

Aspects of Roman Poetic Technique in a Carolingian Latin Satiric Text

CHARLES WITKE

E. R. Curtius has averred that "it was through Charlemagne that the historical entity which I call 'the Latin Middle Ages' was first fully constituted. . . . I use the term to designate the share of Rome, of the Roman idea of the state, of the Roman church and of Roman culture, in the physiognomy of the Middle Ages in general—a far more inclusive phenomenon, then, than the mere survival of the Latin language and literature."¹ Hence significant aspects of Carolingian Latin literature must be studied not merely in relationship to influence from classical Latin works, or in terms of imitation.² Yet the very term "Carolingian Latin satiric text" implies, first, the existence of a literary genre in Latin called *satira*, and second, a continuity of that genre to at least the age of Charlemagne. The term implies, in addition to such generic incitements to write and to comprehend satire, an awareness of the form *qua* form or genre. To use the formal possibilities of a literary form one must be aware of the form first; "Carolingian Latin satire" implies such an awareness.

Even in antiquity the *satira* was an elastic literary genre, accompanied by problems of definition for audience and poet alike. Elsewhere I have suggested that the Carolingian age was aware of the satiric tradition of

¹ E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, tr. W. Trask (New York, 1953), 27. One should also bear in mind that Charlemagne's people paid a high price for his imposing on the Franks and other peoples a language, beliefs and institutions that were basically incompatible with their own culture. For an assessment of the literary and linguistic implications of the classicism of Charlemagne's hegemony, see E. Auerbach, *Literary Language and its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages*, tr. R. Manheim (New York, 1965), 119 ff.

² Auerbach, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 1), 112 ff., and my review of the German edition of 1958, in *Speculum* 34 (1959), 440 ff.

Horace, Persius and Juvenal.³ Further, the writer of the text under review, Theodulph of Orléans, had a good model for writing mordant invective in elegiac distichs, in the denunciation of Calvitor by an anonymous poet in the Latin Anthology, 902 Riese. Although it takes more to make a satire than such invective, I hope to demonstrate here that the verses in question are properly regarded as satire as well as satiric, even though they are an address on the theme *quo indoctior nemo*, and have no named recipient (though the addressee is very probably a specific person).

To turn briefly to the other term in this essay's title, "Roman poetic technique" means Roman norm, not Roman influence, though this latter subject could easily be analysed along historical lines. "Influence" has often been used, especially since the nineteenth century, to signify the transfer and rearrangement of literary forms and themes from one work to another. There are drawbacks to such a narrow definition of influence, especially in light of neoformalist, or structuralist, approaches to literature, according to which a form cannot be de-formed and still persist or subsist as the same form. Theme is best taken as pre-poetic outline, like a topos. The theme *per se* cannot be transferred from one work of literature to another.⁴

The metamorphic implications of "influence" (from *fluere* onward) imply that influence is an objective, tangible and measurable connection. Further, this view of influence equates it to textual parallelism or textual similarity. Actually, according to modern criticism, influence pertains only to the writer's internal intellectual or psychic experience, the world of his experience in reading and otherwise exposing himself to literature, whilst textual parallelism pertains to the world of literature itself. I propose to avoid influence and textual parallelism in favor of "norm."⁵

Many students of the continuing development of Latin literature in the post-Augustan world tend to emphasize too heavily one end of the spectrum of creativity in literature, just as the student of the more rigorously classical tends to inhabit, instinctively perhaps, the other end. I refer to a continuum running from viewing the composition of literature as a pure process of transfer and reorganization of received materials, to another extreme, that of absolutely *ex novo* creation. The one is based too closely on biological analogy, rampant in the nineteenth century, when theories

³ For further details on Theodulph's awareness of Latin satire as a genre, see Ch. Witke, *Latin Satire* (Leiden, 1970), 168 ff.

⁴ For the working definition of influence in this and the following paragraphs, see C. Guillen, *Literature as System* (Princeton, 1971), 17 ff.

