Hunting Literary Legacies: *Captatio* in Roman Satire

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Heather A. Woods

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Christopher Nappa, Advisor

December 2012

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I owe thanks to many people for their help as I completed the research and writing of this thesis. The Department of Classical and Near Eastern Studies, and in particular my PhD committee deserve acknowledgement: Nita Krevans, Philip Sellew, Andrew Gallia and my wonderful and patient advisor Christopher Nappa. I wish also to thank Cynthia Fuller and especially Jamie Meadows for their invaluable assistance along the way. Thanks to my parents Karen Shippen and Randy Woods and my brothers Greg and Nick for their unwavering support and faith in me, and Buster and Elvis for keeping me company as I wrote. Above all, thanks to my dear husband, the best friend and helpmate anyone could ever have.

For my family

NOTE ON EDITIONS USED

Latin passages from the works of Horace, Petronius, Juvenal and Vergil that are included in my chapters are drawn from the following standard editions of these authors:

Horace: D. R. Shackleton Bailey's 2001 Teubner edition
Petronius: K. Müller's 2003 Teubner edition
Juvenal: W. Clausen's 1992 Oxford Classical Text
Vergil: R. A. B. Mynors' 1969 Oxford Classical Text.

All translations into English are my own unless otherwise noted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

Telling the truth through fiction: Satiric captation and authorial anxiety

Among the many complaints that Roman satirists express about contemporary life, entitlement, greed and opportunism are frequently decried as prevailing social ills. This dissertation examines one manifestation of mercenary behavior—legacy hunting—whose appearances in satire have long sufficed as the chief evidence that it was a basic fact of Roman social life. By focusing on the literary dimensions of the texts in which legacy hunting appears most prominently (Horace *Sermones* 2.5, Petronius' *Satyrica* and Juvenal *Satire* 12), the literary function of legacy hunting narratives can be discovered, a project which has implications for not only these individual works, but for how we read Roman satire in general.

Roman satire and historical reality.

Roman satire[1] is particularly complicated to study. It offers tantalizing glimpses of "real life"—the bustle of traffic on the streets of Rome, the cacophony of public spaces, the overwhelming smells and sights of dinner parties, stage performances, and spectacles, as well as details about social niceties, diet, dress and personal grooming. In many ways it is satiric texts that can most fully transport the reader into the world they portray, because these texts are concerned not with reporting the headline events of history or retelling stories from the mythic past or even in painting romantic or dramatic scenes of love, loss, triumph, or nostalgia. For this reason, much more of the mundane

[1] The term "satire" is normally used in reference to classical literature to refer specifically to hexameter verse satire, though in this work I use it in its broader sense of literature with a satiric purpose and perspective, including non-hexameter verse, prose, and prosimetric texts.

realia of ancient life can be found in satire than in other genres, making it quite appealing as a witness to historical reality. But, as modern critics have come to realize, the world created by the satirist is *realistic* down to its smallest details, but not *reliable*.[2]

This is because satire is deeply concerned with conveying meaning through characterization—satirists examine society, individuals, institutions, and attitudes more through showing than telling. That is not to say that satire does not include plenty of "telling"—satiric characters unleash opinions, lectures, and (not infrequently) tirades on a universe of topics, but, as scholars have come to realize, these attacks are not to be taken at face value. The explicit concerns of a satiric character are only part of the story presented by the satirist. Through his preoccupations, his diction, his interactions with others, his interpretation of aspects of the world that would be familiar to the contemporary reader, and indeed even his omissions, additional (and indeed essential) facets of a satiric character are revealed. It is often the dissonance created between the character's explicit representation of the world or himself and the "reality" implicitly present for the reader that is the heart of a satire's meaning. The argument of the satiric speaker, extracted from its context and stated simply and on its own, could perhaps be summarily accepted or rejected, but the interplay between his argument and his characterization draw the reader into a much more substantial engagement with the issues

[2] As Damon (1997, 9) explains, the use of appearances of a phenomenon in satiric and rhetorical (to this I would add "moralizing") literature as evidence of its historical reality is problematic: "To be sure, the world that satire reflects is stylized and even literary, and Cicero (the only orator from whom we have complete speeches extant) is not a social critic but a pleader who reshapes reality for the purposes of his case. Yet neither satire nor oratory achieves its purpose unless it reveals something that people will take to be valid about reality. The worlds created are not impossible fictions but interpretations of the familiar..."

raised. If the reader is allowed to identify with the character of the satiric figure initially, when he or she finds his message becoming outlandish or unconvincing, the inconsistency has personal implications. If, on the other hand, the reader agrees with the message but finds the character espousing it unsavory, his or her own character cannot but be, in some way, impugned as well.[3]

Works that for centuries were construed as evidence of social and historical realities from the humorously (or at times distastefully) dyspeptic perspective of their authors, are now recognized to be much more complex. The "truth" that satire presents is truth told by means of fiction—there is no voice in a satiric text (least of all that of the satirist himself) that can not be considered an artistic construction.[4] The innate complexity of a genre that relies on irony in conveying meaning is exacerbated by the temporal and cultural distance from which ancient satire is studied by modern scholars. We are outsiders to the culture that produced this literature, and the passage of time and fragmentation of cultural evidence has left us with an incomplete picture of the world that anchors the messages of Roman satire. The fact that satire utilizes characterization so

---

3 A vivid instance of satire directly implicating its reader occurs at Horace, *Serm*. 1.1.69-70, when, in the midst of criticizing those whose greed leaves them perpetually miserable, the speaker abruptly breaks off his rant with an apostrophe to the audience—"what are you laughing at? Change the name and this story is about you." In this case, the reader, lulled into a false sense of security by the distance from which the satiric attack is launched, is suddenly the target of the satire that he has perhaps found quite reasonable in its criticism of others. This passage and its relationship to *Serm.* 2.5 are discussed in more detail in Chapter 2.

4 The question of the extent to which the perspective (or opinions) presented in a work of satire can be reasonably ascribed to the author himself is still an area of disagreement among scholars, and is discussed in more detail below. While I reject the fallacious application of unverifiable reconstructions of the poet's biography as a legitimate method of studying his work, I would not argue that there are no gains to be made from approaches that consider the life and social situation of the author.

integrally in the construction of meaning, however, is a heartening reality. Whatever aspects of the "backdrop" of Roman society remain unclear, the satirist provides us much of what we need to understand his message. It is not only the conflict between the satiric character's perspective and "real" Rome that makes the point or generates humor, it is largely the conflict present between the character and the satirist's construction of his context that is most significant in conveying meaning.

Before moving to more recent treatments of satire in scholarship, it is worth considering the fact that literary criticism of Roman satire is exactly as old as the genre itself. As Freudenburg (2001, 2) has noted, "the problem 'What is satire?' has embarrassed not only professional scholars since antiquity. It was there to be wrestled with, and staged as a problem of writing, by the ancient satirists themselves." The tumultuous shifts in tone and content from author to author kept the satiric genre in a process of continual revision as it was repeatedly redefined by its successive creators. One feature of satire's continuity from Lucilius onward is a claim to plain or honest speech on the part of the satirist and a suggestion that he is not able to produce material like that of his predecessors for one reason or another. Lucilius distinguishes himself from a poet like Ennius, calling his own work *ludos ac sermones* (1039). Horace distances himself from Lucilius' outspoken fire but likewise calls his own more reserved satires *sermones*, the production of which he describes as *haec ego ludo* (1.10.37). Horace excuses himself from the ranks of those who can properly be called poets on the

grounds that his work is more like conversation (*sermo*)[5] and elsewhere describes his satiric practice as *ridentem dicere verum* (*Serm.* 1.1.24). This thread can be found picked up in the work of Petronius, in the poem at *Satyr.* 132.15, in which the speaker refers to the work as *novae simplicatatis opus* and describes his creation thus: *sermonis puri non tristis gratia ridet,/ quodque facit populus, candida lingua refert* ("The pleasure—not grim—of my pure speech laughs and my pristine tongue reveals what people do.")[6] Juvenal likewise presents himself as motivated not by talent per se, (*si natura negat, facit indignatio versum*), and finds it difficult not to write satire (1.30), and while the topic of his work is also *quidquid agunt homines* (1.85), he declines to take up the "drawn sword of fiery Lucilius" against the living (1.165).

These self-definitions (along with any biographical details that can be found in or even hypothesized from the works themselves), as Anderson (1964b) most notably recognized[7] were for too long taken as legitimate parts of actual biographies and were used to write literary history.[8] This is particularly problematic in a genre which frequently

---

[5] *Serm.* 1.4.39-42: *primum ego me illorum dederim quibus esse poetis/ excerpam numero. neque enim concludere versum/ dixeris esse satis; neque si qui scribat, uti nos,/ sermoni propriora, putes hunc esse poetam.*

[6] Though his work does not form part of my argument, it is worth noting that Persius likewise presents a self-deprecating vision of himself as being not a "real" poet in his prologue: the satirist disavows any claim to divine poetic calling and labels himself *semipaganus* (6).

[7] Anderson (1964b) credits as particularly influential to his perspective Mack (1951) and Kernan (1959), two studies of English satire (the former focused on Pope specifically, the latter on Jacobean satire). Mack directly responds to the biographical interpretation of Highet as a starting point, and Kernan posits that the use of an extremely irascible satiric *persona* would serve to alienate the audience to the point that the message itself would be rejected. As Anderson (1964b, 112) puts it: "sometimes the *persona* created by the satiric poet is so distinct from the poet's biography that the two are opposites."

[8] The dangers of taking authors' claims about their work and its relation to that of predecessors is particularly well argued by Hinds (1998), particularly in his discussions

asserts itself as relatively pedestrian or less-than-poetry—critics of previous generations have made the mistake of taking these claims as truth and have implicitly accepted the genre as more or less subliterary. The reliance on the biographical school of criticism (notably exhibited by Highet's 1954 book, *Juvenal the Satirist*) can lead scholars into dubious speculation on the details of the satirist's historical life, but once these become ingrained in the scholarship, they can become a sort of circular argument, reinforcing readings of the work that they seem to suggest *and* from which they derive. As Anderson states, "as a result of such reasoning, much excellent matter has been deduced from the Satires, matter, however, that is peripheral to the purposes of the poet; and, on the other hand, many mistakes have been committed by those who pursue a biography...in the behavior of the *persona*."[9]

Highet (1974) offers a heated rebuttal to the anti-historicist movement within satire scholarship in his article "Masks and Faces in Satire," directly responding to Anderson (1964a). He argues that the inconsistencies present in the satires (particularly of Juvenal, but in the work of other Roman satirists as well) are better interpreted as representing the inconsistencies of a real human author (who, as a flawed person, holds contradictory views; or who feels one way at one moment, and another when in a different mood) than as evidence of the use of *personae* distinct from the author. His resistance to the extreme application of *persona* theory (that is, the idea that the satirist

---

of "change and decline" and "secondary epic" (83-98). As he points out, self-deprecating claims to artistic inferiority are quite often self-conscious acts of reframing and redefining artistic territory—efforts that long escaped literary historians, who naively accepted as fact artistic claims of this type.

[9] Anderson (1964b, 107) is here specifically referring to the circumstance of Lucilius' critics allowing biography to supersede poetics, but his point applies equally to any overuse of biographical criticism of satiric texts.

feels opposite to, or otherwise in no way resembles his satiric speakers) throws out the baby with the bathwater—his argument rejects along with *persona* theory the potential new avenues of criticism that are opened by moving away from biographical or historical criticism alone.[10]

More recent scholarship of satire tends to reject either extreme of the *persona* spectrum—making use of the benefits of encountering texts without expectations of, or based on, pure biographical or historical reliability, but recognizing that there is little to recommend a theory of *persona* that places author and speaker as polar opposites in a sort of continual state of tiresome, uninterrupted irony.

Traditional studies of satire have generally been organized chronologically, usually beginning with Lucilius, and tracing the developments of the genre over time. In the past several decades, however, thematic approaches to criticism of satire have been particularly fruitful. Rudd's 1986 *Themes in Roman Satire* is notable for initiating this "horizontal"[11] approach to the study of the genre, by examining selected themes across

---

[10] Highet's argument in this article relies heavily on *comparanda* from modern satire as well as from ancient satirists about whose biography more is known (Horace, for example), to show correspondences between biographical fact and evidence of biography in the satires. He characterizes the *persona* approach as insisting that there can be no correspondence whatever between these apparently consistent voices ("author" and "satirist"), which does make rhetorical sense, but does not take into account any variation in the use of *personae* by author, or for that matter, the clear suggestion that Latin literature itself provides some evidence that the *persona* was on the mind of ancient authors—it is hard not to remember Catullus 16, for example, which highlights the tension between the *persona* suggested by his poems and "Catullus" the author. For another prominent (and more recent) argument against the use of the extreme of *persona* theory, particularly in relation to Juvenal, see Iddeng (2000).

[11] The metaphor is Rudd's (1986, ix) own—he describes previous treatments as having a "vertical" focus (that is, chronological, down through time), while his approach collects thematic evidence from across the corpus of satire to better understand the character of

authors. Particularly useful studies of this type include Gowers (1993) on the role of food and eating in Roman literature, Damon (1997) on the character of the parasite and its usefulness as commentary on patronage, and Rimell (2002) on Petronian satire's interest in consumption and the corporeal. Keane (2006) examines the satiric genre through four modes of its representation: as theater, attack, law, and education, showing the ways in which "satire dramatizes its own generic theory in demonstrating its close and reciprocal relationship with Roman social practices."[12] Braund (1989) presents a collection of studies of themes present across the genre, including friendship, food, and the law.

In addition to the trends of satire scholarship, it will perhaps be useful to mention general critical trends in the scholarship of the works discussed in the following chapters. To begin with, scholarship on Horace's *Sermones* in general focuses on the first book alone, treating the second book only summarily, if at all. This is largely due to the fact that the programmatic satires of the first book (especially 1.1, 1.4, and 1.10) provide the most and clearest evidence suggesting the author's explicit satiric agenda and self-definition vis-à-vis Lucilius.[13] The first book is considered to be bolder, and presents the satirist himself providing most of the moral instruction and social criticism, whereas the second book has struck readers as more reserved, and the satirist himself does not appear at center stage in these eight poems, most of which involve his being criticized or corrected by other characters (who belong to a type that Anderson (1963) identifies as the

---

the genre along the "horizontal bands" of six themes: aims and motives; freedom and authority; style and public; class and patronage; Greek and the Greeks; women and sex.

[12] Keane (2006, 4).

[13] *Serm.* 2.1 is also recognized as a valuable programmatic piece, (though mostly as a counterpoint to the first book) and it is for this reason that it is often the only poem of Book 2 given much detailed attention.

doctor ineptus). The first full study in English of the *Sermones* is Rudd (1966), which provides particularly useful insights on the development of themes through individual poems and groups of poems. Also notable among works on the *Sermones* is Freudenburg (1993), which argues that the artifice (in the constructive, creative sense) of the satires (mostly of the first book) is consistent with the self-awareness and genre-consciousness of Horace's more widely appreciated later works. Despite the fact that Horace is a foundational author of Roman satire, and his other works are so well represented in the scholarship, there exists no scholarly commentary on either of the two books of *Sermones* in English.[14]

A number of factors complicate the study of Petronius' *Satyrica*. Among them are the fragmentary state of the text, the novel's unique prosimetric form, and its pervasive borrowings from and imitations of other genres of literature. These difficulties are not mitigated by readers' perpetual fascination with the author's identification as the Neronian *arbiter elegantiae* (due largely to the portrait of the courtier provided by Tacitus at *Annals* 16.18-9), which long encouraged chiefly biographical and historicist treatment. In part because the work contains low subjects and voices in conjunction with high style, and is complicated by the presence of an unreliable and debauched narrator, critics have accepted that, for those seeking the novel's meaning, some degree of defeat is

[14] There is a student commentary on each book: Brown (1993) covers *Sermones* 1, and Muecke (1993) covers Book 2. Reliable scholarly commentaries do exist in other languages, though they are each over a century old now: Kiesling-Heinze (1910) in German, LeJay (1911) in French. A recent Italian commentary is Fedeli (1994).

inevitable.[15] Such a bizarre, unique, and compelling work has yielded a wide variety of interpretive modes and conclusions. Auerbach (1953) has interpreted the *Satyrica* as an epicurean moralist's reaction to social disintegration, while Sullivan (1968), for example, highlights the criticism of literature and rhetoric as the focus of the novel, and identifies its author as a "literary opportunist" (255). Slater's *Reading Petronius* (1990) applies reader-response criticism to the work (arriving at the conclusion that it is "quite uninterpretable") (250). The poetry in the *Satyrica* is treated by Courtney (1991), whose study of the shorter poems includes a succinct case for the latter part of the *Satyrica* as a parody of the *Odyssey* (45) and a more complete treatment (including substantial engagement with the two longer poems) is available in Connors (1998). Among those works that particularly influenced my analysis of the Croton portion of the *Satyrica* are Conte (1996a), which provides a particularly insightful analysis of the "mythomaniac narrator" of the work; Courtney's invaluable 2001 *A Companion to Petronius*; and Rimell's (2002) strange and intriguing study of the imagery of literary texts as bodies and reading as eating. Though the bibliography of Petronian scholarship is enormous, the latter part of the work is much less commented-upon than the former, with the *Cena Trimalchionis* receiving the most attention. The fact that the novel as a whole did not have the benefit of a modern commentary until 2011 suggests the idiosyncratic nature of Petronian scholarship and the array of difficulties faced by those writing about the *Satyrica*.[16]

---

[15] Walsh (1974) and Slater (1990) conclude that the work, while successful as entertainment, does not admit conclusive analysis.

