original expression of elevated sentiment.

The etymology of the word *satura* is difficult. The meaning of *satyr-play* is very probable, as the jovial country people, clad in goat skin, who celebrated the feasts, could have been called satyrs (18). The first to whom a *satura* is assigned is Naevius. In his case we probably still have to consider the form which was intended not for reading, but for presentation (18).

In discussing the literary satire (*Buchsatura*), Schanz makes the following points: (1) We have already ascertained that this (literary satire) is a dramatic creation—a union of dialogue, dance and song; (2) then we met it in Naevius, but the only fragments left to us cause us to draw no other conclusion than that this is related to the dialogue; (3) in the next writer of satire, Ennius, we have a better basis, for there is a brief account of the fragment; (4) on the other hand, in his imitator, Pacuvius, all traces disappear; (5) of the satires produced by Ennius and Pacuvius, we have a definite idea: they are described as a poem composed of several poems; this definition in the above form cannot possibly be correct, for a poem, composed of several poems, is no poem at all, but a collection of poems. The satires are generally regarded as a collection of mixed poems; (6) the word *satura* has also been harmonized with this definite idea in religious life in connection with the dish (*lanx*) filled with the offerings for sacrifices and called *satura*, in the culinary art as the name of a kind of pastry (*satura*) consisting of several ingredients and in its legal use to designate a law embracing several different provisions (*lex satura*). In its application to poetry, *satura* is said to be mixed poetry. The use of the plural *saturae* is justified by the use of *silvae* for *silva* and of *prata* for *pratium*. Against this explanation, however, there arises serious objection. There is lacking the bridge which leads from the book *satura* to the dramatic *satura*. We cannot use *satura* of a collection of poems. In that connection, too, the idea of mixed contents must be related to the individual satire; but such a connection is not allowed by the contents, for the dramatic creation, also, must be coherent. It is also true that the name *satura* cannot be derived from the mixture of forms, dialogues, song and dance. Such mixtures are found in other forms of poetry, e. g., song and dance in sacred hymns. To escape this difficulty, the view has been expressed that the word *satura* has existed only in the heads of those writers who wished to have for the old improvisation of the Roman stage a creation corresponding to the Greek satyr-drama (108-109).

We have the dramatic *satura* as a pantomime of the crowded people as goats' play. The character of this play was banter and joviality; the

form dialogue, song and dance. A weak illustration of the *satura* is furnished by the insertion of the contest between Sarmentus and Messius in Horace's satires, I. 5 (50-69), and by the account of the law suit of Rupilius Rex and Persius in Horace's satires, I. 7. If in Horace the *satura* is introduced for readers and not for spectators, there remains as common ground the dialogue form and the sprightly character.

Schanz concludes with the assertion that both of these factors originally worked out the literary *satura*. The content could naturally be different, only there was adherence to the *ἔθος* (custom) and to the dialogue dress. It is not necessary that each satire should contain a formal dialogue. The dialogue character is proved, if the poet here and there causes a person to speak to another and if the whole appears to be a chat with the reader. Nearly all the satires in Horace show the dialogue element.

That the Greek models had their effect upon the literary *satura* cannot be doubted. As a proof of the final assertion, he mentions the poems of Timon entitled *σάτιροι* to which the same peculiarity was ascribed as to the literary *satura* (88).

In his principal attack upon the existence of the *satura*, G. L. Hendrickson<sup>23</sup> accepts the theories of Jahn and Leo in their substantial features, but goes a great deal farther. With Jahn and Leo, he regards the dramatic *satura* as described by Livy, as a hypothetical construction, invented by that author, or by his source in an attempt to create for Roman literature what he learned from Aristotle to have existed in Greece. His observations regarding the methods employed by the Roman historians have forced upon him the general conclusion that "many of the events reported by them are so closely paralleled by fact and fable from Greek history and poetry as to preclude the possibility of belief in them as independent events, and to make the assumption of their derivation from Greek sources inevitable." He cites several examples from Livy to show that the invention of such parallelisms not seldom occurs in his history. We sometimes find in the history of Roman literature forms which never had any real existence at Rome and which served only to fill out a parallel (1-3). He compares the accounts of the origin and development of the drama as given in Livy and in Horace with Aristotle's description of the beginning of the old comedy in Greece.