⁵ Cf. E. D. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven, 1967), 69 ff.

dicitur et Circe socios insignis Ulyssis
 mutasse in varias carminis arte feras.
 plurima cum possint, scabiem sanare nequibunt,
 tinea nec horum murmure sana fiet. 20
 ut tamen illa nihil cui manserit hernia prosunt,
 cumque fiunt, totum perditur illud opus:
 sic deperdet opus tibi qui, simulator inique,
 quiddam nisus erit insinuare boni.
 denique rex sapiens cum plurima dixerit istinc,
 hoc unum exempli ponere sorte libet. 25
 si contusus erit pilae in vertigine stultus
 ut far, segnities non sua linquet eum.
 verba ducis posui, ponam quid rustica plebes
 re bene de tali dicere saepe solet: 30
 non facere hoc usu, non verbere quibus, ut unquam
 bubo sit accipiter, qui petat ungue grues,
 utque tuum officium, cape, vultur possit habere,
 est quia tardus, edax, inque vehendo gravis.
 discere nulla cupit bona, sed mala discere cuncta, 35
 vis cur hoc faciat discere? stultus inest.
 hic Iuda peior, melior te, Petre, videri
 vult, mala multa tegit sors simulante peplo.
 hic bona parva putat magna, et mala plurima nulla:
 se, cum vult alios fallere, fallit inops. 40

The text before us is Latin. The *langue* of which this is a *parole* is a system, not merely the sum of all extant Latin words, phrases or indeed sentences.⁸ Rather it is a system which can generate new phrases and sentences by means of its grammar, and hence can generate new poems by means of the grammar of literature. The *parole* itself, namely this text beginning with *illum* and ending with *inops*, is likewise a system of signifiers and of signifieds. Classical Latin satire is not coterminous with all extant works of Horace, Persius and Juvenal. It too is a system, a network of formal opportunities or possibilities, of incitations to commit or to understand *satura*.⁹ This text's signifiers and significations, locked into arbitrary and conventional relationships first on the merely semantic level (the poem is in Latin, not Greek or Japanese), reflect this arbitrary associativeness on

⁸ The terms are borrowed, of course, from F. de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale*³ (Paris, 1967), *passim*. See also J. Culler, *Structuralist Poetics* (Ithaca, 1975), 8 ff. My adaptation of certain structuralist frames of reference for situating the problems of Theodulph's text implies nothing about the efficacy of structuralism (or of post-structuralism) as a means of critically approaching classical or mediaeval works of literature.

⁹ Cf. C. A. van Rooy, *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory* (Leiden, 1965), 30 ff.

another level: the text is not an epic fragment or a romance, but a satire.

How is this known? The first two lines provide an answer. The *ego*, the "I" speaking the poem, the first-person singular of the verb system, is asserting the inoperability of intellectual activity on *illum*. Even though no first-person singular verb appears until line 29, we must understand that the speaker is speaking *in propria persona*, and that the whole poem is a pronouncement, a speech act, in the first person singular. In poems in Latin where the speaker goes on at some length to characterize in negative terms the shortcomings of another, speaking from a judgmental perspective that is rarely tested and sometimes cleverly concealed, we have either a comic excerpt or *satira*, including satiric invective. The former possibility can be ruled out by the absence from this text of other arbitrary systems of the comic, viz., dialogue between characters, reversal of expectations, surprise, and other familiar elements. It can also be demonstrated on an *a priori* basis that Carolingian Latin court poetry did not develop extra-classical genres, and that this poem is not a modern forgery.

If, as I believe, this *parole* or speech act is in the *langue* of satire, what do its signifiers and significations do that is different from other examples of an earlier, or classical, stage of the development of this *langue*? What systems does the relationship between signifier and signified constitute—systems that are like other ones, yet unlike? Another way of asking this question is, how does the writer make this writing something that his audience and he himself can decode without being an antiquarian or indulging in pre-artistic archaeology? Alternatively, how does the writer make a speaking voice, the first-person singular, which is intelligible not only on the level of Latin (e.g., these are well-formed grammatical sentences) but simultaneously on the level of code or the generic level?¹⁰ Further, how does the "I," first-person singular, show that he has naturalized both *langue* and *parole*, and is not fashioning or re-fashioning an antique artifact? In a word, what is traditional and what is Carolingian?

I shall invert the order of this query and deal first, and primarily, with what is Carolingian; because one may assume that readers are already familiar with the larger hallmarks of the classical exercise of satire, such as direct address of the reader, as we see in line 36 of Theodulph's text; abrupt beginnings, as in line 1; the proverb, as in lines 5 ff., and again in 27 f.; and the whole practical everyday tone of the piece, with its exempla drawn equally from life and from literature; and also the discrepancy

¹⁰ "Writing" here subsumes a view of the post-structuralist J. Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, tr. G. C. Spivak (Baltimore, 1976), 6 ff. However, I do not intend my term "writing" to be only so narrowly construed.

between outer appearance and inner reality of moral status, as in lines 37 f.¹¹ Whilst these formal features assist in identifying this poem as satire, they do not alone constitute what I would call the Roman norm.