[16] Schmeling (2011) represents not only the first modern commentary in English to cover the entire work (the first to supersede the 1743 commentary by Burman), it is the only

As discussed above, the advent of *persona* theory marked a significant sea change in the study of Juvenal. Among other notable trends in Juvenalian scholarship are the recognition of the influence of rhetoric and declamation on his satire, as discussed in DeDecker (1913) and Kenney (1963); and the study of anger and irony covered most thoroughly by Braund (1988) and (1997). Given the particular focus given to women and problematized masculinity in Juvenal, the study of sexuality and gender issues has formed a significant approach to the study of his works—notable among this group of scholars are Gold (1998), Henderson (1989), and Winkler (1983).

My approach, though influenced by a great variety of scholarship, bears the closest resemblance to a combination of two of the sources mentioned above: Damon's chronological study of the figure of the parasite through different genres as a means of examining Roman concerns about and with the system of patronage; and Keane's thematic treatment of satire's generic markers, which recognizes programmatic metaphors as a key to better understanding the genre and its metaliterary concerns. Keane's suggestion that satire, in practice, *does* what it is *about*, has particularly informed my readings of the works treated here.

These efforts have distinguished satiric literature as a particularly rich and complex body of texts, and have also brought to bear on this corpus the literary-critical techniques and perspectives long employed in elucidating other genres of classical literature. The current project contributes to this work by identifying a new lens through which to search for truths in the fiction of satire: the metaliterary implications of a

---

commentary that covers the work after chapter 110—Habermehl's (2006) extant volume is only the first of two proposed volumes, and so covers chapters 79-110 only. Among student commentaries Smith (1975) is quite helpful, though it covers only the *Cena*.

particular satiric *topos*. In the following chapters I present detailed examinations of three satiric texts concerned with the topic of legacy hunting, which reveal a surprising amount about the artistic concerns of their authors and which constitute an ongoing conversation on these concerns among authors of successive generations. Before entering into these detailed analyses, however, it will be worthwhile to briefly orient the reader in the social circumstances of Roman friendship and inheritance, and the phenomenon of legacy hunting.

Roman friendship and wills.

Roman satire from Lucilius to Juvenal is, at least ostensibly, concerned with adjudicating social behavior, a goal that is achieved through means ranging from good-natured moralistic exhortations to behave correctly to highly caustic ranting against misbehavior. The more important a particular topic or type of relationship is to social cohesion, the more focused and energetic the attention it receives in the satirists.[17] Marriage, gender and class, family relationships, civic involvement, commerce and consumption all appear as topics of interest to satirists, but among the targets of satiric energies, the stabilizing system of friendship between elite and lower class individuals—known as patronage or *clientela*—has been identified as a particularly keen focus of attention.[18] As Mayer indicates in his article "Friendship in the Satirists," it is impossible to create with any certainty a complete picture of the normal functioning of patronage, but it is without doubt that "Roman free society was founded on *officium*, loyal service,

[17] The same correlations can of course be seen in other moralizing genres, such as didactic philosophical texts.

[18] On Roman friendship in general, see Konstan (1997) (pages 122-148 concern Rome specifically); Brunt (1988); Wallace-Hadrill (1989); and Saller (1982). On friendship in satire specifically, see Mayer (1989).

which cut both ways."[19] The amorphous nature of these duties, which could clearly range from moral to financial support, from political assistance to visible participation in a patron's entourage, proved a problematic subject even for the ancients who had first-hand experience of these relationships. Of particular delicacy is the issue of motive in these reciprocal, but inherently unequal friendships, and one facet of this anxiety is expressed through discussions of *captatio,* or legacy hunting.

One traditional way of commemorating important relationships was through the recognition of a friend in one's will, by means of an affirmation of their loyalty and dutiful attention either with or without an accompanying financial gift.[20] Certainly not every Roman made a will, but those who did often used the public will as a means of recognizing those extrafamilial ties that had been important in life. This freedom in the disposal of an estate to friends and associates, while an important aspect of *amicitia*, became a source of increasing discomfort in the face of the changing role of patronage in the society of the late Republic and into the Principate.[21] The image of the rapacious opportunist, taking advantage of the childless by offering false friendship in the hopes of

[19] Mayer (1989, 6).
[20] As Wallace-Hadrill (1981, 67) explains, friends could be named as "heirs in the third grade"—largely a nominal honor, since their inheritance would only occur in the case of death or relinquishing of rights on the part of the primary and secondary heirs. However, there was an expectation that friends would receive bequests in one's will as a mark of honor. He sums this up nicely: "The will in fact expressed one's pattern of obligations. The first duty was of course to the family; but the testator should also remember anyone to whom he was bound by ties of *officium*."
[21] Wallace-Hadrill (1981) makes the argument that Augustus' marriage laws were intended to "stabilise the transmission of property, and consequently of status, from generation to generation."

receiving a legacy or inheritance[22] appears first in Cicero[23] and becomes increasingly common as a signal of the increasing turpitude of contemporary society.[24]

The most common term for this practice derives from its first occurrence in satire—in Horace *Serm.* 2.5, a poem in which Tiresias advises Odysseus to "hunt" legacies, and follow in the footsteps of a *captator* like Nasica (57). *Captatio* (a metaphor from hunting and fishing) becomes the standard term for the practice of legacy hunting, in both literature and in legal texts. While it is a straightforward enough behavior to condemn in writing, it can be quite difficult to identify in actual practice. This is because captation presents all the outward indications of traditional, socially acceptable *amicitia*—in fact the only difference between a true friend and a captator is his motive, which of course may be a source of speculation by others, but cannot truly be known. In fact, captation occupies a nebulous medial area on the spectrum of friendship, somewhere

---

[22] Because Romans had need of several ways to recognize others in their wills, a "legacy" would be a sum of money paid out of the estate before its final disposal to the "heirs" (and hence "inheritance" is the remaining sum left after the payment of the dedicated legacies). Though the terms are often used interchangeably, this distinction is useful to scholars of testamentary law, as the two categories are legally different, but for my purposes, the terms "legacy" and "inheritance" need not be sharply differentiated. For more on the distinction and definitions of these categories, see Buckland (2007) and Mansbach (1982); on the increased burden of responsibility on the *suus heres* versus the legatee, see Champlin (1989, 203).

[23] A description of opportunistic, legacy-seeking behavior is presented in Plautus' *Miles Gloriosus* (705-15), but this is distinguished from proper captation in that the *orbus* in this case (Periplectomenus) is attended by his own relatives. These *individuals will be heirs regardless,* but they compete in their attendance on him in order to secure a larger percentage of his wealth. The first appearance of captation as the term is generally used is in Cicero *Parad.* 5.39 (circa 46 BC), in which Cicero compares the obsessive seeking of an inheritance to enslavement.

[24] Juvenal 6.212-18 presents a scenario which dramatizes the danger of losing power over one's property—the speaker claims that a wife will control her husband's purchases and disposal of goods, even after death, as she insists upon dictating those who may inherit his estate (*testandi cum sit lenonibus atque lanistis/ libertas et iuris idem contingat harenae,/ non unus tibi rivalis dictabitur heres.*)

between devotion and exploitation. On one end is "true" friendship in which both parties care about one another, and perform the *officia* appropriate to a legitimate and socially-stabilizing relationship. At the other pole is exploitative "friendship" which involves deceit, violence, blackmail, and the like —this behavior is not only illegitimate socially, but is in fact legally actionable, and does not qualify as captation.[25] In between these two poles lies legacy hunting, which is motivated by self-interest rather than genuine feelings of affection, but which is nearly indistinguishable from legitimate friendship externally. In this way, the captator is not unlike the parasite, or the modern American concept of the "gold digger." All of these are pejorative appellations that describe a type (as opposed to an individual) and each time such a "mask" is applied to a person, (as Damon (1997, 7) notes in her study of the parasite figure), "an effort of interpretation is underway." That is, there is no external litmus test that can establish a person as a captator (or parasite or gold digger), the term conveys no concrete demographic or personal information (like gender, age, or status) nor does it specify a particular mode of behavior (accounts of captation include prostitution, marriage, flattery, advocacy, provision of social or material resources, and so on). Rather than describing any quantifiable body of specific evidence, these terms are universally negative, qualitative labels applied by those who disapprove of particular features of an observed relationship. After all, authenticity of affection—

[25] Buckland (2007, 295) describes the legal recourse for cases in which force or fraud influenced testation: "*Institutio heredis*, being a legal transaction, might be affected by fraud or error. Where one by violence or *dolus* prevented a man from making or altering a will, or induced him to make a will, *bonorum possessio* was refused. In Justinian's law the result was apparently that in both cases the property was forfeited to the *fiscus* for *indignitas*, but it is possible that for classical law this was true only of the first case. In the second, *bonorum possessio* may have been granted to those entitled in default of the incriminated will."

unknowable to anyone but the lover—is the only difference between a May-December romance, for example, and grasping, mercenary gold digging. To label relationships thus is to make a negative judgment on the individual(s) in question, but also to highlight a weakness in the institution that permits such an aberration. Damon's (1997, 9) interpretation of the function of the term "parasite" can be applied to the "captator" as well: "if the parasite is always a mask and if the fit between the mask and its wearer lies in the eyes of the beholder, that the mask seemed to fit people in so many different situations... indicates how well it satisfied those who wanted to complain about or criticize the system." The "system" in question is, for Damon, patronage, and while appearances of captation have certainly been taken purely as a means of critiquing *clientela* and *amicitia*, I will argue that satiric captation narratives serve to comment on the difficulties inherent in an entirely different "system"—literary succession.

The state of satiric captation and the current project.

There exist only two book-length studies of captation (both unpublished dissertations). Schmid (Tübingen 1951), examines passages from Greek and Latin satiric literature as documentary evidence for legacy hunting as a historical reality. Mansbach (Princeton 1982), focuses on precisely defining the term *captatio* (for example, she is concerned with the insufficiency of the term "legacy hunting" as a translation, and with the legal difference between captation and the use of force or fraud in securing bequests). She also reexamines the validity of using literary sources to attempt to recreate social reality and distinguishing incidents of captation in literature from other evidence (for example, legal texts) to understand the real-life phenomenon. She cogently argues against the use of satiric and moralistic philosophical texts (which together form the bulk of

appearances) as sufficient evidence to justify the practice of captation as a widespread social problem, on the grounds that attestations in this type of literature are by nature biased in their judgments and "subject to the theory of imitation." As she observes, "once *captatio* becomes a *topos*, [it is difficult to know] how much weight to give each text as affording independent witness to contemporary social *mores*."[26] Mansbach's work concludes with an alphabetical appendix of testamonia (pages 118-35), which is admittedly drawn from the collection of Friedländer, supplemented by Schmid. Other treatments use the literature as a reflection of the issue of legacy hunting and other testamentary matters (the nature of the Roman will, the often-cited and not particularly accurate Roman "horror of intestacy"), or seek to understand the property rights that were affected by disposition of an estate to extrafamilial recipients.[27] When captation is treated in literary criticism of comedy or satire, it is often lumped together with other general forms of flattery and sycophancy, and it is not identified as a separate and unique satiric element. Up to this point in time, there is no treatment of *captatio* exclusively as a device employed by satiric authors for literary purposes, nor one that considers the three most significant sources for satiric *captatio* individually, each within its own context.

---

[26] Mansbach (1982, 4 and 114). Her argument is a welcome correction of the prevailing view (persisting even quite recently in some quarters) epitomized by Tracy (1980, 399; herself citing Samuel Dill's *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*): "captation was a common phenomenon in ancient Roman times from the days of the Republic, the pursuit of the heirless rich aided not only by the attitude of a society in which 'trade, industry and even professional skill, were treated as degrading to the men of gentle birth,' but by the cult of childlessness among the idle rich."

[27] The famous claim that Romans evinced a "horror of intestacy" was made by Maine (1864, 216), and has been attacked by Daube (1964), whose point that this compulsion to testacy is applicable to only one small band of the Roman population—those who were able to leave wills and who had property to distribute posthumously, Champlin (1989, 209 n.40) concedes.

Horace *Sermones* 2.5, the Croton episode of Petronius' *Satyrica*, and Juvenal's *Satire* 12 are by far the fullest presentations of legacy hunting in Roman literature, and in addition, share several common features that emphasize their cohesion as a group of texts. To begin with, they exhibit similarities at the level of plot—each of these narratives present captation in relationship to storm and shipwreck, and corvine references conspicuously appear in each. More importantly, each text contains abundant evidence of programmatic and metaliterary concerns. These manifest as reinterpretations of famous scenarios from epic, (often using direct quotations from the originals), prominent inclusion of the names of famous poets of the past, and an interest in characters' putting on performances (for example, staging plays or taking up dramatic roles).

This set of texts, however, as the following chapters will demonstrate, makes substantial (if under-recognized) contributions to the artistic program of the works or corpora to which they belong. Each is important in its own right for these reasons, but they are all particularly exceptional as evidence of their authors' acknowledgement and revision of the metaphors presented by the others. The current project reveals that captation serves as a forum for the development of metaliterary metaphors describing persistent concerns about the place of the author in literary history. The texts are here discussed chronologically, beginning with Horace *Serm.* 2.5, so that the evidence of this process of transmission and revision may be best seen.

Chapter 2 examines *Sermones* 2.5—a creative reimagining of Odysseus' conversation with Tiresias in the Underworld from Homer's *Odyssey*. In Horace's version, Ulysses is advised by Tiresias to become a captator, with quite specific instructions on how to do so. The ways in which Horace plays with this famous epic

scene (imagining Ulysses as a captator playing the role of a comic flatterer, a pimp, and an interloper) as well as the strong literary-productive valence of the poem's diction indicate that the inheritance at issue is the literary legacy of Horace's predecessors. Key points of contact with other, deeply programmatic Horatian texts (notably *Sermones* 1.1 and 2.1) are addressed, as a case is made for the significance of *Serm.* 2.5 in the expression of Horace's artistic agenda (with connections pointing toward his later works as well). The chapter concludes with a discussion of the ways in which captation, as Horace presents it here, can be seen as the ideal metaphor for the artist's struggle to create a place for himself in literary history—a metaphor which Petronius will pick up some years later.

My treatment of the *Satyrica* in chapter 3 begins with an examination of the land of Croton as a distinctly literary space, and the arrival of the main characters to that unfamiliar city as an act of literary reinvention. The poetic philosophy of the poet Eumolpus, one of the novel's main characters, is chiefly influenced by Horace (particularly his *Ars Poetica*, but others of his texts as well, including *Serm.* 1.4), but Eumolpus has misunderstood and misapplied Horace's lessons. This misreading of a predecessor's work is emblematic of the dangers of consuming and producing literature, as the *Satyrica* suggests. With the Croton episode, Petronius can be seen to have taken up the metaphor of captation provided by Horace, but rather than characterizing the practice as "hunting" or "fishing" for legacies, he presents captation as cannibalism. My examination of *Satyr.* 132 (a scene in which a frustrated character, Encolpius, attempts to castrate himself, and ends up butchering Vergil instead) provides further evidence of dismemberment and cannibalism as images central to authorial anxieties about literary

succession. The case of a has-been captator who prostitutes her children is investigated as evidence of the literary meaning of captation in the Croton narrative. This is followed by a discussion of the connections between the *Satyrica* and Horace *Serm.* 2.5, specifically, and an analysis of the richly symbolic final scene of the novel—a mock funeral, at which a poet's heirs must publicly eat him in order to inherit. This final, quite literal presentation of literary inheritance as dismemberment and cannibalism reveals the dramatic transformation of the metaliterary captation metaphor presented by Horace as revised by Petronius. Juvenal, in turn, will take up the same task, as is discussed in chapter 4.