According to Aristotle (Poetics 44-45), comedy had its origin in the extemporaneous Phallic verses. Its early history was obscure, and only late was it given a chorus at public expense. The most important event in its development was the introduction of the general plot ( *μῦθοι* ), an innovation ascribed to Epicharmus of Sicily, but at Athens Crates was

<sup>23</sup> American Journal of Philology XV (1894). 1-30, *The Dramatic Satura and the Old Comedy at Rome*.

the first to abandon personal abuse ( ἡ Ἰαμβικὴ ἰδέα ). The stages of development in Aristotle's poetics are: (1) the Phallic verses, (2) the old comedy (personal invective), (3) the new comedy, the founder of which was Crates who abandoned personal invective and generalized his plots and themes.

The corresponding stages in Livy are: (1) The Fescennine verses, which like the Phallic hymns were designed to promote fertility, (2) the *saturae*, the stage of personal invective (*solutus iocus*) corresponding to the old comedy and, finally, (3) the innovation of Andronicus in constructing, as Crates did, a regular plot, in this way giving Rome a drama similar to the new comedy in Greece.

Hendrickson next observes that Livy's account is parallel to that of Horace (Ep. II 1. 139). Horace's description is divided into stages as follows: (1) The Fescennine verses (*Fescennina licentia*), rude extemporaneous improvisation which gave no offense as long as they were free from personal abuse and formed a part of the old harvest festivals, (2) personal invective now became their distinguishing characteristic (*iam sacvus apertam in rabiem coepit verti iocus*), (3) the abuse of the license led to legal enactment which abolishes any attack upon living persons and causes the introduction of a form of drama that was designed to speak only in agreeable terms and to please (*ad bene dicendum et delectandum*). The last stage, according to Aristotle, is the distinctive feature of the new comedy.

According to Hendrickson's theory of parallelism in the three authors mentioned, we would have the following exhibit: Aristotle: (1) Phallic verses, (2) the old comedy, (3) new comedy. Livy: (1) Fescennine verses, (2) *saturae*, (3) Artistic drama. Horace: (1) Fescennine verses, (2) *Rabies aperta*, (3) new comedy (*ad bene dicendum*, etc.).

In Livy's account Livius Andronicus is made to play the role of Crates, while in Horace who handles the subject in more general outlines, the words *Graccia capta* play the same role as Livius Andronicus does in Livy (17-25). Hendrickson<sup>24</sup> later in discussing Livy's source for his account of the beginning of the Roman drama, which was supposed by many scholars to be in the works of Varro, gives an account of the early rhetorical and literary studies at Rome and states that after the death of Ennius Crates of Mallos, a Greek ambassador and author of a treatise  $\pi \epsilon \rho \lambda \ \chi \omega \mu \omega \delta \acute{\iota} \alpha \varsigma$  gave a decided impulse to early Roman literary studies. His most reliable imitator, though guilty of many errors, was

<sup>24</sup>A. J. P. XIX (1898), 285-311, *A Pre-Varronian Chapter of Roman Literary History*. Jahn, in *Hermes* II (1867), 225, says: "Am nächstem liegt es wohl an Varro de originibus scenicis zu denken." Leo, in *Hermes* XXIV (1889), 76, says: "Man darf wohl behauptet dass für Livius eine andere Quelle so wenig wahrscheinlich, wie für die darstellung ein anderer ursprung."