What is Carolingian in this text could be divided into what is non-Roman as well as what is reworking or reshaping of what is Roman. However, there would be no advantage in pursuing such a dichotomy, which might induce our methodology merely to discover what is Latin, and to call this simple heuristic exercise by a grandiose name, perhaps "structuralist approach." I prefer to isolate what is Carolingian the way one would isolate the idiolects of any given text, without bias concerning good, i.e., classical practice, and bad, i.e., mediaeval distortion, to mention cryptic prejudices all too often met with in classical scholarship that extends itself to post-classical concerns.

First of all, we may note that each couplet is end-stopped, that is, it finishes a sentence; this situation is rarely met with in twenty continuous couplets of Roman elegy, and ostensibly is an aesthetic blemish. Such repetition violates a sense of expectation for *variatio*. Second, the poem seems to have no coherent thematic structure. That is, its poetic texture seems to be meagerly derived not from metaphor or even metonymy but principally from the regular recurring units of the meter, which some would say recurs all too regularly indeed, as well as ending monotonously in sentences coinciding with the end of each couplet.

Another post-classical feature in this text is the use of the pronouns *illum*, *istum*, *hunc*, and *eum* at the opening; if by these pronouns only one person is signified their use is illogical and improper. However, one might see in this series of pronouns a sort of *priamel* wherein various evidences of stupidity are catalogued. Then the text goes on to concentrate on the kind of *stultus* who merely becomes *stultior* the more he is instructed. This obliging the reader or audience to sort out *en route* these two possibilities is obviously a feature of post-antique rather than of classical poetry. Texts from the classical period rarely are ambiguous in this non-creative way, and some would say that the text before us is therefore of a low grade for reasons apart from the quality of Latinity displayed. To this one can only observe that mediaeval art is not classical art. Some would see in the attack on a variety of *stulti* that veers off into a series of illustrations on the observation that innately depraved character cannot be changed for the good by teaching or discipline, and that culminates in an identification of

¹¹ Witke, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 3), *passim* and 271 ff. For a view that Latin satire did not continue beyond Juvenal, see M. Coffey, *Roman Satire* (London–New York, 1976; I have not had access to this book).

the *stultus* with one who is morally defective, not so much disjointed thinking as evidence of the Christian axiom that the interior life is a continuum, and that failing to heed instruction puts one in the camp of scoundrels, hypocrites and Judas himself. What would in classical poetry have been a human type is in this mediaeval text confined to an unnamed individual whom the poet detests. But he detests him for his evil, which brings us to the somewhat more general conclusion about moral evil, lines 37 ff. This view is consonant with Carolingian concerns to upgrade the quality of moral life and to do it by didactic means: a basic premise of Christianity itself as well.

Further, this text is Carolingian in that there is a relative absence of reiterative patterns, such as those formed in classical poetry by tense, person, grammar itself in other ways; by theme, image or lexical choice.¹² Meter and the voice of the narrator alone unify and poeticize this text, it would appear. However, the relatively low frequency of such features should not lead us to conclude that the text is not poetically functional or that it is merely phatic. Two basic modes of arrangement are used in behavior that is verbal: selection and combination. Selection of words in a speech chain is based on equivalence, similarity and dissimilarity, synonymity and antonymity; the combination of words, the syntactical build-up or sequence, is based on contiguity. If the poetic function of language projects from the axis of such selection along the lines of contiguity into the axis of combination, as in Roman Jakobson's famous aphorism, then equivalence is made to become the organizing principle, the constructive device of poetry.¹³

It is because such a principle of equivalence can be demonstrated in the poem of Theodulph under review that it is undeniably poetic. Further, the principle of equivalence is projected into the axis of selection in a special way. The equivalents themselves, the syllables as units of measure (all shorts are equally short, all longs equally long), the reiterative figures of sense and hence of sound in this text, are Roman, or more precisely, are selected in accord with a Roman norm. This norm is, grossly, the elegiac meter. More finely, it can be seen in respect for word-boundaries at the diaeresis, in chiasmic arrangements such as *illum non sal | sal nec eum*, lines 1 and 2, i.e., pronoun-negative conjunction-noun, where noun equivalence is also semantic and lexical identity. Examples may also be found in the

¹² See, e.g., J. P. Elder, "The 'Figure of Grammar' in Catullus 51," *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, ed. L. Wallach (Ithaca, 1966), 202 ff.