Juvenal's *Satire* 12 consists of a monologue by an unnamed speaker who relates to his silent interlocutor his preparations for a sacrifice of thanksgiving upon the return of his friend after a near-shipwreck. My analysis of this poem begins with an examination of this speaker's avowed motivations and how they are contradicted by his inadvertent revelations about himself. Despite his protestations that his friendship with the recently returned merchant is authentic, the speaker is revealed to be a "would-be" captator. Though he vociferously criticizes captators in the latter part of the poem, the speaker's own inadvertent self-characterization has undermined his position. This leads to a discussion of the themes of competition and exclusion in the poem, which correspond to the poetic program of Juvenal as expressed elsewhere in his satires. Indeed, the poem's shipwreck scene presents an example of literary competition, as an exaggerated reworking of the epic storm motif. Ultimately, the Juvenalian perspective on the prospect of winning status as the heir of one's literary predecessors appears fairly pessimistic—the author's task to make new great literature is made nearly impossible by society's

oversaturation in literature (of every quality). The dangers of creating literature in such an environment are conveyed through the metaphor for captation presented in the poem—competitive (and perhaps fruitless) sacrifice. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the evidence linking Juvenal *Sat.* 12 to both Horace *Serm.* 2.5 and to the Croton episode of the *Satyrica*.

A final chapter draws together themes linking all three poems directly, focusing specifically on references to captation as "fishing" and the presence in each work of mythic women whose identities are defined by weaving. The chapter concludes with a recapitulation of the transformation of captation metaphors identified across the three selected texts, from hunting/fishing to dismemberment and cannibalism to competitive and fruitless sacrifice.

The value of this study is twofold. First, it contributes significant insights to the extant scholarship on each of the individual works within the context of the author's corpus. Second, and more importantly, it identifies links among these three works that reveal the changing metaphors for captation as a lens through which to observe literary attitudes and authorial self-conception. It has long been understood that satire uses fictional stories to tell its audience the truth about the world—but in the case of captation in these texts, the truth concerns authorial anxieties, not social behavior. Satiric captation, previously considered (if considered at all) to be a piece of "real history"—the literary equivalent of a material artifact buried in the landscape of satire to be unearthed and studied to learn about Roman social history—is actually more like an infrared lens or a radio telescope, a tool through which otherwise invisible facets of the world can be observed and examined. Captation is not, in itself, particularly special—it is merely a

signifier that happened to suit the artistic aims of one, then another, then another Roman satirist, and in being used, it became useful. It is my expectation that Roman satire, enjoying its current and well-deserved renaissance, will yield countless other metaliterary lenses through which we will come to better know and more fully appreciate our own literary inheritance from Rome.

CHAPTER 2

Profiting from Predecessors: Horace, *Sermones* 2.5

In *Sermones* 2.5, Horace presents a humorous dialogue between Ulysses and Tiresias in an imagined continuation of their famous interaction from the *Nekuia* of Homer's *Odyssey*. In this alternate ending to the conversation, Ulysses seeks the deceased prophet's advice on how to restore his fortune, now devastated by Penelope's suitors. Tiresias instructs Ulysses to take up legacy hunting, ingratiating himself to wealthy childless individuals in order to be named a beneficiary of their estates.

Tiresias' advice to Ulysses is specific and extensive, ranging through every step of the con. Advice is given on how to court his "mark" initially (with gifts, social *obsequium*, and free legal representation) and how to deal with frustrations in his hunt (cast a wide net, don't be upset about the few that "escape with the bait").[28] Tiresias presents his advice in the form of direct instruction but also through allusive illustration, in the case of the inset episodes of Nasica and Coranus and the Theban widow—two humorous stories of thwarted captation. The seer goes on to offer Ulysses instruction on how to ensure testamentary recognition and manage the public appearance of the so-called "friendship" once he has entered the mark's good graces.

While this poem has been misunderstood as evidence for legacy hunting as a Roman social phenomenon[29] and has been enjoyed for its clever lampooning of the

---

[28] Roberts' (1984) suggestion that the structure of the poem particularly emphasizes the possibility of failure is discussed below.

[29] Coffey (1976, 86) says of 2.5 that in it "Horace uses the Hellenistic form of Homeric parody to expose the corrupting Roman practice of hunting for legacies particularly from the childless," and Palmer (1891, 328) asserts that *captatores* were "a class which in ancient Rome throve wonderfully." In his commentary on this satire, Fedeli (1994, 672)

heroic Odysseus and reverend Tiresias, it has not been recognized as particularly fruitful for philological investigation, and it is mentioned only in passing or overlooked entirely in most treatments of Horace's work—even those which primarily address the satires.[30] Of those sources that do treat *Sermones* 2.5 in any detail, the approaches have mainly focused on its degree of characteristic "Horatianness." Sellar, Fraenkel and others have identified this satire as the least "Horatian" and most "Juvenalian" of Horace's satires, based on the tone and topic of the poem, while others have fought against the characterization of 2.5 as unHoratian.

The controversy concerning the similarity (or not) of 2.5 to the satiric voice of Juvenal's poems originates with a comment by Sellar (1891, 70): "If Juvenal recognized any affinity between his own invective and the '*Venusina lucerna*,' it must have been with the spirit of this satire, and perhaps the second of Book i, that he found himself in sympathy." Fraenkel (1957) agrees with this statement (though he rejects the inclusion of

---

states that "al tempo di Orazio gli *heredipetae* dovevano costituire a Roma un vero problema," citing as evidence the appearance of the practice elsewhere in satire and in primarily moralistic texts. As recently as 1999, Alexander (1999, 350, n. 1) maintained that legacy hunting was "a sport much practiced in Roman society of the period of Augustus," explaining further that "the small birthrate of the prosperous classes, as a result of which, the rich without sons left wills frequently in favor of strangers, was in that epoch a fact of social preoccupation." This is of course the product of the understandable temptation to use satire, with its apparent frankness of voice, as reliable evidence of social reality rather than as a literary product.

[30] Among notable works on either the Horatian corpus or Roman satire, *Serm.* 2.5 does not receive more than passing mention in Fraenkel (1957), Knoche (1975), Armstrong (1989), Jones (2007), or Sullivan (1963)—and in this case, it is mentioned only as a side note in Sullivan's chapter on Petronius, not, as one might expect, in W.S. Anderson's chapter "The Roman Socrates: Horace and his Satires." Keane (2006) makes brief use of 2.5, but the poem is only mentioned in passing in Hooley (2007) and does not appear even once in Locandro (2008). It is surprisingly left in the cold in Freudenburg (1993), as well as in the recent collections edited by Freudenburg for Cambridge (2005) and Oxford (2009).

1.2 in the comparison, on the grounds that it is similar to Juvenal's oeuvre "only on the surface"), and he supports the "Juvenalian" argument by interpreting earlier scholars' comments in the context of Juvenal's influence on the definition of Roman satire. That is, though Zumpt (1843) and Last (1934) do not mention Juvenal in their assessments of 2.5 as (respectively) "one of the most vigorous [*kräftigsten*]" and "the most satiric" of Horace's satires, Fraenkel (1957, 144) sees support for Sellar's assertion in these remarks, since "the word satirical has, or ought to have, only one meaning, namely, consistent with the manner of Juvenal." This is perhaps what is meant by Palmer's (1891, 328) comment that 2.5 "more truly deserves the title of a Satire in the modern sense than any other of Horace's poems."

The strongest defense against Sellar's assessment is presented by Rudd (1966, 240-2), who examines the claim to the Juvenalian "spirit" of 2.5 in terms of subject matter (captation), setting (*nekyia*), form (dialogue), and irony (in which Rudd finds Horace 2.5 similar only to Juvenal 9). Rudd (1966, 242) concludes that "in the end Sellar's dictum boils down to something like this: 'Sat. 2.5 has a nasty subject; nasty subjects (though not this one) are commoner in Juvenal than in Horace. *Sat.* 2.5 is unusually sarcastic in tone; sarcasm (though not this kind of sarcasm) is common in Juvenal. Hence 2.5 is Juvenalian in spirit.'" Rudd's pointed refutation of the "Juvenalian" reading ought to deter critics from this trivial and dismissive approach to such a complex poem. In any case, 2.5 is certainly unique in that it is the only mythological dialogue among Horace's satires, as well as the only poem in the second book in which Horace himself does not appear as a character. That the poem is exceptional seems to have

contributed to its being overlooked for so long, when in fact, its unusualness should draw the attention of scholars all the more.

Both Boll (1913) and Rudd (1966) have made contributions of lasting significance to our understanding of *Serm.* 2.5, in terms (respectively) of its place within the second book of satires and the ingenuity that the poem displays. Since Boll's initial suggestion that the entire book is composed of two halves, four sets of parallel pairs (2.1 and 2.5; 2.2 and 2.6 and so on), scholars have come to consensus that Ulysses' consultation with Tiresias in 2.5 is at least in some way related to the satirist's consultation with the jurist Trebatius (2.1). This powerful insight has not, however, produced as much discussion as one might expect, particularly since *Serm.* 2.1 is considered the locus of Horace's statement of the second book's programmatic agenda. The connection Boll identified between these two poems will be important for my argument, and I will offer further exploration of this pairing (as well as connections between 2.5 and other programmatic poems in the *Sermones*) below.

In his chapter on *Serm.* 2.5, Rudd (1966) refutes some prevalent yet unproductive (and in fact reductive) views of the poem, attempting to narrow critical focus onto the artistry of the *poem itself*, rather than situating 2.5 within the realms of philsophical discussion of Odysseus' Homeric character or the literary lineage of Homeric burlesque.[31] Dismissing the idea that *Serm.* 2.5 must bear close ties to the works of other

[31] Rudd responds directly to Fiske's (1920, 400-2) claim that Horace *Serm.* 2.5 owes its structure to a satire of Menippus, and participates in a tradition of philosophical criticism by presenting Tiresias as a *χρηματιστικός* sage recommending to Odysseus (the Stoic model of virtue) that he behave as a *κόλαξ*. Fiske's problematic claim is expressed in equally problematic terms in the summary of his argument: "this satire [*Serm.* 2.5] is related with special definiteness to certain tendencies, and stock types of popular Cynic-

poets who wrote satiric versions of *nekyiai*, Rudd (1966, 239) emphasizes the uniqueness of the poem, concluding that "the scanty fragments we possess [from the *nekyiai* of Lucilius and Varro] indicate a treatment so different from Horace's that only the vaguest and most general kind of influence can be assumed." In addition to debunking critical approaches that seek to understand the poem only in terms of derivation or mimesis, Rudd emphasizes the ways in which *Serm.* 2.5 is unique. Worthy of special note is his careful tracing of two specific threads running through the text: the transformation of the imagery used for legacy hunting within the poem and the meaning of the two references in the poem to the name Dama (at 2.5.18 and 101). Rudd finds a great deal of creativity in the irony of the hunting and fishing metaphors that are developed through the poem (in order: using a bird as a lure; fishing with a baited hook; stalking game; depicting a bird as the predator). He also brings to the fore the story implicit in the two references to Dama—namely, that in the background of the conversation between the dialogue's speakers is a sort of moving picture of Tiresias' vision of Ulysses as a captator, at first giving "filthy Dama" the wall, then eventually (after his con has been successful and his mark has died) lamenting his "friend" Dama's death and attempting to disguise his joy at being named heir.[32]

Though not as groundbreaking as either Boll or Rudd, other authors have made some interesting points about *Serm.*2.5 that also deserve mention. Roberts (1984) argues

---

Stoic exposition, while the parallels between Lucian and Horace make it probable that Menippus at least suggested the framework of the Horatian satire" (402). Using a sort of circular logic, Fiske comes to the conclusion that Horace and Lucian both look back to the philosophical-critical purpose of the Menippean "original" (which must be reconstructed through Horace and Lucian).

[32] Rudd (1966) 234.

that the poem's internal structure focuses the reader's attention to lines 45-69 (the story of Nasica and Coranus in particular). This passage highlights the possibility of failure for the captator who chooses the wrong target for his flattery (that is, a *captandus* equally devious as the captator). This leads Roberts to discuss two other passages that follow the Nasica and Coranus story, and which in his view are related to it: the anecdote about the old woman of Thebes and the canine characterization of Penelope. He suggests a connection between the "failure" story of Nasica and Coranus and the revenge of the captated Theban widow, whose oiled corpse (as he indicates) cannot but combine in the reader's mind with the degrading description of Penelope. The result, Roberts suggests, is the essential dehumanization of the captator—Penelope, an accomplice to Ulysses' proposed captation scheme, is a dog feasting on the greasy corpse of the captated. The connection between these images is interesting and useful, though Roberts' conclusion seems to suggest that he, too, is working exclusively within the framework of the first line of inquiry about the poem I outlined above—his assessment is that this dehumanization and criticism of the captator is Juvenalian in its *indignatio*, (more shocking and lurid than Horace's other satiric work) and yet shows restraint compared to Juvenal himself.[33]

Though not focused in particular on poem 2.5, Marchesi's (2005) work on animal fable in Horace and Petronius can be usefully employed to extend Roberts' analysis of the (apparently) alarming metaphorical dehumanization of the captator. She notices that

[33] Hence the article is subtitled "Restrained indignation."

animal fable in Horace is used particularly carefully,[34] and proposes that in Petronius, zoomorphic language is recognized by Trimalchio's guests as suggestive of servility and hence potentially discomfiting.[35] Being especially attuned to the language of fable, Marchesi recognizes an interesting miscommunication between the two speakers of *Serm.* 2.5: when Tiresias mentions the fable of the crow,[36] followed by the story of Nasica and Coranus, Ulysses asks for clarification: *quid tamen ista velit sibi fabula, si licet, ede* ("nevertheless, tell me, please, what this tale means"). It is Marchesi's view that the *fabula* to which the hero is referring is the fable (*fabula*) of the crow, not (as Tiresias interprets the request) the story (*fabula*) of Nasica and Coranus that the seer presently elaborates. The meaning of this misunderstanding is not explicated or discussed by Marchesi,[37] though her conclusion that "satire (in the broader definition of the term) proves particularly receptive among all literary genres to the incorporation of fables' plots or language and the negotiation of the issues of authority and power associated with them" (329) is nonetheless sound. While the connection between this reference to fable and servility is not explained in her article, her recognition of the miscommunication

---

[34] She notices that only the satiric poetry of Horace (in which she, like Rudd (1986) and others, includes the *Epistles* as well as the *Sermones*) allow any allusion to animal fable, and even then, only with deliberate distancing of the narrator from the markedly low literary register of fable.

[35] The analogous relationship between animals and slaves in literature has long been recognized, particularly in scholarship on Apuleius' *Golden Ass*. Fitzgerald's (2000) chapter "Enslavement and Metamorphosis" is especially useful on this topic.

[36] The fable alluded to here is variously identified, and though Marchesi believes that the story in question is that of the crow and the cheese, she acknowledges the difficulty in isolating the exact fable meant here (315, n. 27).

[37] Her analysis of this very interesting passage is limited to the following: "To an inquiry about the meaning of a *fabula* Horace's text thus answers with the explanation of what to Ulysses appears as a *παραβολή* (and is, in fact, for the extradiegetic audience, an *historia*). The crow evoked in the animal metaphor for the legacy hunter and in the language of Ulysses' question remains unexplained and silent" (315).

between the speakers and her identification of such a misunderstanding of terminology is consistent with Horace's interest in programmatic puns (discussed below).

As can be seen from the summary of active perspectives on *Serm.* 2.5, and despite the hints that the poem contains compelling elements and literary promise found by a handful of scholars, the poem has not received sufficient serious scholarly attention. This neglected poem, however, is a metaliterary jewel, whose artistry rewards close examination, and which sheds significant light on Horace's identity as a satirist. Beginning with the way that the specific instructions given to Ulysses in the "*ars captandi*" subvert the Homeric figure of Odysseus, I will examine the intricate web of metaliterary cues woven into the poem that show Horace as satirist practicing what Tiresias preaches—living off of an enormous literary inheritance gained through his (poetic) wiles.