the poet Accius. Accius, despite the lack of evidence, wished to draft a literary history of Rome upon the literary history of the Greeks and, to that end, placed the first dramatic presentation of Andronicus in 197 B. C. Now, since Andronicus had written some pieces which translated from the new attic comedy, of course, conformed to that style of drama, Accius wished to find among the Romans before 197 an ancient comedy, since among the Greeks an ancient comedy had preceded the new comedy. On the other hand, according to Valerius Flaccus, the first theatrical plays were given at Rome in 364 B. C. Between 364 and 197, then, there was a long space which Accius wished to fill. For this purpose he did not delve into Roman documents but into the works of Greek critics. He transported to Rome the stages of development of Greek comedy as given by Aristotle which he undoubtedly found in the  $\pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\iota} \chi \omega \mu \omega \delta \acute{\iota} \alpha \varsigma$  of Crates. In this way the "satura" could have been conceived. The word "satura" could have been chosen either because it fit in well with the idea of mixed and unregulated comedy or because it involved the idea of abuse and, like the  $\Upsilon \alpha \mu \beta \iota \kappa \eta \dot{\iota} \delta \acute{\epsilon} \alpha$  of Aristotle, possessed the aggressive character. He concludes that "the chapter of literary history under discussion is pre-Varronian and is to be attributed most naturally to Accius."

Hendrickson has undoubtedly contributed more on the sceptical side of the discussion concerning the origin of the Roman drama and the questions incidental to such discussion than any other American scholar. His contributions, covering a period of about twenty years, have been in the form of four articles, two in the *American Journal of Philology* and two in *Classical Philology*,<sup>25</sup> though his position has been strongly set forth within briefer compass in many other quarters.

The brilliant theories advanced particularly by Jahn, Leo and Hendrickson have in considerable measure been ably opposed by several scholars in Europe and in America. Charles Knapp<sup>26</sup> comes strongly to the defense of the tradition in several articles and addresses. His chief paper in the *American Journal of Philology* (XXXIII, 125, 148) makes a comprehensive statement of the points involved in the long controversy on the dramatic *satura* and points out the scientific methods whereby certain features of the discussion may be clarified. He endeavors, as well, to

<sup>25</sup> *Classical Philology* VI (1911), 129-143, *Satura—The Genesis of a Literary Form*. *Classical Philology* VI, 334-343, *The Provenance of Jerome's Catalogue of Varro's Works*.

<sup>26</sup> *American Journal of Philology* XXXIII (1912, 125-148, *The Skeptical Assault on the Roman Tradition Concerning the Dramatic Satura*; *A. J. P.* XIX (1908), 468-470, in a review of Marx's *Lucilius*; *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 40 (1910) Iii-Ivi, *The Dramatic Satura among the Romans*; *Cl. Phil* VII (1912), 131, in a review of Kiessling-Heinze, *Horace, Satiren*.



refute theories of both German and American skeptics. Knapp claims that the parallelism between Livy and Horace is far from complete and that neither account deals in detail with Aristotle's description or with any of the treatises  $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \chi \omega \mu \psi \delta \acute{\iota} \alpha \varsigma$ . However close, in his opinion, may be the resemblance between the Greek and the Roman accounts, this resemblance may be due to the fact that the germs of the drama did actually develop among these related people in a similar way.

In his article defending the tradition, R. H. Webb<sup>27</sup> concludes as follows: "Against the dramatic origin of Roman satire stands the fact that the existence of a dramatic *satura* is ignored by ancient critics, including Horace, Quintilian, Diomedes, and his sources Suetonius, Verrius, and possibly Varro; and is attested by Livy alone in a passage which has been violently and in some measure successfully assailed. On the other hand, I urge, first, those who doubt the existence of a dramatic *satura* become involved in difficulties which cannot be solved by any other facts that they have adduced; second, Livy's statement bears strong internal evidence of truthfulness, so far as the *satura* is concerned; third, the essential elements of Roman satire, as found in Ennius, seem a natural outgrowth of a native drama, transmuted by pressure of circumstance, and by the genius of a great poet, into a new literary form (189).

Somewhat recently B. L. Ullman has written three articles<sup>28</sup> in which he handles the *satura* question in a thorough manner, particularly with reference to the word *satura*—its origin, its uses in different connections and, finally, its grammatical form. Though Mr. Ullman evidently favors the Roman claim for originality and defends the traditional view, he, nevertheless, by convincing argument rejects several of the incidental theories for a long time held by many who support the tradition.

