

Howard University Studies in History

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

Article 10

3-1-1923

V Conclusion

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) "V Conclusion," *Howard University Studies in History*. Vol. 3: Iss. 1, Article 10.

Available at: <https://dh.howard.edu/hush/vol3/iss1/10>

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.

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

The tradition is also defended by Mischaut²⁹ and D'Alton³⁰ 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.³¹ 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 *satirae* (dramatic *satira*) 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 *satirae*. Since the occasions on which these native forms of drama were used recurred

²⁹ Mischaut, G., *Sur les Tretaux latins*, Paris, 1912, 104-106.

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

³¹ Horace *Ep.* II. 1. 145-150.

with regularity, one would assume that the Roman youth who possessed a marked dramatic instinct,³² in making preparations for occasions of mirth and of religious celebrations, saw to it that these improvisations became less loose and improvised and more regular and better arranged. Whether, or not they called them *saturae* still remains a matter of doubt.

The relation that Livy, in his fourth stage seems to establish between the comedy of Livius Andronicus and the native *saturae*, as a result of a critical analysis of all of the factors which would have to be considered in such a situation, has been rejected generally by both sides of disputants.³³ There is obviously an utter lack of organic connection between the third and fourth stages. Besides, Andronicus translated Greek works into Latin—the *Odyssey* and Greek plays—and was conspicuous on account of his efforts to promote Greek influence in the field of early Roman literature. It seems far-fetched, to say the least, to find Livy associating his name with what was a mere development of native drama.

If the recital of the beginning of the native drama, as stated by Livy, could be traced to an authoritative source, it would, probably, show that there was a native form of drama in Italy prior to the time of extended Greek influence upon Italian literature. The so-called *saturae*, before they were touched by Andronicus, were entirely free from any Greek flavor whatsoever. The fact that they consisted of coarse and satiric repartee, exchanged between the participants in the dialogues, as well as the use of musical and gesticulatory accompaniments, would entitle them to be regarded as satiric medleys in motion—moving satires, so to speak, i. e., dramatic *saturae*. These *saturae*, I think, may be regarded as disconnected and extemporized moving pictures of early Italian life, highly colored and exaggerated and replete with melody and gesture.

Now assuming that Livy's account is reliable, it would seem that the transition from the satire in motion (dramatic *satura*) to the literary satire, which everywhere contains a pronounced dramatic element and which may be regarded as the developed written expression of the dramatic *satura* in literary form, is one that should offer not much difficulty. The literary *satura* (satire) would, of course, have been intended for readers instead of spectators. Admittedly, Andronicus needed no small amount of courage and of ingenuity, as well, successfully to unite the *saturae*, hitherto made up on the spur of the moment and utterly devoid of connection, in a harmonious story centering around a common theme. We should not apply to Livy as a literary witness the principle so frequently expressed in legal proceedings, "*falsus in uno falsus in omnibus.*"

³² Teuffel's *History of Roman Literature* (translated by Warr), London (1891), Vol. I, 3-5.

³³ Rejected by Leo, *Hermes* XXIV, 78; Mischaut, 105; D'Alton, 262; Ullman, *Stud. in Phil.* XVII, 389.

Even if Livy's survey exhibits obvious inaccuracies and a manifest lack of connection between certain stages, we are not warranted, in any thing which has been offered by the skeptics, in rejecting the traditional view held by the Romans, as expressed through Horace³⁴ and Quintilian.³⁵ Obviously, the Romans in making such a claim did not mean that either the satirical spirit or satirical expression was original with themselves. The satirical spirit which attacks and holds up to ridicule the foibles, follies, frailties and vices of mankind has existed in all ages, in every clime and in every people; the expression of this spirit is found interwoven in the varied types of every national literature. We find traces of it, more or less distinct, in epic, in drama, in lyrics and in oratorical and historical composition. The spirit and expression of it, therefore, belongs to all mankind and to the literature of the world. So, when the claim is made that satire is an original product of the Roman mind, it must not be inferred that elements of the satirical type of literature cannot be found in Greek as well as probably in any antecedent literatures that may have existed prior to Greek literature. What is really understood by the Roman claim is that they were the first³⁶ to produce and to develop the satire as a separate and distinct type of literary expression. Since no distinct prototype for this form or department of expression has yet been found in Greek or any other literature prior to that of Rome, the boast of the Romans, with the above modifications, seems well established.

³⁴ Horace Sat. I, 10, 66, *Græcis intacti carminis*.

³⁵ Quintilian X, 1, 93, *Satura quidem tota nostra est*.

³⁶ W. Rennie, in *The Classical Review* XXXVI (1922), 21, "*Satira Tota nostra est*," argues briefly that in the comparison of Greek and Roman writers as regards their excellence in the varied types of literature, Quintilian does not mean, by the statement "*satira tota nostra est*" to claim originality for the Romans in the department of satirical writing, but only to point out the surpassing superiority of the Romans in that particular branch of literary composition.