The contrast provided by the prophet's picture of the successful legacy hunter on the one hand and the familiar character and deeds of Homer's venerable Odysseus on the other is certainly enough to make the satire humorous in the manner one might expect of the "gentle" and genteel satirist Horace. There is more here than meets the eye, however. Every familiar aspect of Odysseus' character is subverted by Tiresias' plan for Ulysses. The "man of many wiles" is at a loss for a plan, and the solution proposed is that the noble hero of epic poetry debase himself to the point of becoming a slave from the comic stage (*Davus sis comicus atque/ stes capite obstipo, multum similis metuenti.* "Be a comic Davus and stand with your head bent down, as if very scared" 91-2). The best of the Achaeans in public speech is directed to be silent, lest he annoy his wealthy "friend," and to become a flatterer, inflating the ego of a lesser man in the hope of financial gain (96-

8). Odysseus won the great honor of receiving Achilles' armor through his outstanding argumentation, a skill that Tiresias instructs Ulysses to now turn toward defending wealthy litigants of every deplorable sort (27-31). The "man of sorrows" is told to shed crocodile tears at the welcome funeral of his mark. Under Tiresias' tutelage even the relationship between Ulysses and Penelope—the classic paragon of marital fidelity—devolves into the collusion of pimp and gold-digging bitch (as she is vividly characterized at line 83).

The model Tiresias presents of Ulysses the captator is an upside down, through-the-looking-glass image of the Homeric figure of Odysseus—and the subversive use of the *character* of Odysseus, Homer's hero, is consistent with the satirist's subversive use of the *Odyssey* itself to accomplish his artistic purpose. The central theme of the dialogue—captation—will prove to be a key to this metaliterary interpretation of the poem, but first it will be necessary to look in more detail at the cues within the poem that signal the self-consciousness of the satirist's product.

Throughout 2.5 a concern with literature and writing is apparent, and epic looms large in the satire even beyond the obvious adoption of the Homeric context for the dialogue. Horace includes a number of specific allusions to Homer's epics within the poem, perhaps most obvious among them the rendition of Odysseus' apostrophe to his heart from *Odyssey* 20.18-21 that occurs at lines 20-21:

> 'Fortem hoc animum tolerare iubebo;
> et quondam maiora tuli.
> [*Serm.* 2.5.20-21]
>
> I will order my steadfast heart to bear this;
> indeed I have endured greater evils in the past.

> *"τέτλαθι δή, κραδίη: καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο ποτ᾽ ἔτλης.*
> *ἤματι τῷ ὅτε μοι μένος ἄσχετος ἤσθιε Κύκλωψ*
> *ἰφθίμους ἑτάρους: σὺ δ᾽ ἐτόλμας, ὄφρα σε μῆτις*
> *ἐξάγαγ᾽ ἐξ ἄντροιο ὀϊόμενον θανέεσθαι."*
> [*Od.* 20.18-21]
>
> "Patience, my heart. You endured worse than this before,
> when the Cyclops, with irrepressible strength, ate my
> stalwart companions: yet you held firm until cunning
> led you out from that cave where you thought you would die."

The Homeric original is situated just before Odysseus, wildly outnumbered, begins his assault on the suitors who have overrun his home and attempted to usurp him. The comparison that is indicated by the situation of the Homeric passage indicates that the unsavory and potentially deadly battle against a huge number of rivals for his power is at least to some degree less unbearable for Odysseus than having to watch, helpless, as his companions and subordinates were eaten alive by the monstrous Cyclops. The implication of the allusion in 2.5 to the Homeric passage is that for Horace's Ulysses, the idea of subordinating himself to a social inferior by giving him the wall is on the same scale as committing grisly domestic slaughter in his own home or failing to protect those who depended upon him for their survival. This deflation of the poignant Homeric model is humorous, but it is also interesting to note that the threat faced by Odysseus (usurpation of his home, family, and wealth) is the very behavior that Tiresias encourages Ulysses to practice. Poverty due to the invasion of the suitors (and the threat of replacement through a quasi-legitimate marriage) can be remedied by *Ulysses* ingratiating *himself* into a quasi-legitimate relationship with a wealthy (if socially inferior) man.

Homer is not the only epic target in the poem, however—in lines 39-41 overblown Roman epic is lampooned, with the (apparently) bad poet Furius specifically named.

> persta atque obdura, seu rubra Canicula findet
> infantis statuas seu pingui tentus omaso
> Furius hibernas cana nive conspuet Alpis.
> [*Serm.* 2.5.39-41]
>
> Stand firm and endure, whether the red Dog-Star cleaves
> the speechless statues or Furius, distended with fat tripe
> spit-spatters the wintry Alps with white snow.

These two metaphors (summer represented by the personified Dog Star and winter by Furius' snow-spitting) may be drawn from different authors, and while commentators do not agree on the identification of this Furius with Furius Bibaculus, it seems clear that he is the same "turgid" poet (nicknamed Alpinus) mocked at *Serm.* 1.10.36-39.

In addition to epic, comic drama is also a constant presence in the poem, both in the familiar figure of the parasite or flatterer conjured by Tiresias' advice and also in the specific instruction to Ulysses to make himself over into a *comicus Davus* (2.5.91). Against this mish-mash of generic influences, some much more complex indications of self-conscious literariness are present in the poem, and it is to these I shall now turn.

As may be expected, the first few lines of this poem are particularly densely packed with meaning, and warrant a close reading.

> 'Hoc quoque, Tiresia, praeter narrata petenti
> responde, quibus amissas reparare queam res
> artibus atque modis. quid rides?'
> 'Iamne doloso
> non satis est Ithacam revehi patriosque Penatis
> aspicere?'

‘O nulli quidquam mentite, vides ut
nudus inopsque domum redeam te vate, neque illic
aut apotheca procis intacta est aut pecus; atqui
et genus et virtus nisi cum re vilior alga est.’
[*Serm*. 2.5.1-8]

“In addition, Tiresias, beyond the things already said,
tell me: by what skill or method shall I seek to recover my lost
property—what are you laughing at?”
“Oh, so now
it is not enough for the tricky one just to be borne back to Ithaca
and to behold your paternal Penates?”
“Deceiver of no one ever, you see that
I will return home naked and penniless, since you are a prophet,
and there neither the storehouse nor the flock is untouched by the
suitors; yet birth and courage unaccompanied by money are worth
less than seaweed.”

Ulysses’ question appears straightforward initially—he wants advice on rebuilding his devastated wealth—but he scarcely gets the question out of his mouth before Tiresias begins laughing. The question *quid rides?* sets the tone for Tiresias’ sarcastic response, but more importantly, it is a verbal marker that recalls *Serm.* 1.1.69—part of a passage that presents several examples of men who continually and perversely strive to possess more than they have.

At bona pars hominum decepta cupidine falso
‘nil satis est’ inquit, ‘quia tanti quantum habeas sis.’
quid facias illi? iubeas miserum esse, libenter
quatenus id facit: ut quidam memoratur Athenis
sordidus ac dives, populi contemnere voces
sic solitus: ‘populus me sibilat; at mihi plaudo
ipse domi, simul ac nummos contemplor in arca.’
Tantalus a labris sitiens fugientia captat
flumina—quid rides? mutato nomine de te
fabula narratur. congestis undique saccis
indormis inhians et tamquam parcere sacris
cogeris aut pictis tamquam gaudere tabellis.
nescis quo valeat nummus, quem praebeat usum?
[*Serm*. 1.1.61-73]

> But a good part of men, trapped by deceptive desire say "nothing is enough, when you are only as great as what you have."
> What can you do for this sort? You may as well tell him to be wretched, since he freely makes this the case: likewise a certain Athenian is recalled, a man filthy and rich, whom the voices of the people scorned; having grown accustomed to it he would say: "the people hiss at me, but I pat myself on the back at home, as I count the money in my strong-box." Thirsty Tantalus grasps for the stream receding from his lips—what are you laughing at? With a different name the story is about *you*. With your sacks of cash piled up everywhere you try to sleep on top, yawning, and you are compelled to abstain from them as sacred relics or to find happiness in them only as museum pieces. Do you not know what money is for, what enjoyment it provides?

In this passage, the speaker of poem 1 continues his attack on those for whom nothing is ever enough, providing three examples to illustrate the pitfalls of avarice. The first example is an archetype: the man who believes that his social standing is proportionate to his wealth, a perspective that the satirist immediately dismisses as hopeless to help. The second example, likened to the first, is the Athenian miser who hoards his money, never using it as if out of devotion (either religious or curatorial) to the cash. This man is living out the punishment of Tantalus[38] (the passage's third example), only he is doing it *by choice* rather than being forced to do so, in that he surrounds himself with resources that he does not allow himself to use. The comparison of the Athenian[39] to Tantalus is apt, clearly, but the comparison of the hopeless first type of man to the miser is notably not. As Brown (1993, 95 n. 64-7) has indicated, "the admission *populus me sibilat* (66) reveals the fallacy of the premiss *tanti quantum habeas sis* (62)."

[38] Brown (1993, 95 n. 65-72) notes that both Teles and Lucian (*Timon* 18) have used Tantalus as an illustrative comparison to the greedy man's lot.
[39] Pseduo-Acron identifies this man with Timon (Brown p. 95, n. 64-7).

In fact, it seems that the miser's stinginess is the very cause of the people's disdain. Why, after all, would the people be bothering to hiss at the miser, except for the fact that he is *sordidus ac dives*—lowly and wealthy at the same time. This situation hints at the competitive envy at the heart of satire 1.[40]

Immediately following his comparison of the Athenian miser and Tantalus, the satirist breaks off to issue a chastising apostrophe to the audience. "Thirsty Tantalus grasps for the stream receding from his lips—what are you laughing at? With a different name the story is about *you*." As has been noted, the sudden break in the dramatic scenario of poem 1 caused by the address to the audience serves to freeze the smiles on our faces, pointing out our own vulnerability to criticism. This is characteristic of Horace's brand of satire, and as Hooley (2007, 35) notes, with this passage "for a moment, Horace had [the audience] worried...with the lightest of touches [he] has shown that he can be a little serious." The importance of *quid rides* in signaling a link between the opening lines of 2.5 and this passage from poem 1.1 lies in the programmatic message imbedded in this section of the first satire.

Just a few lines before *quid rides?* at *Sermones* 1.1.62, Horace presents a significant sentiment from the mouth of his target, the greedy man: "nothing is enough" he says "since you are considered only as great as what you possess." The recognition that Horace makes use of the verbal similarities among *satur, satis,* and *satura* is

[40] Brown (1993, 89) notes that "at 117-9 Horace presents the formal answer to his opening question; man's general dissatisfaction with life stems from the competitive envy (an aspect of *avaritia*) just described." Brown identifies "competitive envy" with the aspect of the insatiable craving known as *πλεονξὶα* that is concerned with not only having more than what one does, but having more than what others have.

widespread,[41] and Freudenburg (2001, 28) in particular has emphasized the importance of the concepts of "enough" and "limit" in Horace's vision of his work within the genre of satire. The wordplay between *satire*/*satura* and *satis* found here is a programmatic identification for Horace's refined, non-Lucilian brand of satire, and Horace the satirist seems concerned with defining himself in terms of his use of resources—just as his satire ostensibly presents moral instruction on how much is "enough." It is important that the greedy man in 1.1 states that what others think of him has motivated his avarice—he is judged by others based on the extent of his wealth.

Returning to poem 2.5 we see that several details of the context surrounding the interjection *quid rides* are common between the two poems. The passage from poem 1.1 was concerned with how much is "enough," and Tiresias' first words in response to Ulysses ask the question *non satis est?* ("so *now it is not enough* just to get home safely?"). The recurrence of the loaded programmatic concern with "what is enough" from poem 1.1 is reinforced by another feature that links the two poems. Ulysses' complaint at line 8 that "birth and character are worth nothing without wealth" reflects the same concern expressed by the greedy miser of 1.1—that he must hoard his wealth in order to be thought well of by others. Of course, as noted above, the miser's unpopularity seems to prove that the converse of Ulysses' statement is also true (that having wealth without status is equally insufficient socially). The interest in the concepts of wealth,

[41] See esp. Freudenburg (2001, 28-32), where the significance of *non amplius addam* in the final line of *Serm.* 1.1 is discussed in conjunction with the sat* pun. Also Schlegel's (2005) chapter entitled "The Limits of Satire, *Iam satis est*" on *Serm.* 1.1-3 (esp. 20-1), Freudenburg (2005, 7-8), Gowers (2005, 58), Rutherford (2007, 254) and Hooley (2007, 34). Van Rooy's (1965, 1-29) chapter on the possible meanings of the word *satura* is particularly helpful for understanding the basis of the pun.

satis, external judgment of an individual's value, and the question *quid rides* in both 1.1 and 2.5 combine to form a clear programmatic link between the agendas of these poems. As Muecke (1997, 80 n.1-3) notes, the placement of *quid rides* in poem 2.5 is important—its position at the center of a line which opens with *artibus* and ends with *doloso* is ironic. That the man known for being "full of wiles" should need to seek advice on what "tricks" might help him win his wealth back provokes a smile in the reader. It is notable also that the verb *capto* appears in 1.1 in reference to Tantalus' attempts to quench his thirst—this is the same verb used for the legacy hunting enterprise suggested by Tiresias at 2.5.23-4 (*captes astutus ubique / testamenta senum*). Indeed, the standard term for the practice of legacy hunting, *captatio*, arises from the verb's use in *Sermones* 2.5, and we shall see that captation is not just the subject of the poem's plot (and a means of gaining both wealth and status at once), but is also the answer to the artistic question which underlies the scenario of the dialogue.

The Artistic Agenda of *Sermones* 2.5.

Ulysses' question for Tiresias at lines 2-3, (*quibus amissas reparare queam res artibus atque modis*) is of central importance to the plot of the poem, but it can also be read as an artistic one, posed by the poet from behind the mask of Ulysses, that is: "by what *art* or *modes* can I seek to *renew* lost material?"

Several of the words in Ulysses' question are laden with ancillary meaning. *Ars* is the primary term used for poetic skill and craftsmanship. *Modus* is the rhythm, beat, or musical mode of poetry and it can be read as a term for poetry itself. *Reparo* is used of "recovering" something lost, but also has the sense of "renew," "reinvigorate," or "revive." In the first lines of the poem, the author has established a poetic quandary—

how his poetic abilities might revive the literature of the past—and couched it artfully within the dramatic context of a humorous scene of epic parody.

Reading the central question of the poem in this way leads us to consider Tiresias' suggested solution through a literary lens as well. If the question is "how can a clever poet revive neglected literary material?" the answer seems to be "by becoming the heir to his predecessors' literary legacy." And in poem 2.5 we see Horace doing just that—drawing his situation and characters from Homer, and investing them with comic and even philosophical elements to create a new and productive mode of literature—his brand of satire. In redefining satire for himself, Horace does not need to respond to only Lucilius as a predecessor, but to other revered authors also; he is the beneficiary not just of satire's legacy, but of epic's and comedy's as well. In fact, although Horace's own project may not be considered a direct descendant of Homeric epic, it utilizes the "estate" of Homer more productively than at least some of the heirs apparent (namely, the work of Furius) have proven capable of doing.

Just as the Homeric character of Odysseus is subverted and repurposed toward a new end, Horace undermines the *pathos* of the *Nekuia* passage of the *Odyssey* in service of his own poetic message. Horace is the captator, or hunter, of literary wealth that can be used in the service of his own project, Horatian satire. Horace's use of the Homeric scene can be seen as a sort of extension of a common feature of the *recusatio*—the demonstration of the poet's skill at composing in the genre (usually epic) that he claims is beyond his artistic ability. It will be particularly useful to examine, then, the poem containing Horace's first true *recusatio* and (it is no coincidence) the partner poem to 2.5—poem 2.1.

Correcting previous commentators' failure to find an organizational principle in the second book of *Sermones*,[42] Boll (1913) recognized that the poems fell easily into matched pairs based on their subject matter and form.[43] There is much more to recommend a close connection between poems 2.1 and 2.5 than simply their common premise, consultation. In fact, at the center of each dialogue is a conceptual ambiguity of terminology which functions similarly in each poem.