In Classical Philology VIII (1913), he points out the necessity of having a clear understanding of the origin and history of the word *satura* which obviously has a most vital connection with any discussion of the origin of Roman satire. He at once rejects the traditional derivation of *satura* from the expression *Lanx Satura* which has been generally adopted by scholars who regarded the word in its literary use as the nominative feminine of the adjective *Satur* with the noun *fabula* understood. Now Ullman maintains that in its literary application no noun is understood but that *satura* is itself a noun. In proof of this assertion, he quotes from the well known passage of Diomedes (485-486, Keil) the phrases, *satura carmine*, *lege satura* where in both cases *satura* must be a noun. In Isidorus' paraphrase of Diomedes we see the same substantive use (Orig.

<sup>27</sup> Classical Philology VIII (1912), 177-189, *On the Origin of the Roman Satire*.

<sup>28</sup> Classical Philology VIII (1913), 172-194, *Satura and Satire*; Classical Philology IX (1914), 1-23, *Dramatic "Satura"*; Studies in Philology XVII (1920), 379-401, *The Present Status of the Satura Question* (Univ. of N. C.).

V. 16): "*De lege satura. Satura vero lex est quae de pluribus simul rebus eloquitur dicta a copia rerum et quasi a saturitate.*" In addition to this he shows that through this same passage in Diomedes, we find that Varro points out the earliest known use of the word and makes it an appositive of "*farcimēn*" a kind of stuffing. Furthermore Diomedes gives in a quotation from Varro's Plautine Questions the ingredients of *farcimen* which are such that the mixture could not possibly be sausage, as was traditionally supposed, but clearly a kind of stuffing. It seems likely, according to Ullman, that the literary use developed out of the culinary meaning (172-186). We have *farsa, olio, olla podrida, melanges, pot-pourri*, and even, in American newspaper English, hash and chop-suey. For cooking terms in literature we may also compare "macaronic poetry." Now, it was the miscellaneous character of their works that was indicated by the title *saturae* in the case of Ennius, Lucilius and Varro. When Horace was finding a title for his first book of satires, his choice did not light upon *saturae*, chiefly because his poems were not strictly miscellanies, as he used only one meter. So it was that he called them *sermones*.

The fact that Hendrickson, who follows Marx, denies that *saturae* was used as a title by Ennius, Lucilius, and Varro is merely an assertion for which Hendrickson offers no evidence. As for Ennius, the strongest evidence in favor of this title is that of Nonius, who regularly employs the formula "Ennius satyrarum libro I," etc. Nonius likewise constantly uses the formula "Ennius annalium libro I," etc. Nonius' evidence is supported by Gellius and Servius. For Lucilius the evidence is stronger. Books I-XXX are cited by Nonius under the formula "Lucilius Satyrarum libro I," etc., Books XXVI-XXX under the formula "Lucilius libro XXVI," etc. The difference has been explained as arising from the fact that two different individuals excerpted Lucilius for Nonius (186-187). The article in Classical Philology VIII, to which reference has just been made, appears adequately to meet the view of Hendrickson (Class. Phil. VI (1911) 129-143) that the word *satura* was not used as a title for their poems by Ennius, Lucilius and Varro and that *satura* had no currency as a literary term prior to the second book of Horace's *Sermones*, between 40 and 30 B. C. The argument of Ullman in tracing the history and use of *satura* back to Plautus establishes the Roman origin of the word.

In his discussion on *Dramatic "Satura,"* Class. Phil. IX (1914), 1-23, Ullman considers the application of the word *satura* to dramatic performances. This of course brings up the traditional view as found in Livy and others. The theory of parallelism advanced by Hendrickson and others is discussed. According to Ullman, Livy's account is a summary not of comedy alone, but is a history of the development of the drama-comedy and tragedy (page 2). Ullman feels that in the passage

as a whole the first consideration is the proper understanding of the various stages; then, the meaning of *satura*. He accepts the five stages which are now generally agreed upon by most scholars. In the critical examination of Livy's words, two questions must be separately considered, the existence of the stages described and the truth of the relations indicated between the stages. On the latter point there is room for skepticism, for there seems to be no actual relation between the second and third, or third and fourth stages. The burlesque dancing and the jesting duels of the amateurs seem to have little in common with the professional performances of the *satura*, with its continuous song and dance. Probability here becomes certainty in connection with the fourth stage. We know, of course, that the *fabula* of Livius Andronicus had no connection with the *satura* or any other previous stage in Roman drama. Besides, Livius was thoroughly Greek and is not likely to have perpetuated a Roman custom. Skepticism on this point, is, however, no excuse for skepticism as to the existence of the stages described by Livy. The contrast between the two questions is striking: we know that the *fabula* of Livius Andronicus existed just as certainly as we know that it did not grow out of the *satura*. Merely this contrast would be sufficient to establish the credibility of Livy as regards the various stages in themselves.