¹³ R. Jakobson, "Linguistics and Poetics," *Style in Language*, ed. T. A. Sebeok (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1960).

alteration of finite verb indicative present active / finite verb subjunctive present active in lines 7 and 8, and again in lines 9 and 10, 11 and 12, framed by an inversion of this pattern in lines 5 and 6, *studeat/facit* and a variation, indicative / indicative in lines 13 and 14. Such patternings can be found in many continuous passages of Vergil or Ovid, and are akin to the organizing principles one comes upon in Merovingian Latin poetry, such as organization of strophes by means of the physical senses of sight, smell, etc., in Fortunatus' *Vexilla regis*.¹⁴

But if the empirical linguistic data are constituted on a Roman basis, out of the resources of the Latin poetical language, and selected in accord with the, or a, Roman norm, the referential function of the text and its cumulative aesthetic impact are not Roman but mediaeval: specifically, early mediaeval style associated with the court of Charlemagne, its widespread veneration of the Augustan poets, and its wholesale, even uncritical, adoption of their poetic techniques, to use them to compose unroman, unaugustan poetic texts.¹⁵ The tension between the Roman norm and the mediaeval reference and aesthetic can be seen to a greater extent in other forms, particularly panegyric and epic, and need not detain us here.

Once agreement is reached that this text is poetic use of language, we must press on with another question: are its poetical qualities mere versification along Roman canonical lines, normative in that sense, following techniques dead and gone with the rest of Romanitas? Has Roman metaphor left behind only the empty shell of mediaeval metonymy? Does the absence of metaphor, that poetic trope *par excellence*, leave us with a prosaic variety of metrical art?¹⁶ Mediaeval Latin literary theory shares with Old Indic a clear dichotomization of two poles of verbal art, *ornatus difficilis* and *ornatus facilis*. The latter is much harder to analyse, both linguistically and from a literary critical point of view, since the language has few verbal devices and is close to everyday referential language. Yet I submit that the prolonged grammatical trope noticed above in reference to the verbs in lines 5 through 14 would alone lift this text from the realm of metrical prose. Further figures and tropes concealed in the morphological and syntactical choices of these lines can readily be found by the attentive reader. The poet has exploited the poetic resources adhering in both the *langue*, Latin, and the *parole*, the genre of satire. A dearth of lexical tropes

¹⁴ This poem will be discussed in a forthcoming paper.

¹⁵ See Auerbach, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 1), 117 ff.

¹⁶ Culler, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 8), 179 ff.; for the subsequent statement on *ornatus*, see Jakobson, *loc. cit.* (*supra*, n. 13).

beyond the proverbs in lines 5–6 and 27–28 should not dull our response to the poetic texture of this metonymical composition.

Latin satire is not a genre relying heavily on the arsenal of poetic techniques familiar in, say, Roman lyric or mediaeval hymn. Absence of much poetic density in a satiric piece of writing or in formal satire should not cause alarm or provoke opinions about mediaeval incompetency to compose satire. Classical satire's meter is not elegy, but hexameter. Theodulph, however, is using *the* didactic meter for his age. His elegiacs are functionally the hexameters of the Augustans. Here again Ovid's example in the *Ars Amatoria* can be adduced. But further, generic deviance can easily be seen in this case as one of those literary mutations which uphold a conservative tradition whilst seemingly slighting it. Genre and metre are inextricably twined together in both the classical and the mediaeval practice of Latin poetry. Yet even in the classical age, experimentation was carried forth, as can be seen from a close examination of Ovid, whose elegiacs (apart from the *Ars Amatoria*) yielded motifs and poetic principles of organization also to his epic *Metamorphoses*.

Let us now examine Theodulph's text for more local effects. What sets it off from the Roman practice of the genre of satire? Intense observation yields relatively little, apart from too great regularity of diaeresis, absence of caesura, certain traps of syntax (in lines 39 f., for instance), that would presumably have not been imposed on a Roman audience for such a poem; and, of course, relatively minor cultural shifts, such as *littera sancta*, line 16, *rex sapiens*, i.e., Solomon, line 25, Judas and Peter, line 37. Apart from these, the *ingenium* of the poem's *parole* is Roman, just as the ethos or grammaticality of the *langue* is Latin.