Sermones 2 opens with the poet seeking advice from the famous jurisconsult Trebatius[44] concerning a satiric quandary—some find him too harsh, pushing the boundaries of the genre of satire, while others complain that his work lacks teeth. Trebatius' advice is that the poet stop writing altogether, or (once the poet makes clear that he cannot) to instead write panegyric as opposed to satire in order to avoid revenge from powerful satiric targets. Horace invokes the protection of a powerful patron (Caesar himself), and is satisfied with a final (punning) conclusion that he will violate no law as long as he writes *bona* rather than *mala carmina*. The ambiguity of the term *lex* in the poem allows the two speakers to arrive at an agreement without actually having understood one another entirely (and allows for the concluding pun on *mala*). Horace's initial question regards the *lex* of the genre of satire,[45] that is, whether or not his first book of *Sermones* falls within the boundaries of the *lex operis* of satire. Trebatius' response misses the point of the question, as the jurist assumes that a satiric poet would

[42] Notably Kiessling-Heinze (1910), Schanz (1911), and LeJay (1911).
[43] Boll (1913, 143): 2.1 & 2.5 "Consultation"; 2.2 & 2.6 "Ländliches Genügen"; 2.3 & 2.7 "Saturnalienpredigt"; 2.4 & 2.8 "Gastrosophie."
[44] This character is to be identified as the Trebatius Testa with whom Cicero corresponded and who was a member of Julius Caesar's retinue.
[45] For a discussion of useful evidence for the concept of the "law of genre," see Muecke (1995, 206).

be confused about the legal impact of his work—that is, whether the satirist's poems are punishable under the laws concerning defamation. It is interesting that Horace's identity crisis is in a way both completely missed and also resolved by Trebatius' assumptions—to him, Horace *is* a satirist (regardless of Horace's own uncertainty about the place of his work). The central joke of the poem is the misunderstanding between the two speakers concerning the topic of the conversation. Trebatius remains concerned only with the *legal* aspect of the word *lex*, while the poet is concerned with its *poetic* meaning. The resolution of the poem turns on the similar dual meaning of the evaluative terms *mala* and *bona*—Trebatius thinks that Horace will write poems that are inoffensive (*bona*) while the poet intends to continue his satiric project with attention to writing poems of high artistic quality (*bona*).

Poem 2.5 is not only linked to 2.1 by the common setting of a formal consultation, but also by the presence of a conceptual/linguistic ambiguity at the center of each dialogue. In 2.1, the meaning of the word *lex* is the issue. In the case of 2.5, it is the word *res* that is at the heart of the ambiguity, and it creates a miscommunication situation less between the two speakers than between the poet and the audience.

As we have seen, poem 2.5 shares several concerns in common with Horace's programmatic poem 1.1 (namely issues of boundaries/*satis*, wealth and worth in the eyes of others), and Ulysses' inquiry can be seen as a thinly veiled expression of a purely poetic dilemma (that is, how can the poet make use of his literary predecessors?) *Res* is both the wealth that the character Ulysses would like to restore as well as the established poetic material that the poet Horace would like to capitalize upon in his own project. Tiresias' response to the hero's question contains the answer to the poet's—captation, the

fraught art of insinuating oneself into the legacy of another without benefit of a direct (or even "legitimate") association. By utilizing the wealth (*res*) left behind by the poets who have come before him, Horace can build his own estate, establish a literary pedigree for himself (as an heir of Homer, for example), and create a new genre—Horatian satire. Just as the enterprise of legacy hunting is rife with potential pitfalls, (failure at any point in the con, but also the continuing danger of social alienation even if one succeeds), so is the enterprise of writing poetry for Horace. For the Augustan poet, the revered authors of the past (including the titan Homer) cannot be ignored, lest their long shadows obliterate the contemporary poet's work. On the other hand, attempts to either impersonate literary predecessors or to somehow pass as legitimate heirs through mimesis (as poets like Furius had done) are also doomed to failure. The only recourse for a poet like Horace is to acknowledge his debt to his predecessors, and attempt through his own poetic skill and effort to make his living off their estate.

The idea that there are rules governing the process of utilizing predecessors' material brings the concerns of poem 2.5 into close contact with the generic inquiry of 2.1. The epic setting of 2.5 presents a unique juxtaposition of the two genres discussed in 2.1—as Muecke (1995, 212) notes, "epic and satire can be presented as opposites on two interconnected grounds, style and purpose. Epic is written about heroes in the grand style, satire about scoundrels in the low style...The idea that character determines, or is bound up with, genre is also assumed by Horace for the purposes of his argument." 2.5 does not conform to the polarized model suggested by the "rules" implicit in poem 2.1—just as Horace and Trebatius come to agreement while operating on two parallel, but distinctly separate planes of discussion, the poet of 2.5 reorients the epic-satire continuum of poetry

by making an epic hero into a scoundrel and heroizing the base elements of his (prescribed and imagined) behavior (consider, for example, Ulysses' apostrophe to his heart).[46] That all of this is done within the shared meter of hexameter serves to further highlight the clever discord.

The utilization of Greek predecessors in particular will continue to be a concern for Horace in the *Odes* as well, and the presence in satire 2.5 of the loaded Augustan poetic term *vates* (2.5.6) connects this poem to the poetic self-identification agenda of Horace's lyric books. The word *vates* occurs at key programmatic points in *Odes* 1-3, including in Horace's famous hope to be labeled a *lyricus vates* at 1.1.35, and in 2.20, where he calls himself a *biformis vates* as he transforms into a swan. In fact, as J. K Newman (1967) notes in his study of the "*vates*-concept" in Augustan poetry, each occurrence of the term in the first three books of *Odes* is used to designate its subject as a special sort of inspired *poet*. Furthermore, he concludes of the "*callida iunctura"* phrase *lyricus vates* that "the whole history of the Augustan experiment in poetry can be read in these two words" (45). The fact that *vates*—which will come to represent the Roman and

[46] Freudenburg (2001) discovers an interesting depth to the mock-epic lines of poem 2.1.13-4 that hint at the same sort of concern with the ways that one can stumble and perhaps fall short attempting to live up to the epic works of predecessors. In short, he finds that the metaphor of the battle lines "bristling with javelins" is not simply reminiscent of ancient epic, but is in fact a pointed reference to a particularly clunky and unsatisfying line from Ennius' *Scipio*, which is itself a cause for derision of Ennius' poetry by Lucilius. Freudenburg summarizes the importance of this allusion thus: "By bringing in that 'bristling with spears' metaphor famously lampooned by Lucilius, Horace shows that his refusal to write panegyric epic is not just a matter of flagging strength, the standard Callimachean dodge. He gives an actual, remembered sample of just how thankless and unforgiving such enterprises could be...[panegyric epic] is to be refused because...the comfort it buys is purchased at a very steep, unrefundable price" (91-2). The poetic autonomy offered by establishing his own brand of satire, on the other hand, is perfectly suited to Horace's creative poetic imagination.

divinely inspired parts of Horace's poetic identity—appears only in 2.5 of all the *Sermones* is further evidence that this poem is particularly important for understanding the evolution of Horace's poetic identity. Interestingly, Newman himself discounted this early occurrence of *vates* as having no poetic significance (preferring to read it simply as "seer" here) because it is Tiresias who is called "*vates*" in 2.5, not Horace himself. However, as we have seen, with the character Horace absent, both speakers in this dialogue work to accomplish the satirist's objectives and both can thus be seen to represent the poet.

In *Serm.* 2.5 Horace presents a humorous reimagining of a familiar episode from Greek epic, but the topic has been changed to a detailed discussion of legacy hunting. Beneath the veneer of the plot, however, Horace the poet simultaneously examines his own use of the poetic *matter* (*res*) of his predecessors. In this poem he cleverly does to the works he "inherited" what the scenario does to the Homeric character Odysseus: he makes epic/Odysseus funny; he mixes Greek epic and other genres as he combines Homer's Odysseus with comedy's Davus to form the Horatian Ulysses; he recasts the work of his predecessors into a novel and distinctly Roman form. At the same time, Horace presents a critique of others who have unsuccessfully attempted to write themselves in as "heirs" of Homer—he shows with his parody of bad Roman epic that he is able to "play their game" but chooses to pursue his livelihood by using new arts and creating new modes of poetry (not by merely copying Greek epic into Latin).

Among Horace's *Sermones*, poems 1.4, 1.10, and 2.1 are the most explicitly programmatic, in that they contain direct references to the writing of satire and the relationship of Horace's satire to that produced by his predecessor, Lucilius. In these

poems Horace certainly spends more time *telling* his audience what he is doing (as a satirist) than he does in 2.5, but this poem nonetheless deserves programmatic recognition as well, since in the case of 2.5 the poem is *about* what the poet is *doing*—it establishes Horace as heir to the "estates" of his predecessors. Understood in this way, 2.5 becomes an essential piece of evidence for Horace's poetic self-identification and an early indication of some of the themes that he will develop further in the *Odes*.

Why captation?

Poem 2.5 introduces a new metaphor for the fraught and delicate relationship between a poet and his literary predecessors, but the reason why Horace chose this particular mode of succession—captation—rather than another to describe the process is worthy of consideration. Legacy hunting is not a flattering characterization of ones' livelihood, and this may be the reason that the metapoetic aspect of the metaphor clearly at work in 2.5 has not been identified to this point. Why would Horace describe his poetic project in such an unbecoming way? It is my belief that the employment of this metaphor is intended partly as practical description, partly as self-deprecation, and partly as humorous poetic play.

Among the means of deriving benefit from the wealth of others are approaches ranging from aggressive (usurpation, cooption) to entirely passive (gifts, biological inheritance) on the part of the recipient. The relationship that Horace sees between himself and those poets whose influence has shaped him is more respectful, creative, and active than either pole of this spectrum, and hence falls in a middle-ground. As a poet, he does not trample his predecessors underfoot, steal from them or pillage their legacies, but neither is he the passive recipient of inexorable, indisputable, and unexceptional

generational succession. Rather, he has thoroughly studied the available influences, sizing up the benefit that each can offer his own artistic project (satire), and has achieved the status of external heir through assiduous dedication to the living (if perhaps declining in relevance or vigor) works of Greek and Latin predecessors.

The stakes of his enterprise are huge, as the boundaries between his legacy hunting and either self-centered disrespect or toadyish mimesis can be indistinct and difficult to navigate. His path, as his nuggets of mock-epic bombast and the vignettes of failed captation illustrate, is littered with examples of those who came before him and failed to capture the favor of their targets, and whose efforts made them pariahs of the literary world. His success depends upon cleverness, but also upon his own self-awareness. His intimate familiarity with the literature of the past and his own poetic flexibility lend hybrid vigor to his brand of satire—combining elements of epic with those of comedy, high style with low, heroic characters with rogues, atemporal mythic space and themes with acute awareness of contemporary Roman social concerns. Given the difficulty of this endeavor, and the intellectual and rhetorical skill required for success, Odysseus is a perfect model for symbolically articulating the poet's own position.

Using captation as a metaphor for his poetic endeavor is not only a way to accurately characterize the fraught nature of his project, but also fits with Horace's deprecating mode of self-description in the *Sermones*. Throughout poem 2.5 literature has been good-naturedly mocked, and at points he offers subtle indications that he is happy to laugh at himself as well. Among the captatorial techniques suggested by Tiresias is the use of the target's praenomen as a mark of familiarity in conversation: "*Quinte" puta aut*

"Publi"(gaudent praenomine molles / auriculae) "tibi me virtus tua fecit amicum." ("Say 'Quintus' or 'Publius' (for tender little ears relish a first-name-basis) 'your character made me your friend'" (32-3)). The fact that Horace's own first name is Quintus cannot be lost on the reader. With the coincidence of the author's praenomen as that of the imagined mark, Horace at the very least offers a laugh at his own expense, but it is possible that there is more to the passage than just a passing joke. Of course there were a very limited number of Roman praenomina, but the pairing, in a highly self-referential and literary context, of the first names of Horace and his most famous poetic fellow—Vergil—begs exploration. In fact, Horace does mention Vergil by name at several points in the *Sermones*. A number of these references to Vergil predictably occur in 1.5 (which relates the journey of Horace, Vergil, Varius and others along with Maecenas to Brundisium), but the epic poet is also named in *Serm.* 1.6 (lines 52-55), and 1.10 (lines 44-5 and 81-4).[47] Of particular interest is the latter passage (1.10.81-4), in which the names of Vergil and other notable friends appear in a list of those whom Horace hopes to impress with his first book of *Sermones*. This "name-dropping" is meant to function just as Tiresias' suggestion that Ulysses' use of first names will do in *Serm.* 2.5—to flatter a receptive audience. In each of these poems, references to Vergil convey commingled issues of artistic and personal respect and influence, appropriately suited to the covalent function of captatorial name-dropping in *Serm.* 2.5. The fact that in each of the passages noted Vergil is referred to not by praenomen, but by "Vergilius" does not diminish the point. In any case, the poet's use of his own praenomen as a (not particularly) random

[47] Vergil is directly referenced in the satiric *Ep*. 2.1.245-50 and at *Ars Poetica* 52-9 as well. I am grateful to Christopher Nappa for helping me identify references to Vergil in Horace.

example of a potential *captandus'* name is notable, and lends additional significance to Tiresias' advice that Odysseus praise even the bad poetry of his mark (2.5.74-5): *scribet mala carmina vecors:/ laudato* ("Suppose he, crazed, writes bad poems: offer praise!"). Given the central concern with satire as (potentially) "bad poetry" (*mala carmina*) in this poem's partner, 2.1, Tiresias' suggestion is particularly resonant with meaning. In this passage Horace has again identified himself (a writer of poems which he admits some see as *mala*) with the object of legacy hunting. The poet himself is implicated in the activities of both captator and *captandus*—he shows himself to participate to some degree in both sides of this crafty pursuit. The meaning of this surprising revelation is that the life of poetic wealth is long and over time poets like Horace (and perhaps Vergil) serve as its beneficiaries and benefactors alike.

CHAPTER 3

The decomposing *corpus*: Legacy hunting in Petronius' "Literatureland"[48]

Petronius' *Satyrica* is a uniquely compelling and frustrating piece of literature. Because of its vivid presentation of characters and environments and its explicit and descriptive portrayal of "real life" pursuits--from dining, travelling, and conducting love affairs, to bathing, sorting out legal disputes, and administering an estate—the text tantalizes us with social historical riches. The *Satyrica* provides a vibrant picture of a chaotic and engaging world populated with amusing characters and near-tangible surroundings, and yet remains at the same time elusive. First and most obviously, the unanswered questions presented by the state of the text provide obstacles to its readers. The text is fragmentary and its form—prosimetric novel—is entirely unique, its original length is unknown, the identity of its author can only be speculated, its narrative frame has been lost, and the position of the extant portion within the original whole is not certain. The difficulties that arise from what we, as readers, do *not* have of the *Satyrica* are, however, dwarfed by those which arise from what we *do* have of it.[49] The work's vividness suggests it is a slice of (low) life, but the complex layering of countless references to literature creates for Petronius' audience an uncanny, surreal experience as the novel reverberates with remembrances of other works and appears tinged with the

[48] I have borrowed this effective and memorable nickname for the world of the *Satyrica* from Richlin (2009), and I find it especially suitable to Petronius' Croton in particular.
[49] I follow the text of Müller (2003), the current standard edition of Petronius, though arguments can and have been made for arranging fragments differently here and there. I have not concerned myself with challenging Müller's ordering of the text since my argument does not turn on the ordering of individual fragments.

influences of many disparate genres at once.

Literary references abound in the text and every episode contains allusion and parody, from discussions of literature and spontaneous poetic composition to explicit invocations of famous authors and works. In fact, the entire *Satyrica* is concerned with literature, particularly its reception and (mis)utilization by contemporary rogues. As Fantham (1996, 163) notes, "Petronius's novel is infinitely more complex in its reflection of both the literary production and the literary attitudes of his generation than can be conveyed in summary; it could fairly be called the single most powerful demonstration of the literariness of Nero's age, caught between admiration and competition with the authority of the great literature of the past, with Homer, with tragedy, and now with Virgil." It is not surprising, then, to find present in the *Satyrica* a persistent interest in literary succession, nor to find Petronius taking up Horace's metaphor of legacy hunting to describe it. The final portion of the extant novel takes place in the city of Croton, a land of legacy hunters, and by examining these chapters in light of the literary-metaphorical significance of captation, some light may be shed on the meaning of the *Satyrica*'s integral engagement with Literature.