The author of our summary was, in Ullman's opinion, no doubt familiar with current Greek theories of the rise of the Greek drama, and got the very idea of putting together a story of the Roman drama from them. Very probably even the emphasis on certain details was unconsciously due to the same source. But that there was a conscious attempt to make the square facts of the Roman drama fit into the round hole of Greek theory is an assumption that seems unnecessary and, therefore, unjustified when we carefully examine Livy's words (19). There are to be sure features of Livy's description that match Aristotle's, e. g., that Andronicus acted his own plays, and the emphasis laid upon dance, song and accompaniment, but there are also omissions or dissimilarities in Livy's account which would not have been left out, if we are to assume a conscious effort by Livy to parallel Aristotle's account. For tragedy, Livy says nothing, e. g., of the changes like those introduced by Aeschylus (Poetics 1449a. 17). Tragedy and comedy are not separated. Nothing is said of comic or tragic choruses.

Horace's account of the rise of the drama is somewhat similar to Livy's. Though Hendrickson sees in it a close parallel to Livy's review, we can go no farther than to say that the *Fescennina Licentia* of Horace is like Livy's amateur *iocularia*. We can go no farther (20).

Ullman's last article in *Studies in Philology* XVII (1920), 379-401, *The Present Status of the "Satura Question"*, is especially valuable in its review of the more recent material relating to the *Satura* question and in

setting forth the results arrived at after the prolonged discussion of over a half century.

The tradition is also defended by Mischaut<sup>29</sup> and D'Alton<sup>30</sup> in their books in connection with a wider treatment of subjects in literary history.

#### V. CONCLUSION.

A survey of the lengthy and ingenious debate which has continued almost without cessation from Jahn down to the present time, relative to the origin of the Roman satire and to the numerous questions incidental to its origin, must lead, at least, to some conclusion, however qualified it may be.

The seemingly persistent activity of many eminent scholars in attempting to refute the Roman claim, based upon evidence in many respects uncertain and even improbable, should certainly not be unfavorably criticized by those who would have the tradition for the Romans. The aim both of skeptics and supporters should be, so far as possible, to establish the truth or falsity of the matter, in whole or in part.

In the light of evidence from other ancient sources and of the brilliant discussion of the passage from Livy VII. 2, it appears inescapable that this particular account possesses elements of strong probability in at least two of the stages of development therein described, viz: (1) the appearance of the Etruscan dancers, (2) the imitation of these dancers by the Roman youth who mixed in with the dances of the foreigners their native Fescennines, which sometimes were good natured and jovial, but at other times abusive.<sup>31</sup> The real existence of the Fescennines is attested by evidence from many different sources. It is, doubtless, true that they bear a close resemblance, in their content and purpose, to the Phallic hymns which figure in Aristotle's description of the development of the old Attic comedy; but it is not only possible, but even probable that they developed independently under early Italian influences, to meet local needs of relaxation and of religious expression. Their analogy to the Phallic verses would not, of course, lead irresistibly to identity with them.

The third stage of Livy's account in which he describes the *saturnae* (dramatic *saturnae*) is the one that has provoked the strongest protest on the part of modern critics. It is by no means inconceivable that, within a reasonable stretch of years between the rude improvisations of the second stage, the Romans produced a form of native drama made up of elements similar to, if not identical with, what Livy styles *saturnae*. Since the occasions on which these native forms of drama were used recurred

<sup>29</sup> Mischaut, G., *Sur les Tretaux latins*, Paris, 1912, 104-106.

<sup>30</sup> D'Alton, J. F., *Horace and His Age*, London, 1917, 255-267.

<sup>31</sup> Horace *Ep.* II. 1. 145-150.