

very soon after the restoration of democracy in 403 B.C.¹ A result was that *demokratia* ultimately was applied to any republican government. An interesting example is found in Dio Cassius (52. 5. 4) in the speech in which he represents Agrippa as advising Augustus against establishing a monarchy. It would be difficult, he states, to enslave once more the allies and subjects (*ὑπήκοοι*), some of whom had been democratically governed from ancient times, and some of whom had been set free by "us ourselves" (the Romans). Note the implication that all subjects of the Romans are free. Here democracy and freedom are equated and both are opposed to kingship. The allies and subjects freed by the Romans obviously are the ones whose kings had been deposed by the Romans. To make this still more clear, it is implied that if Augustus establishes a monarchy, it will be the end of freedom. He is warned (52. 5. 3-4) that monarchy, besides being difficult to apply in the provinces,² would be even worse for himself. It would be difficult to subject the populace which had been free so many years. Then

comes the statement about the allies and subjects already noticed.

The change in the meaning of *demokratia* should not be difficult to understand if it is borne in mind that the word means rule by the *demos* and that such rule need not necessarily involve manhood suffrage. There may have been communities of that kind surviving here and there, but in Hellenistic and Roman times they certainly were rare if they existed at all. The important point remains that the word implied rule by the people instead of by a king and so could be applied to any state with a republican form of government no matter how narrow or liberal. Though this is not a discussion of the Roman idea of freedom when applied to non-Romans, it may not be out of place to note that any community with a modicum of local self-government, no matter how closely it was supervised by Roman officials, and no matter how heavy the taxes it paid to Rome, could be called free.³

J. A. O. LARSEN

UNIVERSITIES OF CHICAGO AND MISSOURI

1. "The Judgment of Antiquity on Democracy," *CP*, XLIX (1954), 1-14.

2. The word translated "provinces" is *δήμοις*. It seems that the word again is used with its old meaning of country or a district. The Loeb translation (Cary-Foster) renders it "democracies." This clearly is wrong. As used here, the *demoi*

are contrasted with the *polis* of Rome and so must refer to the rest of the empire.

3. For an early example of freedom of this kind, cf. Larsen, *Greek Federal States* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 295-300 on the organization of Macedonia in 167 B.C.

TRIMALCHIO'S CORINTHIAN PLATE

"Nec non cocus potione honoratus est et argentea corona, poculumque in lance accepit Corinthia. Quam cum Agamemnon propius consideraret, ait Trimalchio: 'Solus sum qui vera Corinthea habeam'" (*Sat.* 50). The boast is typical of Trimalchio, and the subsequent lecture is based on two of the host's recurrent foibles: a pun and a snatch of garbled mythology. He buys his plate from Corinthus the *aerarius*, and so has the only genuine plate. But he is aware that Corinthian bronze dates back to Hannibal at the fall of Troy!

The presence of Corinthian ware on Tri-

malchio's table is unsurprising; indeed, an *asellus Corinthius* had already been noticed as an olive dish (*Sat.* 31). The fashion is frequently attested by Cicero in the late Republic,¹ and Augustus was notorious from his youth for being "pretiosae suppellectilis Corinthiorumque praecipidus."²

Some, however, thought the fad had become a mania and a menace. Velleius Paterculus deplored the popularity of *Corinthia* in A.D. 30, and blamed it on the *rudis* Mummius for his sack of Corinth in 146.³ This connection was stressed by the elder Pliny, who thought that

1. *Rosc. Am.* 133; *Verr.* 2. 2. 46, 83; *Tusc.* 2. 32; *Fin.* 2. 23; *Att.* 2. 1. 11.

2. Suet. *Aug.* 70; Octavian was allegedly dubbed *Corintharius* for proscribing owners of *vasa Corinthia* which he coveted. Pliny *NH* 34. 6 claims that Antony proscribed Verres for much the same reason.