Before proceeding to the novel's final setting, it will be useful to summarize the events that transpire before the characters' arrival at Croton. The narrating main character, Encolpius and his fellow con man Ascyltus, both rivals for the affections of their younger companion, Giton, seem to be making a living as teachers of literature.[50] A

[50] Conte (1996, 2 with n. 2) identifies Encolpius and Agamemnon as *scholastici*, a term for a wide range of individuals who frequent rhetorical schools, including pupils, teachers, and hangers-on or fans of declamation. The evidence for this is 10.6 (*tamquam scholastici ad cenam promisimus*) and 61.4, when a fellow dinner-guest says *timeo istos*

local rhetoric teacher, Agamemnon, secures for himself and the three companions an invitation (26) to a dinner party at the home of his wealthy and uncouth friend Trimalchio, a freedman. The narration of this infernal banquet (28-78), luxurious and vulgar, is the portion of the *Satyrica* both best loved and most commented-upon. Overwrought, perversely prepared dishes and cacophonous spectacles are presented by Trimalchio to his rowdy guests, and the chaos of the evening concludes when the noise of the host's mock funeral (71, 77-8) is mistaken for an alarm and the fire department breaks down the doors. After escaping the event, Ascyltus and Giton part ways with Encolpius (79-80), who eventually meets a prolific and terrible poet, Eumolpus, in an art gallery (83). Eumolpus, unbidden, offers spontaneous poems, artistic criticism, opinions and stories, until the two are run out of the area by angry bystanders (90). After reuniting with Giton (91) (and a brief fracas with an angry Ascyltus, an innkeeper, and onlookers, (95-99)), Encolpius, Giton, Eumolpus, and his slave find passage on a ship out of town (100). Unfortunately, they learn once at sea that the ship belongs to Lichas, a man whom

---

scholasticos ne me [de]rideant. Courtney (2001, 39-40) argues that the more likely interpretation of the ambiguous *tamquam* in the first passage is "as if we were *scholastici*" rather than "in our capacity as *scholastici,*" preserving misrepresentation as a precondition of the companions' involvement in the *Cena*, (misrepresentation which is perpetuated by the apparent relationship between Encolpius and Agamemnon noted by another dinner guest at 57.8, referring to Agamemnon as *magister tuus*). The interpretation that Encolpius and Ascyltus were making a living through teaching is consistent, however, with the circumstances of Encolpius' proposal at 10.4-5 (which occurs just prior to the *tamquam scholastici* line): that the two part ways in order to improve their individual success by eliminating competition with one another for customers: *rursus in memoriam recovatus iniuriae 'Asculte' inquam 'intellego nobis convenire non posse. itaque communes sarcinulas partiamur ac paupertatem nostram privatis quaestibus temptemus expellere. et tu litteras scis et ego. ne quaestibus tuis obstem, aliquid aliud promittam; alioqui mille causae quotidie nos collident et per totam urbem rumoribus different'* Though *aliquid aliud promittam* is quite vague, the premise that splitting up will be no detriment because the two each "know their letters" suggests that their livelihood is made by teaching literature or a related profession.

Encolpius and Giton had grievously wronged in an earlier (lost) episode, and that Tryphaena, another unwelcome figure from their past, is also on board. After considering several outrageous solutions to their problem (101-2), Eumolpus offers to have his barber shave the heads of Encolpius and Giton and "tattoo" their foreheads with pen-ink so that they might escape notice by acting as Eumolpus' slaves (103). This plan is foiled, however, when a fellow passenger notices the head-shaving, and superstitiously believing that the act has jinxed the ship (since shipwreck survivors cut and dedicate their hair once safely ashore), reports them to Lichas (104). A mock trial (with Eumolpus as self-appointed defense attorney) ensues (107), followed by another brawl, some dramatic threats to self by Giton and then Encolpius (108), spontaneous recitation of poetry (again), and finally peace (109). Eumolpus tells another story (about the widow of Ephesus) (111-2), which leaves Lichas bitter; Encolpius continues to nourish jealousy in his heart over Giton's mercurial affections (113). Suddenly a terrible storm erupts, Lichas is swept overboard, Tryphaena and her baggage are put into a lifeboat, and Encolpius and Giton lash themselves together as the ship is destroyed around them (114). When local fisherman arrive to salvage what goods they can from among the flotsam, they find the lovers still alive and rescue them instead (114). The poet Eumolpus, furiously composing verses and apparently oblivious to the wreck, is found in what is left of the pilot's cabin and is also dragged to shore (115). The next morning the companions (Encolpius, Giton, Eumolpus, and the slave Corax) discover Lichas' body and give him an impromptu funeral, then set out for the nearest town (115-6).

Arrival at Croton: A Literary Space.

The final extant episode of the fragmentary novel takes place in the once-great city of Croton, a place now populated exclusively by captators and *captandi*. Though it shares its name with an authentic Italian city, the Croton presented by Petronius is not a real place. Rather, it is a literary construction, an artificial arena in which artistic concerns can be explored, as its description reveals.

At 116, Encolpius and company, having left behind the shore on which shipwreck had deposited them, climb a mountain inland. It is from this vantage point that they first glimpse the city of Croton, situated atop a high ridge nearby (*impositum arce sublimi oppidum*). Scholars have recognized the disparity between this description of the city's location and the topography of the historical city, which was a low-lying seaport surrounded by hills.[51] Courtney (2001, 178) cites as referents for this scene both Aeneas' arrival at the *arx* of Carthage (*Aen.* 1.419) and its own model, Odysseus' arrival at Aeaea (*Od.* 10.148)[52] and states that "topographical accuracy is less important to Petronius than literary resonance." This, however, may be an understatement—in fact, the topographical inaccuracy serves to *highlight* the literary resonance of Petronius' Croton. Well-known Italian geography has been revised to provide the reader an interpretive cue and thematic

[51] The recent archaeological study of ancient Croton by J. Morter and J. Robb (2010, 16) notes that "This coastal corner forms a broad, relatively flat headland marked by the capes of Capo Colonna and Capo Rizzuto. It was an important landfall for shipping, as demonstrated by the large number of wrecks of all periods found along this stretch of coast. The city of Crotone—Croton in classical times—is just north of Capo Colonna. In antiquity, this was one of the few natural harbors along the entire coast." The authors do erroneously state, that the city was "mentioned as a port in the *Satyricon* of Petronius" (ibid.)—this error may be mitigated by the fact that the point bears only the remotest relevance to their argument, though it is essential to ours.

[52] *ἔστην δὲ σκοπιὴν ἐς παιπαλόεσσαν ἀνελθὼν*—this is the same line that appears at *Od.*10.97, in reference to Odysseus' arrival at the city of the Laestrygonians.

introduction to the action at Croton. The companions' arrival in this invented realm is designed to reflect a suitably literary outcome to the epic storm that shipwrecked Petronius' characters, (and to the poetic storm Eumolpus, unaware, had been frantically creating below deck at the time of the catastrophe). Rimell (2002, 140) sums up the situation well:

> "Parallels and overlaps between apparently distinct episodes make it difficult to determine when the poem ends and where 'real-life' narrative begins, or vice versa, thus problematising distinctions between and definitions of fiction and reality, poetry and prose. When Eumolpus and his gang enter Croton, therefore, just as the *Bellum Civile* ends at *Sat.* 124, they seem to be entering into the landscape represented in the poem itself."

The collocation of narrative and (imbedded) poetic storm, followed by the contrafactual physical situation of the city serves to present Croton as a metaspace—removed by a few degrees from the "real" world that the reader and author share, but retaining some recognizable features. Transportation to an alternate reality or an uncanny fictional realm is not uncommon in modern narrative art (film is particularly well suited to presenting such alternate worlds), but is notable here in ancient literature. Petronius' Croton is a fiction-space, defined in literary terms, in which literary matters are explored, as is confirmed by the description of the city by a local bailiff (*vilicus*) at 116.4-9:

> 'o mi' inquit 'hospites, si negotiatores estis, mutate propositum aliudque vitae praesidium quaerite. sin autem urbanioris notae homines sustinetis semper mentiri, recta ad lucrum curritis. in hac enim urbe non litterarum studia celebrantur, non eloquentia locum habet, non frugalitas sanctique mores laudibus ad fructum perveniunt, sed quoscumque homines in hac urbe videritis, scitote in duas partes esse divisos. nam aut captantur aut captant. in hac urbe nemo liberos tollit, quia quisquis suos heredes habet, non ad cenas, non ad spectacula admittitur, sed omnibus prohibetur commodis, inter ignominiosos latitat. qui vero nec uxores umquam duxerunt nec proximas necessitudines habent, ad summos honores perveniunt, id est soli militares, soli fortissimi atque etiam innocentes

habentur. adibitis' inquit 'oppidum tamquam in pestilentia campos, in quibus nihil aliud est nisi cadavera quae lacerantur, aut corvi qui lacerant'
[Petronius, *Satyr.* 116.4-9]

"My friends, if you are businessmen, change your plan and seek another livelihood. But if you are men of a more refined sort, and can put up with always lying, you're running directly toward profit. For in this city the study of literature is not honored, eloquence has no place, neither economy nor time-honored customs come to profit in glory, but whatever men you find in this city, be aware that they are divided into two groups: either they have fortunes being hunted, or they are hunting fortunes. In this city no one raises children, because whoever has his own heirs does not get into dinner parties or shows, rather he is prohibited from every advantage; he lurks among the disgraced. But men who have never taken wives and have no close relatives reach the greatest honors; that is, they alone are considered to be warriors, they alone the strongest and upright men as well. You're going to a town," the man said, "that is like plague-ridden fields: nothing but dead bodies being mangled or the crows that mangle them."

The bailiff warns the travelers to change their plans, if they are business men. He allows that they may succeed in Croton if they are *urbanioris notae* ("of a more urbane bent") and are happy to always tell lies, *since* (*enim*) in Croton the study of literature is not celebrated, eloquence has no place, and simplicity and traditional mores are ignored.[53] Those who are respected in Croton are without natural heirs—the opportunistic

[53] The oppositions posed within this characterization of the city are interesting and worthy of consideration. On the one pole the *vilicus* places honest business (*negotiatores*) alongside respect for traditional morals, interest in the study of literature, and possession (or at least appreciation) of eloquence; to these he opposes the quality of *urbanitas* and a willingness to lie incessantly. *Urbanitas* might be expected to coincide with *eloquentia* as a companion value, but in the bailiff's mind, these are qualities in opposition. Given the poetic-programmatic significance of the term *urbanitas* (particularly for Petronius' predecessor Horace), it is appropriate to consider the literary critical aspect of the bailiff's speech. Schmeling (1996, 474-9) has recognized that the rhetorical style of the bailiff's speech is quite elegant, and since, as Conte (1996, 24) has cogently argued, "irony is generated as a function of the disparity between the points of view activated in the narrative," the *vilicus'* dichotomy of values may be considered reliable to Conte's "accomplice"-reader. For more on the concept of *urbanitas* generally, see Ramage, 1973.

population is composed of urbane liars who care not at all for literature or eloquence and are motivated purely by greed.

In this debased city, it is particularly notable that eloquence and zeal for literature have no place, and that fathers with living children are especially reviled. The collocation of literary pursuits and biological reproduction, which may at first seem coincidental, recurs throughout the episode, and the connection provides a key to reading the attitudes and events at Croton as literary commentary. In fact, as the episode will ultimately reveal, the only literary production possible in Petronius' version of reality is *re*production, and it is marked as a particularly unwholesome and destructive variety of reproduction. The treatment of literature (including allusions, direct citations, and even literary-philosophical discourse) throughout the Croton episode reveals that Petronius has adopted Horace's invention of literary-satiric captation and has modified it to suit the aims of his own exceptional project.

Upon hearing the description of the city, the main characters, Encolpius, Eumolpus, and Giton, (having arrived penniless in this unfamiliar town) consider how they might most advantageously proceed. Eumolpus, the poet, devises a plan for the companions' survival—they will engage in the only occupation possible in Croton: legacy hunting. Rather than behave as Horace's "Ulysses-the-captator" however, and seek the favor of the town's prosperous elderly, Eumolpus devises a way to turn the long-con of legacy hunting to short-term profit. He proposes that the group act as legacy hunting bait—by posing as the entourage of an extremely wealthy and sickly old

widower temporarily stranded after a shipwreck. The *dives fugitivus*[54] in this case is to be played by Eumolpus himself—which, it appears, well suits his preference. Casting the other companions as his servants makes use of the shorn heads of Encolpius and Giton, recalling their (ultimately unsuccessful) servile disguises adopted on Lichas' ship. In this new charade, the group hopes to benefit immediately and indefinitely from the lavish attentions of the city's throngs of rapacious captators, and once they have worn out their welcome they will escape the city, depriving their legacy hunters of any promised testamentary benefit.[55]

In the course of the episode (as throughout the entire work), almost every genre of literature receives attention through direct reference, allusion, or parody. Upon first hearing Eumolpus' audacious plan for thriving in the land of the captators, the novel's main character, Encolpius, assumes that this must simply be *poetica levitate* "poetic fancy." He finds, however, that his companion has already clearly designated himself

---

[54] This character type is attested in Cicero and Seneca, see Panayotakis (1995), 158 n. 59.

[55] It is worth mentioning that during Encolpius' first meeting with Eumolpus in the art gallery, the poet had indulged in a rant against exactly the sort of people he now proposes to imitate: greedy opportunists focused only on the pursuit of money, people for whom no arts (logic, astronomy, philosophy, eloquence) are worth studying. Among the types he condemns for living on unearned wealth, he specifically mentions those seeking legacies: *ne bonam quidem mentem aut bonam valetudinem petunt, sed statim antequam limen [Capitolii] tangant, alius donum promittit, si propinquum divitem extulerit, alius, si thesaurum effoderit, alius, si ad trecenties sestertium salvus pervenerit.* "People these days don't even pray for 'sound mind in a sound body' but rather, before they even set foot on the threshold of the temple one man promises a donation in exchange for the death of a wealthy relative, another for finding buried treasure, and another for coming easily into three hundred thousand sesterces." (*Satyr.* 88.8) As it happens, Eumolpus is just the sort of opportunist that he criticizes, as he takes quite naturally to the new circumstances at Croton, and produces a successful plot in no time. *prudentior Eumolpus convertit ad novitatem rei mentem genusque divitationis sibi non displicere confessus est.* "More astute, Eumolpus turned his mind to the novelty of the situation, and admitted that he was not displeased with this mode of wealthification" (*Satyr.* 117.1).

director, bemoaning his limitations in scenery and selecting appropriate costumes and props to successfully stage their *mimus* ("mime.")[56] The use of technical terms from dramaturgy (*scaena, vestis, instrumentum*) situates the scene in a theatrical context[57] and—given the high degree of theatricality in the *Satyrica* generally—prepares Petronius' audience for a sort of play-within-a-play.[58] Immediately upon receiving their roles, the companions experience stock-situations from comedy, love elegy, epic and other literary genres. Encolpius' assignations with a wealthy woman named Circe,[59] negotiated by a go-between, are described in lines reminiscent of comedy, and the couple exchange love letters that evoke Roman love poetry. The dramatic speeches of the pair over their romantic difficulties approximate tragic laments. That their meetings take place in a carefully described *locus amoenus* and that Encolpius (confronted with bouts of impotence) resorts to love-magic and witchcraft recall pastoral poetry and novel.

The fact that this group of hapless con-men-of-letters does prosper in Croton is particularly telling. It is perhaps no surprise that a bad poet and an impotent teacher of literature excel here—this is exactly the world for which they are best suited. Croton is a debased literary space, and what happens here has literary meaning. Before examining

---

[56] Courtney (2001, 179) considers that Encolpius' provision of the garment (curiously described as *rapinae comes*) designates him as a *choragus*, the party responsible for providing costumes in the Roman theater.
[57] See Panayotakis 1995, especially p. 158-60.
[58] For a discussion of whether the *Satyrica* was intended for an audience of readers or listeners, see Slater 1990 and 2009 (the former draws a fairly staunch opinion favoring the reading audience model based on the poem of 80.9; the latter seems to revise the opinion to a more neutral stance, citing the same lines).
[59] Klebs (1889) first proposed that the structure of the *Satyrica* could be understood as a parody of the *Odyssey*, with a hero hounded through various exploits by the wrath of a god (Priapus, rather than Poseidon, in this case). For a concise discussion of the similarities see Courtney (2001, 152-7); Courtney (1991, 45); and Connors (1998, 27-33).

the role of captation in the Croton episode, it will be worthwhile to briefly consider the literary acumen of the architect of their captatorial ruse, the poet Eumolpus.

From their first meeting, Encolpius describes Eumolpus' incessant poetic performance as exhausting and even dangerous. Upon their first meeting, in the gallery, Encolpius identifies Eumolpus as a writer at first glance on account of his shabby appearance:

> ...intravit pinacothecam senex canus, exercitati vultus et qui videretur nescio quid magnum promittere, sed cultu non proinde speciosus, ut facile appareret eum <ex> hac nota litteratorum esse, quos odisse divites solent
> [*Satyr.* 83.7]
>
> A white-haired old man entered the picture gallery, who had a troubled expression that seemed to promise I don't know what greatness, if not likewise impressive in respect to his grooming, so that it was clearly evident by that mark that he was one of the literary sort whom rich men are accustomed to hating.

And the first utterance this stranger offers is a poem on the poverty of the artistic life. After relating the story of his time in Pergamum, Eumolpus, unbidden, launches into a 65-line poem on the fall of Troy, which prompts passers-by to begin pelting the poet with rocks—a reaction that Eumolpus finds not unfamiliar.