What, then, gives it a Carolingian aesthetic, as I have several times asserted it has? It would seem to subsist in the *rate* of selection of elements of equivalency, and the lack of variety with which they are projected into combination. See, for instance, *discere/discere/discere*, lines 35 f.; *nulla/cuncta*, line 35; *peior/melior*, line 37; *fallere/fallit*, and *se/alios*, line 40, to confine observation solely to those visible on the level of lexical choice, from the poem's locale where parallelisms dramatically increase toward the closure of the poem. A more Roman norm for such combinations can also be seen in this text, such as the bracketing of such topical units as lines 4 and 20, *fiet/fiet*; or 15 and 25, *plura/plurima*, with *plurima* also in line 19, in the middle as it were; see also lines 15 and 19, *nequeunt/nequibunt*, on a smaller scale of separation. But even here, such dense lexical repetition is unroman, or worse, a feature of bad Roman poetry, such as the repetition of morphological units in a touchstone of bad Roman verse, Cicero's "o fortunatam natam me consule Romam!"

None can deny that the principles of selection and of combination on the linguistic, lexical, semantic and generic levels are principles of Roman poetic composition, specifically of satire, that is, are elements of the Roman norm. The out-of-scale usage, dense frequency and lack of inflectional variation of the choices, however, are Carolingian. Poetic texture is achieved through repetition and density; the scale of the reactive units or locales of the text is relatively small, although larger units (such as lines 4 and 20, as mentioned above) do occur, and seem to offer our best evidence of the Roman norm.

Roman too is the reliance on exempla drawn from vivid scenes of everyday life, such as the man who in vain washes a brick,¹⁷ or the proverb from the *Old Testament*, *Proverbs* 27:22, in the Vulgate “si contuderis stultum in pila quasi ptisanas feriente desuper pilo, non auferetur ab eo stultitia eius” (5 f.; 27 f.). Further, the Roman norm is at work in selecting the wisdom of the *rustica plebes*, closer to nature and hence to timeless truths (lines 29 ff.), here exemplified in the comparison of rates of velocity of birds of prey, such as owl and hawk, vulture and falcon. The comparison is merely incidental to the inability to change the innate nature and capacities of the birds mentioned, and, by implication, the inability of art or training to alter any living being’s innate nature: a point not to be confused with the Christian doctrine of salvation for all who heed the teachings of the church. Theodulph’s victim is being satirized (a classical literary activity), not relegated to damnation (a Christian pastoral function). It is precisely at this juncture of ancient poetic practice—viz. the genre of satire with its overdrawn denunciation, and Christian doctrine and convention of salvation for the transgressor—that the classical-Carolingian frontier is most uneasy. However, one may say that Christian institutions have been so thoroughly internalized (e.g., Judas and Peter, line 37) that they disappear behind the artistic fabric, the literary artifact, the text itself. Probably the original audience saw no discrepancy between asserting the impossibility of growth or development or alteration of habit, and the doctrine of accessibility for all to God’s grace, once the second idea had deeply sunk into the culture, and was perhaps as removed from daily Carolingian social and hortatory concerns as it is now.

The compartmentalization of the birds, their classification and incipient grouping as noble (hawk, falcon) and ignoble (vulture, owl) is also Carolingian, or at least in the spirit of an Isidore, who provides a useful if dubious etymology in this connection: “capus Italica lingua dicitur a

¹⁷ A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter der Römer* (Leipzig, 1890), s.v. *later*, has seven citations, of course not including Theodulph.

capiendo. hunc nostri falconem vocant.”¹⁸ The observation of the world of nature, to return later in Walahfrid Strabo, is here nevertheless Roman in spirit and akin to, say, Horace *Satires* 2.6. It is thoroughly Augustan.

One may also with confidence assert a Roman value expressed in the words “poetry can do many things, but not all,” line 15. Some persons, the poet admits, can never be reached and taught; all the art and wisdom cannot dissuade the fool from his folly, the dissimulator from his deception. This insight proceeds more from an awareness of human nature than of theology or even practical pastoral experience. That same human nature was well studied in the Roman comedians, as well as in Ovid, who at *Fasti* 6.469 uses the locution *auritis . . . asellis*, should one seek for a classical parallel for the well-known and obvious zoological feature of the ass-ears in line 11 of Theodulph’s text.¹⁹ Ovid likewise asked in *Metamorphoses* 7.167, “quid enim non carmina possint?,” with *carmina* in the sense of spells. The more mundane or realistic Carolingian court poet limits himself to qualifying poetry’s capacity to effect change. Even the exemplum from the *Odyssey* (17 f.), via Vergil, *Eclogues* 8.70, “carminibus Circe socios mutavit Ulixi,” with *carminibus* again meaning spells, puts everyday and very mediaeval limits on what verbal art of any kind can do to or for a closed mind. The day for incantations was past.