3. Vell. Pat. 1. 13. 4: "non tamen puto dubites, Vinici, quin magis pro re publica fuerit manere adhuc rudem Corinthiorum intellectum quam in tantum ea intellegi, et quin hac prudentia illa imprudentia decori publico fuerit convenientior."

most devotees of Corinthian ware were ignorant chasers after fashion who could easily be fooled by counterfeit items.⁴

By contrast, the younger Pliny found Corinthian ware on the table of the respectable Vestricius Spurinna and thought it acceptable, since Vestricius followed the fashion with restraint.⁵ Elsewhere,⁶ Pliny mentions his own purchase of a *Corinthium signum*, bought "ex hereditate quae mihi obvenit" and destined for the temple of Jupiter at Comum. Pliny states that he will not retain the item for private delectation: "emi autem non ut haberem domi (neque enim ullum adhuc Corinthium domi habeo)."

Trimalchio's private myth of the original Corinthian ware created by Hannibal at Troy is more than a confused version of Mummius and Corinth. He is mocking both the myth and the fashion. Awareness of the myth is subtly indicated by his later mention of Mummius' bequest of one thousand cups to his patron, who in turn left them to Trimalchio (*Sat.* 52). Nor does he slavishly follow the fashion: glass and silver are more to his taste (50–51).

There may be further proof in this episode that Trimalchio is not really a sensationally

rich man.⁷ Corinthian ware was, to be sure, an expensive fad, but the *lanx Corinthia* in question may well have been counterfeit. It is unlikely that Trimalchio would be too lavish in rewarding a cook (unless the scene was re-enacted nightly, and the man gave the dish back to his master). Glass commends itself to him because of its cheapness (*vitrea . . . vilia*, 50). Agamemnon's close scrutiny may indicate his doubts over the authenticity of the piece. If so, Trimalchio's exposition is designed to deflect attention from the dish and also to disparage the Corinthian vogue. He admits that his preference for glass and silver may strike the audience as peculiar: "ignoscetis mihi, quod dixero: ego malo mihi vitrea" (50).

Trimalchio's lecture surprises Encolpius, who had expected that his host would merely claim to import his plate directly from Corinth, forestalls Agamemnon's demonstration of expertise, and provides a nicely logical reason for the very next incident at the *Cena* to begin: "haec dum refert, puer calicem proiecit" (52).

BARRY BALDWIN

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

4. *NH* 34. 6–7: "ac mihi maior pars eorum simulare eam scientiam videtur ad segregandos sese a ceteris magis quam intellegere aliquid ibi subtilius . . . sunt ergo vasa tantum Corinthia, quae isti elegantiores modo ad esculenta transferunt, modo in lucernas aut trulleos nullo munditiarum dispectu."

5. *Epist.* 3. 1. 9: "sunt in usu et Corinthia, quibus delectatur nec adicitur."

6. *Epist.* 3. 6. 1.

7. See G. Schmeling, *CP*, LXV (1970), 248 ff.

FACT AND FABLE IN HORACE *EPISTLE* 1. 7*

The Seventh Epistle has generally been taken (beginning with the ancient commentators) as the most personal and occasional of the entire collection: that is, if it is not the actual document by which Horace declared his independence from Maecenas, it is at least a poetic record of the event, published with the agreement of both parties.¹ The argument over the meaning of the poem has concerned the

extent to which we are to believe that an actual historical rift is represented between the poet and his patron. But in addition to this there also remain some apparent logical flaws in the argument, and these must be examined and resolved.

The Epistles of Book 1 are, in this writer's view, poetic constructs. They may take their rise individually in occasions and personal

* This paper was first presented in May 1971, in St. John's, Newfoundland, at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of Canada.

1. See E. Burck's "Nachwort und bibliographische Nachträge" in the reissue of the Kiessling-Heinze commentary, *Quintus Horatius Flaccus: Briefe* (Berlin, 1961), pp. 437–38. Also F. van Ooteghem, "Horace et l'indépendance," *Latomus*, V (1946), 185–88; G. Stégen, *L'Unité et la clarté des Epîtres d'Horace* (Namur, 1963), pp. 40–59; C. Becker, *Das Spätwerk*

des Horaz (Göttingen, 1963), pp. 25–37; H. Drexler, "Zur Epistel 1, 7 des Horaz," *Maia*, XV (1963), 26–37; R. G. Peterson, "The Unity of Horace, *Epistle* 1. 7," *CJ*, LXIII (1968), 309–14; G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 19 ff.; M. J. McGann, *Studies in Horace's First Book of Epistles* (Brussels, 1969), pp. 48–56; Gregor Maurach, "Der Grundriss von Horazens ersten Epistelbuch," *AClass*, XI (1968), 95–98.