> *ex is, qui in porticibus spatiabantur, lapides in Eumolpum recitantem miserunt. at ille, qui plausum ingenii sui noverat, operuit caput extraque templum profugit. timui ego ne me †poetam vocaret†. itaque subsecutus fugientem ad litus perveni, et ut primum extra teli coniectum licuit consistere, 'rogo' inquam 'quid tibi vis cum isto morbo? minus quam duabus horis mecum moraris, et saepius poetice quam humane locutus es. itaque non miror, si te populus lapidibus persequitur. ego quoque sinum meum saxis onerabo, ut quotiescumque coeperis a te exire, sanguinem tibi a capite mittam' movit ille vultum et 'o mi' inquit 'adulescens, non hodie primum auspicatus sum. immo quotiens theatrum, ut recitarem aliquid,

> intravi, hac me adventicia excipere frequentia solet. ceterum ne [et] tecum quoque habeam rixandum, toto die me ab hoc cibo abstinebo'.
>
> [*Satyr.* 90.1-6]
>
> At this, those who were strolling in the porticos hurled stones at Eumolpus reciting. But he, who had become familiar with this reaction to his genius, covered his head and fled the temple. I was afraid that I might be called a poet myself. And so pursuing him in flight, I arrived at the shore, and so that we might be permitted to stay out of the line of fire, I said "What, I ask, are you after with this disease of yours? You have stayed with me less than two hours and you have spoken more often like a poet than a man. And so I am not surprised if the people chase you away with stones. I myself will load up my pocket with rocks, so that anytime you begin to leave your senses, I can leech some bad blood from your head." He lowered his head and said "my young man, not today have I first seen these signs. On the contrary, every time I have entered the theater for the purpose of reciting something, the crowd is accustomed to expel me with this unsual means. Lest I should have cause for quarrel with you too, I will fast myself from this diet[60] for the whole day.

Despite this promise, and in accordance with Encolpius' suspicion, Eumolpus is not able to suppress his poetic outbursts, even for one day. He holds forth on a variety of topics in verse throughout their pre-Crotonian adventures. His most substantial recitation is a *Bellum Civile* in 295 lines, recited on the road to Croton, begun just after he devised the "back-story" for the group and concluding just before their arrival at the city.

Eumolpus and Horace.

The *Bellum Civile* is a bad historical epic and the longest poem in the novel, and it is significant that it follows close on Eumolpus' presentation of his own poetic philosophy.[61] This statement of artistic values not only mentions Horace by name

[60] The conflation of literature with food in Petronius is discussed in more detail below.
[61] What to make of the longer poems in the *Satyrica* (the *Halosis Troiae* at 89 and the *Bellum Civile* at 119-24) has posed a difficult conundrum for critics, not least because they are each prefaced by Eumolpus' criticism of decline in the arts. A wide variety of interpretations of the *Bellum Civile* have been offered. Some have seen the poem as a

(alongside Homer and Vergil) praising his *curiosa felicitas*, but directly quotes the first line of *Odes* 3.1. Upon closer examination, Eumolpus' artistic manifesto reveals itself to contain many points of similarity to aspects of Horace's own programmatic works, specifically the *Ars Poetica* and *Sermones* 1.4, and Eumolpus' reading (or, more correctly, misreading) of his model, Horace has significant implications for our understanding of the entire Croton episode.

> Eumolpus: 'multos', inquit Eumolpus 'o iuvenes, carmen decepit. nam ut quisque versum pedibus instruxit sensumque teneriore verborum ambitu intexuit, putavit se continuo in Heliconem venisse. | sic forensibus ministeriis exercitati frequenter ad carminis tranquillitatem tamquam ad portum feliciorem refugerunt, credentes facilius poema extrui posse quam controversiam sententiolis vibrantibus pictam. ceterum neque generosior spiritus vanitatem amat, neque concipere aut edere partum mens potest nisi ingenti flumine litterarum inundata. refugiendum est ab omni verborum, ut ita dicam, vilitate et sumendae voces a plebe semotae, ut fiat "odi profanum vulgus et arceo". praeterea curandum est, ne sententiae emineant extra corpus orationis expressae, sed intexto vestibus colore niteant. Homerus testis et lyrici Romanusque Vergilius et Horatii curiosa felicitas. ceteri enim aut non viderunt viam qua iretur ad carmen, aut visam timuerunt calcare. ecce belli civilis ingens opus quisquis attigerit nisi plenus litteris, sub onere labetur. non enim res gestae versibus comprehendendae sunt, quod longe melius historici faciunt, sed per ambages deorumque ministeria et fabulosum sententiarum tormentum

---

parody, and not particularly serious, others consider the poem to be a criticism of Lucan's *Pharsalia* (that is, a demonstration of how Lucan should have treated the subject). Connors (1998) and Rimell (2002) offer particularly notable readings, both of which embrace, rather than diminish or disparage the poem's importance to the work as a whole. Connors examines the poem in terms of several themes (issues of genre and scope, as well as the relationship of Eumolpus' poem to Vergilian epic), finding the poem as characteristically inclusive of the entire contemporary Roman experience as is the rest of the novel. The first note of her chapter (100 n.1) offers an outline of salient critical perspectives on the purpose of the *Bellum Civile*. Rimell likewise seeks to discover the value of the poem as an inherent facet of the novel, and finds in it the same problematization with distinctions of "inside" and "outside" (of narrative structures, of bodies) and "real" versus "fiction" that she sees elsewhere in the *Satyrica.* Though an analysis of the mini-epic lies outside the bounds of the present study, I find these inclusive approaches to the longer poems of Petronius most convincing.

> praecipitandus est liber spiritus, ut potius furentis animi vaticinatio appareat quam religiosae orationis sub testibus fides: tamquam, si placet, hic impetus, etiam si nondum recepit ultimam manum'
>
> [Petronius, *Satyr.* 118.1-6]

> "My young friends" said Eumolpus, "Poetry has misled many. For as soon as each one has built his verse foot by foot and woven the sense through a rather delicate circumlocution, he's decided that he's immediately arrived on Helicon. Thus those trained in the work of the public courts have frequently escaped to the "tranquility" of poetry as if to a more hospitable port, believing that a poem can be constructed more easily than a forensic exercise decorated with shimmering little maxims. But nobler spirits do not love emptiness, and the mind is able neither to conceive nor bring forth issue unless it has been inundated with a great flood of literature. One must flee from every cheapness (as I call it) of vocabulary, and the modes of expression remote from the common crowd must be adopted so that "I hate the vulgar crowd and shun it" is put into practice. In addition, one must take care that the carefully modeled lines do not stand out from the body of the speech but shine with brilliance woven into the cloth. Homer is a witness to this, as are the lyric poets and our own Roman Vergil and the careful felicity of Horace. For others either have not seen the way by which one may advance toward song, or having seen it, they feared to embark upon it. Look, if anyone even touched the enormous work of (relating) our civil war, he would collapse beneath the burden, unless he were full of literature. For actual events are not to be gathered in verses, a thing which historians do much better, but the free spirit must be thrown headlong through circuitous ways and the works of the gods and the storied twisting of maxims, so that it appears more like the prophecy of a raging soul than the scrupulous loyalty (to fact) of a testimony under oath: as this foray, if I may, although it has not yet received the final touch..."

Eumolpus' statement is part aesthetic pronouncement, part rant, and in both respects, it reflects ideas presented in similarly programmatic poems of Horace. Like the *Ars Poetica*, Eumolpus' philosophy expresses concerns with internal integrity, propriety of register and diction; it insists that poets must first and foremost be skilled readers, and laments the fact that members of a dilettante class consider poetry their province as a leisure activity. Eumolpus characterizes the production of poetry as a skillful art using the

language of weaving (*intexuit, pictam*) and his argument closely follows Horace's use of this metaphor in asserting that ponderously literary passages must not incongruously stand out from the rest of the poem:

> Inceptis gravibus plerumque et magna professis
> purpureus, late qui splendeat, unus et alter
> assuitur pannus, cum lucus et ara Dianae
> et properantis aquae per amoenos ambitus agros,
> aut flumen Rhenum aut pluvius describitur arcus.
> [Horace *Ars Poet.* 14-18]
>
> Often in overweighty opening passages promising great things,
> are patched on one or another purple swath of the widely resplendent sort,
> when a description is given of the grove and altar of Diana,
> and the circuit of a stream through pleasant surrounding fields,
> or the river Rhine or the watery rainbow.

> praeterea curandum est, ne sententiae emineant extra corpus orationis expressae, sed intexto vestibus colore niteant. Homerus testis et lyrici Romanusque Vergilius et Horatii curiosa felicitas.
> [Petronius *Satyr.* 118.5]
>
> In addition, one must take care that the carefully modeled lines not stand out from the body of the speech but shine with brilliance woven into the cloth. Homer is a witness to this and the lyric poets and our own Roman Vergil and the careful felicity of Horace.

That this statement concludes with praise of Horace's own skill in poetic craftsmanship is notable, and adds to the overwhelming evidence of the influence of Horace specifically on Eumolpus' artistic worldview.

Attention to diction is also essential to success—Eumolpus proudly proclaims his avoidance of common language as too lowbrow for his taste, and uses a direct quotation of the first line of Horace's *Ode* 3.1 to support his position.

> "...neque concipere aut edere partum mens potest nisi ingenti flumine litterarum inundata. refugiendum est ab omni verborum, ut ita dicam, vilitate et sumendae voces a plebe semotae, ut fiat "odi profanum vulgus et arceo".
>
> [Petronius *Satyr.* 118.3-4]

> "... and the mind is able neither to conceive nor bring forth issue unless it has been inundated with a great flood of literature. One must flee from every cheapness (as I call it) of vocabulary, and the modes of expression remote from the common crowd must be adopted so that 'I hate the vulgar crowd and shun it' is put into practice."

The fact that his abhorrence of plebian idiom is sandwiched between an exhortation to inundation in great literature of the past and a direct quotation from an admired predecessor highlights Eumolpus' instruction on diction. It seems that in this, too, Eumolpus means to follow Horace's own preferences, as expressed at *Ars Poetica* 45-72.

> Hoc amet, hoc spernat promissi carminis auctor.
> in verbis etiam tenuis cautusque serendis
> dixeris egregie, notum si callida verbum
> reddiderit iunctura novum. si fore necesse est
> indiciis monstrare recentibus abdita rerum,
> fingere cinctutis non exaudita Cethegis
> continget dabiturque licentia sumpta pudenter;
> et nova fictaque nuper habebunt verba fidem si
> Graeco fonte cadent, parce detorta. quid autem
> Caecilio Plautoque dabit Romanus ademptum
> Vergilio Varioque? ego cur, acquirere pauca
> si possum, invideor, cum lingua Catonis et Enni
> sermonem patrium ditaverit et nova rerum
> nomina protulerit? licuit semperque licebit
> signatum praesente nota procudere nummum.
> ut silvae foliis privos mutantur in annos,
> prima cadunt **********
> ********** ita verborum vetus interit aetas
> et iuvenum ritu florent modo nata vigentque.
> debemur morti nos nostraque; sive receptus
> terra Neptunus classis Aquilonibus arcet,
> regis opus, sterilisve †diu palus† aptaque remis

vicinas urbis alit et grave sentit aratrum,
seu cursum mutavit iniquum frugibus amnis
doctus iter melius: mortalia facta peribunt,
nedum sermonum stet honos et gratia vivax.
multa renascentur quae iam cecidere, cadentque
quae nunc sunt in honore vocabula, si volet usus,
quem penes arbitrium est et ius et norma loquendi.
[Horace, *Ars Poetica* 45-72]

Let the author of a pledged poem prefer this, reject that.
Likewise let him be delicate and circumspect in joining words;
you will declare it done excellently, if a familiar word
is restored as a new one by a cunning association. If by chance it is
necessary to inform with new signifiers obscure things,
it is permitted to devise words not heard by the girded Cethegi
and license, obtained prudently, will be granted;
even new and recently invented words will have legitimacy
if they fall from a Greek spring, sparingly modified. Moreover, what
will the Roman grant to Caecilius and Plautus but deny to
Vergil and Varius? Why am I envied, if I am able to accrue a few things,
when the tongue of Cato and Ennius enriched the language of my fathers
and discovered new names for things? It has been and always will be
permitted to forge coin stamped with the current sign.
Just as the leaves of the forests are changed year by year,
the first ones fall******
*** thus the old age of words fades
and like children do, the new born ones bloom and flourish.
We and our loved ones are owed to death; whether Neptune, taken in
on land, wards off the north wind from the fleet, the work of a king,
or a marsh, long-sterile and suited to the oar
nourishes the nearby city and feels the heavy plow,
or the hostile course of a river changed for the benefit of the crops
the learned journey is more pleasant: the things made by mortals will
perish, still less does the esteem and grace of speech remain vigorous.
Many things will be renewed which now have fallen, and
those terms which now are held in high regard will fall, if Utility prefers;
Utility, in whose hands lies the judgment and law and standard of
speaking.

In this passage, Horace defends a poet's use of a variety of nonstandard forms, including new interpretations of familiar words, newly-invented words, novel terms derived from Greek components, and revivification of obsolete expressions. Extensive freedom of

diction is allowed to the creator of a "pledged poem," provided that such terms suit the context (*si forte necesse est* at 48; *dabiturque licentia sumpta pudenter* at 51; *si volet usus* at 71). On the surface this statement of lexical flexibility permitted to the poet is similar to Eumolpus'—in each case the use of nonstandard or uncommon language is supported, but though Eumolpus has taken care to signal the pedigree of his philosophy of diction (not only drawn from predecessors, but Horace specifically), he seems to have misunderstood the point. The license that Horace espouses is qualified throughout the passage—verbal flexibility is defended for the purpose of furthering artistic goals, whereas Eumolpus has understood only that outlandish diction is a mark of "artiness" and so endeavors to avoid the use of any but the most grandiose language.

Eumolpus may be seen to share other aesthetic opinions with Horace concerning diction and register, but it is clear that he approaches the topics from a consistently skewed perspective. At *Ars* 92, Horace maintains that for each type of poetry, there is an appropriate meter: *singula quaeque locum teneant sortita decentem* ("Let each individual one hold the appropriate place to which it is assigned"). Comic scenarios, he says, do not fit tragic meters--*versibus exponi tragicis res comica non vult* ("a comic situation does not want to be related in tragic verses") (89), and, as Homer has established, the form suited to the deeds of kings and great wars is epic—*res gestae regumque ducumque et tristia bella/ quo scribi possent numero, monstravit Homerus* ("In which meter can be written the deeds of kings and generals and sad wars was shown by Homer") (73-4). Eumolpus, in defending his own poetic license (specifically in contrast to factual fidelity), expresses a similar sentiment:

> non enim res gestae versibus comprehendendae sunt, quod longe melius historici faciunt, sed per ambages deorumque ministeria et fabulosum sententiarum tormentum praecipitandus est liber spiritus, ut potius furentis animi vaticinatio appareat quam religiosae orationis sub testibus fides
> [Petronius *Satyr.* 118.6]
>
> For actual events are not to be gathered in verses, a thing which historians do much better, but the free spirit must be thrown headlong through circuitous ways and the works of the gods and the storied twisting of maxims, so that it appears more like the prophecy of a raging soul than the scrupulous loyalty (to fact) of a testimony under oath.

Here the same aesthetic idea—that there are clear rules regarding which register or genre must be used for a given sort of material—is expressed by Eumolpus from the reverse rationale. On the surface, his claim seems to be at least in part contradictory to the message of Horace's *Ars*: on the one hand, Horace tells us that the deeds of kings belong to the realm of epic verse, and on the other, Eumolpus seems to assert that epic verse is not suited to historical facts. Rather than versifying history, Eumolpus holds that one must *epicize* it—changing the material's basic content to fit the epic form. Eumolpus' model, Horace, had outlined a set of well-established generic rules, among them that certain topics were appropriate only to epic verse (as had been established by his own predecessor—Homer).[62] Eumolpus, on the other hand, views the process backward—rather than seeing the poet as responsible for using a form suited to the subject matter, he posits that the poet, having chosen the form (in this case epic), must force the material to fit the expectations of the genre. This might, at best, mean "dressing up" the material with

[62] Aristotle's *Poetics* had codified generic rules in the 330s BC with a classification rubric based around three general criteria: "matter" (including language, rhythm and music), human subjects covered (status of the work's characters, on a spectrum from high to low), and "manner" of the treatment (i.e. the role (or absence) of the narrator and performance context).

epic embellishments or, at worst, exerting a procrustean force upon it, cramming it into the selected format—but either way, it reveals that Eumolpus has, at the very least, privileged form and artifice over purpose and content. If Eumolpus means to follow his predecessor Horace in this respect (as he has seemed to do throughout chapter 118), he has missed the point.