We find in these borrowings from Ovid and from Vergil classical influence of a mechanical sort, mere transferred verbal signals, mentioned at the outset of this discussion. It would, however, be rash and narrow in outlook for the critic, on the basis of such textual parallels, to say that this poem is classically influenced. If we can see the Roman norm at work, shaping this poem, it is in the areas I have drawn attention to, and it is not limited to mere verbal parallelisms, interesting and important in their own right though they be. The Roman norm can be seen best in such features as the purely operational terms in which *ille*, the stupid man, is characterized up to lines 23 f., where the depiction turns assertive or descriptive.

What is post-Augustan, post-antique, is best characterized by the end-stopped lines, a doublet pattern signalled at the outset by *sal* repeated in two lines of parallel grammar and syntax recurring in narrow space (1 f.) and reinforced by *variatio* in lines 4 and 6. This locus and other similar ones in the poem suggest that a binary code pervades this text; an algorithm is demanded by such poetic parallelism as *nulla|cuncta*, line 35,

¹⁸ Isidore, *Etym.* XII.7.57. Cf. Du Cange, s.v. *capus*; the bird might also be a hunting hawk.

¹⁹ The proverb ὄνος λύρας in Latin has also a long career; see Otto, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 17), s.v. *asinus*. Cf. Boethius, *Cons. Phil.* I.4.

peior/melior, line 37, and many other locations. Such parallelisms are not to be explained by adducing poverty of intellect or of poetic technique. The procedure of the two-line units both strengthens the dichotomy of binary opposition and draws attention to the problem of juxtaposition of king and peasant, noble and ignoble bird, sighted and blind, honey and dank caves, cleansing agent²⁰ and filth, music and the brute animal world, strength and inefficiency, and all of the other contrasting, antonymic equivalencies with which this text abounds, and which form its principle of poetic organization. These juxtapositions, in turn, underlie the major confrontation of the text, its major contrast, that of *sapiens* or the I-narrator, and *stultus*. The line-formation in two-line units does not permit qualification, run over, shading, nuance or perspective: only confrontation.

Elsewhere I have tried to show that Theodulph of Orléans is different from a Roman satirist, in having in his Christian culture a calculus of values dichotomized along clear-cut, even binary lines.²¹ We are not far in the Middle Ages from those great static balancings in visual art of virtues and vices in dichotomized adversary relationships. There are four manuscripts of the ninth century that present such arrangements of the virtues and vices: Bern, Burgerbibl. Cod. 264; Leyden, Cod. Bur. Q3; Brussels, Bibl. Roy. ms 974; and Paris, B.N. lat. 8085. The first is probably from St. Gallen. All are considered of the second half of the ninth century. Theodulph is conceiving of his balancings along lines that may have had their origins in a fifth century archetype for Prudentius' *Psychomachia*.²² At any rate, the literary pairing is not Roman, but Carolingian.

It should come as no surprise to the careful student of post-classical Latin literature to see how a Latin satirist of the Carolingian court, though working from entirely different cultural premises, uses the Roman norm of satire to fashion a message of counsel and of insight into abiding human characteristics, though the message be unmistakably Carolingian in aesthetic impact.*

University of Michigan

²⁰ Line 10, *litor*, var. *lutor*, "washer," "fuller."

²¹ See above, n. 3.

²² A. E. M. Katzenellenbogen, *Allegories of the Virtues and Vices in Mediaeval Art from the Early Christian Times to the Thirteenth Century* (London, Warburg Institute, 1939), passim. I am indebted to my colleague Professor Ilene Forsyth for aid in assessing the manuscript evidence.

* [Theodulph, 1 *sal* . . . 2 *sal* : Read 1 *sal* . . . 2 *sol*. For, 2 *doctrina* = *sol* ∞ 13 f. *bona verba* = *sol*. Cf. Cicero *De fin.* 1.71 *ea quae dixi sole ipso illustriora et clariora sunt*.—Line 10 *litor* . . . *olei* : Read *liquor* . . . *olei*: Unguent is applied to a clean, not to a dirty body.—Editor.]