This misreading and subsequent misapplication of a predecessor's work is emphasized by the two exhortations present in *Satyrica* 118 instructing poets to master the works of their literary forebears: *neque concipere aut edere partum mens potest nisi ingenti flumine litterarum inundata* (118.3) and *ecce belli civilis ingens opus quisquis attigerit nisi plenus litteris, sub onere labetur* (188.6). Horace gives similar advice to Roman poets at *Ars Poetica* 268-9: *vos exemplaria Graeca/ nocturna versate manu, versate diurna* ("Study your Greek models day and night"). At *Epistle* 2.1 he reveals his own "inundation in literature," recalling his education in early Latin poetry as a boy: *Naevius in manibus non est et mentibus haeret paene recens?* ("Isn't Naevius held in our hands and clinging in our minds almost as if recent?") (53-4) and *...memini quae plagosum mihi parvo Orbilium dictare* ("I remember the works which Orbilius, believer in beatings, taught me as a boy") (70-1). While Horace advises a thorough understanding of Greek and Latin poetic predecessors as a necessity to a poet's own critical understanding of his craft, Eumolpus' advice seems motivated primarily by a belief that poetry is a game of imitation. Eumolpus produces unique material not by intentional

innovation, but by slavishly adhering to artistic rules gleaned from misreading his predecessors.[63]

Despite his failure to comprehend the rationale underlying Horace's artistic advice, Eumolpus nonetheless considers himself a member of the in-group of poets, able to identify interlopers into this realm and justified in castigating them. At 118 he complains about the masses of lawyers who believe themselves poets based on their unschooled weekend dabbling.

> 'multos', inquit Eumolpus 'o iuvenes, carmen decepit. nam ut quisque versum pedibus instruxit sensumque teneriore verborum ambitu intexuit, putavit se continuo in Heliconem venisse. | sic forensibus ministeriis exercitati frequenter ad carminis tranquillitatem tamquam ad portum feliciorem refugerunt, credentes facilius poema extrui posse quam controversiam sententiolis vibrantibus pictam.
>
> [Petronius, *Satyr.* 118.1-2]

> "My young friends" said Eumolpus, "Poetry has misled many. For as soon as each one has built his verse foot by foot and woven the sense through a rather delicate circumlocution/period, he's decided that he's immediately arrived on Helicon. Thus those trained in the work of the public courts have frequently escaped to the "tranquility" of poetry as if to a more hospitable port, believing that a poem can be constructed more easily than a forensic exercise decorated with shimmering little maxims.

This passage recalls Horace *Ars* 24-5 in which the author draws a contrast between true artistry and the appearance of formal rectitude: *maxima pars vatum, pater et iuvenes patre digni, / decipimur specie recti* ("the greatest part of us poets, father and

[63] Horace had notably described his own literary predecessor, Lucilius, as "muddy" and criticized his prolific output (*Serm.* 1.4.9-13): *nam fuit hoc vitiosus: in hora saepe ducentos,/ ut magnum, versus dictabat stans pede in uno./ cum flueret lutulentus, erat quod tollere velles,/ garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem,/ scribendi recte; nam ut multum, nil moror.* With his poetics of excess and overproduction of poetry, Eumolpus has clearly missed the mark in emulating his idol.

young men worthy of their father, are fooled by the appearance of correctness"), as well as *Serm.* 1.4.40-1: *neque enim concludere versum/ dixeris esse satis* ("for you would not say that composing verses was enough [to be called a poet]").[64] Eumolpus follows Horace's general criticism of most poetry as trivial, and identifies poetry as defined by some quality beyond simply the verse form, and even distinguishes himself from the crowded field of would-be poets by his high (as we've seen, Horatian) ideals. However, the poet is deflated by the contrast between his own pretensions and the model of poetic philosophy he has adopted. After all, he has written (and readily recites) his civil war epic, suggesting that he is among those who have *not* foundered beneath the burden of such a task—that he is a true poet, not a dabbler. In fact, the poet whose artistic worldview he has (mis)appropriated had denied his own right to poetic status in the model passage: *primum ego me illorum dederim quibus esse poetis/ excerpam numero* ("first of all, I consider myself one of those whom I would exclude from being among the ranks of poets") (39-40) based on his use of a conversational tone in the *Sermones* (*neque si qui scribat, uti nos,/ sermoni propriora, putes hunc esse poetam*). This demure

[64] This sentiment is not unlike the critique of the overgenerous use of the term *ποιητής* by Aristotle at *Poetics* (1447 B): *πλὴν οἱ ἄνθρωποί γε συνάπτοντες τῷ μέτρῳ τὸ ποιεῖν ἐλεγειποιοὺς τοὺς δὲ ἑποποιοὺς ὀνομάζουσιν, οὐχ ὡς κατὰ τὴν μίμησιν ποιητὰς ἀλλὰ κοινῇ κατὰ τὸ μέτρον προσαγορεὺοντες : καὶ γὰρ ἄν ἰατρικὸν ἢ φυσικόν τι διὰ τῶν μέτρων ἐκφέρωσιν, οὕτω καλεῖν εἰώθασιν : οὐδὲν δὲ κοινόν ἐστιν Ὁμήρῳ καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλεῖ πλὴν τὸ μέτρον, διὸ τὸν μὲν ποιητὴν δίκαιον καλεῖν, τὸν δὲ φυσιολόγον μᾶλλον ἢ ποιητήν :* "People append the term 'poetry' to the metre, distinguishing for example between 'elegiac poets' and 'epic poets'. They class them, not as poets in virtue of the act of imitating, but according to the metre used; even if some one produces a work on medicine or music in verse form, they are in the habit of calling him a poet. But Homer and Empedocles have nothing in common except their metre; and therefore, while it is correct to call the former a poet, the latter should be called a scientist rather than a poet." (Greek text is from Lucas' 1968 Oxford edition, English is Potts' 1968 translation).

statement, according to Eumolpus' oversimplified reading of Horace, supports the philosophy he himself espouses—that not just versification, but "poetification" is what makes successful poems. Lost to Eumolpus is the finesse of Horace's poetic philosophy, as he outlines the careful balance necessary between brevity and obscurity, graceful delicacy and enervation, solemnity and bombast. Indeed, at *Ars* 133-5, Horace warns the poet to exercise discretion in using his models: *nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus/ interpres, nec desilies imitator in artum,/ unde pedem proferre pudor vetet aut operis lex* ("take care not to render word for word as a faithful translator, nor as an imitator dismount into the trenches, whence shame or the generic constraints prevent extraction"). Eumolpus' "inundation" in Horace seems to have had the effect predicted by Horace himself at *Ars* 337: *omne supervacuum pleno de pectore manat* ("every extra word runs off the oversaturated mind").

In the mirror of Eumolpus' imitation, the poetic philosophy of Horace appears distorted and bizarre, but it is nonetheless clear that Eumolpus regards Horace as his literary forebear. The signature of a great poet's mind cannot be erased entirely by later misunderstanding, misapplication, or misuse of his legacy—as Horace himself had proclaimed at *Serm.* 1.4.61, no matter how mangled a great text may become, in it *invenias etiam disiecti membra poetae* ("you will find the limbs of a poet, however dismembered"). There is some indelible quality to great literature that survives the process of decomposition, like lovely pieces of shaped marble—a graceful hand, or fine drapery—remnants of a great ancient work no longer intact. In focusing exclusively on the external accoutrements of "Great Poetry," Eumolpus misses the point in exactly the way that Trimalchio had done with his overproduced dinner earlier in the *Satyrica*. In his

eagerness to convey virtuosity in gastronomic cleverness, he ignored the basic expectations of a meal—to appetize, to provide sustenance and to bring about satisfaction. Rather, the food offered by Trimalchio, subjected to increasingly perverse culinary treatments, ends up disgusting and unsettling his guests—it is ultimately unappetizing, overabundant, and for the most part, uneaten. Even the memory of the meal, as it is recalled later, causes Encolpius revulsion well after the fact.[65] The connection between literature and food in the *Satyrica* has been closely examined by Rimell (2002, 9), who finds that

> "literature in the *Satyricon* is no longer just written, static and containable, but is imaged as a live body, a flesh or food ingested in the process of learning and spewed out from bodies in performance...this disruption of civilising hierarchies between eater and eaten evokes a graphic picture of the risks of eating (and therefore reading) *per se*. Yet in Petronius' universe, good scholars must not only face the horror of eating, they must stuff themselves to the point of nausea...for bloating is a precondition of writing."

---

[65] *hanc humanitatem insecutae sunt matteae, quarum etiam recordatio me, is qua est dicenti fides, offendit.* ("Following this kindness [Trimalchio's order that the slaves drink the offered wine or be drenched in it] were served 'delicacies' the recollection of which, if there is any faith in words, appalls me to this day.") *Satyr.* 65.1; Encolpius expresses similar disgust as he narrates the *Cena* at 69.7 (*et haec quidem tolerabilia erant, si non fer[i]culum longe monstrosius effecisset ut vel fame perire mallemus*) and 78.5 (*ibat res ad summam nauseam, cum Trimalchio ebrietate turpissima gravis novum acroama, cornicines, in tricilinimum iussit adduci...*). Recall that at 1.3-2.1 Encolpius complains that the current educational program focused on declamation is a poor "diet," describing the unrealistic rhetorical set-piece compositions to sticky sweets without any nutritive value: *ego adulescentulos existimo in scholis stultissimos fieri, quia nihil ex his quae in usu habemus aut audiunt aut vident, | sed piratas cum catenis in litore stantes, sed tyrranos edicta scribentes quibus imperent filiis ut patrum suorum capita praecidant, sed responsa in pestilentiam data ut virgines tres aut plures immolentur, sed mellitos verborum globulos et omnia dicta factaque quasi papvere et sesamo sparsa. | qui inter haec nutriuntur non magis sapere possunt quam bene olere qui in culina habitant.* Indeed, as Rimell (2009, 69) notes,Horace used similar language at *Ars* 374-8: *ut gratas inter mensas symphonia discors/ et crassum unguentum et Sardo cum melle papaver/ offendunt, poterat duci quia cena sine istis,/ sic animis natum inventumque poema iuvandis, si paulum summo decessit, vergit ad imum.*

Readers in Petronius' work consume and poorly digest the literature of Greece and Rome, and through the process the great works—and their authors—are figuratively carved up and cannibalized. The mangled and dismembered poet is the central theme of the Croton episode of the *Satyrica*, as Petronius' use of captation vividly illustrates. Ultimately, even the hack Eumolpus faces (literal) dismemberment by his own heirs in the end.

The dismembered poet: castration and castigation at 132.

The pervasive association of reproductive potency with literary production at Croton and the theme of the dismembered poet are vividly crystallized in a memorable scene of self-censure at *Satyr.* 132. Humiliated by several bouts of sexual impotence and furious at his uncooperative penis, Encolpius bursts into mock-epic verse as he describes his attempt at self-castration.

> conditusque lectulo totum ignem furoris in eam converti, quae mihi omnium malorum causa fuerat:
>
> ter corripui terribilem manu bipennem,
> ter languidior coliculi repente thyrso
> ferrum timui, quod trepido male dabat usum.
> nec iam poteram, quod modo conficere libebat;
> namque illa metu frigidior rigente bruma
> confugerat in viscera mille operta rugis.
> ita non potui supplicio caput aperire,
> sed furciferae mortifero timore lusus
> ad verba, magis quae poterant nocere, fugi.
>
> [Petronius, *Satyr.* 132.7-8]

> I turned the entire fire of my rage against that part which had been the cause of my every misfortune:
>
> thrice I snatched up in my hand the frightful double blade;
> thrice, suddenly limper than a cabbage sprout's stem,
> I shrank from the knife, wielded as it was by a badly shaking hand.
> Nor was I any longer able to accomplish that which had recently
> seemed pleasing; for in fact that member, colder than winter from
> numb fear, had taken refuge up in my guts, buried in a thousand

> wrinkles. So I was not able to uncover its head for punishment, but mocked by the scoundrel's deadly fear, I had recourse to words, which could do more damage.

This high-sounding parody presents the act of castration with heroic diction (e.g. *corripui...bipennem*, *mortifero*)[66] but in the priapic meter of Sotadeans.[67] The framing of Encolpius' task using the heroic triple-attempt motif highlights the dissonance between the frivolous subject matter and playful meter on the one hand and the weighty diction and dramatic attitude on the other. As Connors (1998, 31) has noted,

> "at the level of literary form, the sotadean meter could invert the normative structures of the hexameter. This transformation of the utterances of the heroic past into the sound of the debased present recasts lines which describe heroic exploits to produce a sexual double meaning—and that double meaning is hard to erase: for mischievously sotadic readers, spears in the *Iliad* might never look quite the same."

Connors is particularly interested here in the Priapic motifs evident in the work, and discusses this passage as one of "Petronius' 'Priapic' attacks on epic," but the inversion

---

[66] See Palmer (1954, 103) and Courtney (1991, 34). Adamietz (1995, 323 n. 7) notes here resonances from *Aen.* 2. 479f.: *ipse* [Pyrrhus] *inter primos correpta dura bipenni limina perrumpit*...and *Aen.* 2.792-4=6.700-2: *ter conatus ibi collo dare bracchia circum;/ ter frustra comprensa manus effugit imago,/ par levibus uentis uolcrique simillima somno*.

[67] Sotadean verse has long been associated in general with obscenity and emasculated men (either *cinaedi* or eunuchs), though as Bettini (1982, 87) notes, the four sotadean lines performed by a *cinaedus* during the orgy of Quartilla (*Satyr.* 23.3) serve as "l'unico esempio chiaro ed esplicito di poesia cinedica in sotadei." Quintilian (9.4.6) remarks on the "effeminate sotadean" and Martial 2.86 refers to "reading the *cindaedus* Sotades backward" (*nec retro lego Sotaden cinaedum*), though, as Habinek (2005, 287 n. 71) remarks, it is not clear what exactly is meant by the statement.

Within the so-called *Iolaus*-fragment there is an address to the title character and a cinaedus in sotadeans in the context of initiation into the rites of Cybele, which Connors (1998, 17) observes could well involve transformation into a *gallus* by castration, but as the speaker is not identified, this example provides less reliable evidence for the necessarily cinaedic context of sotadean verse. The effect of Petronius' use of this meter at 132 is to contrast high and low in the tone and narrative circumstances of the scene, not unlike Catullus had done in his poem 60, which contains apparently serious content, but is presented in choliambs.

of the model material may be less an attack than an indication of an inverted or unstable literary world. The model material, cheapened by ubiquity to the point that it is no longer seen as original artistic work, has become a tone or mode (or even a "language") now available to serve any purpose at all. In his chapter on the "mythomaniac narrator," Conte (1996, 2) characterized Encolpius as a "victim of his own literary experiences, who naively exalts himself by identifying with heroic roles among the great mythical and literary characters of the past."[68] As was made clear in the introduction to the Croton episode, this is a land in which eloquence has no place, and the production of legitimate heirs is reviled. Success here is based not on ability to bring forth original material, but to engineer relationships with decrepit models through artifice. Petronius' characters, perfectly suited to thrive in this environment, have internalized literary models of the past to so great a degree that they are not able to express themselves in any other language.

A testament to this is the vivid description of Encolpius' penis as *metu frigidior rigente bruma*, which evokes a complex of images both complementary and contrasting to the character's impotence with his lover, Circe. In his thorough examination of this short phrase, Dehon (2001) unpacks the layers of meaning found in the line—from the proverbial barrenness of winter and the literary *topos* of cold fear to the rigidity of freezing as comic contrast to the *mentula*'s flaccidity—and reveals that the phrase is

[68] I would argue that it is not Encolpius alone who has too thoroughly internalized his models—the same can be said about Eumolpus and Trimalchio—but Conte's focus is on Encolpius as the narrator, as his interest is the irony created by dissonance between the narrating "I" and the narrated or acting "I" of the *Satyrica*. The multiple narrative frames do complicate the matter of whether other characters are reliably presented (especially in regard to dialogue), as Encolpius himself could be epicizing or literizing other characters by misremembering in his characteristically mythomaniac way. While I fully agree with Conte, my reading ascribes this tendency for literary obsession to other characters as well.

steeped in Latin poetic history.[69] Petronius' aim is not so much to undermine great literature as to comment on modern dependence on and misuse of it—Encolpius is not deriding epic, but epicizing his self-criticism: established literary models are for him so deeply ingrained that they have become the only lens through which Encolpius can view the events of his own (decidedly un-epic) life.

Connors' conclusion about the result of this misapplication of epic ethos is especially true of the three hexameter lines that follow Encolpius' castigating response to his unsuccessful sotadean heroics. Having had no luck in his castration attempt, Encolpius berates his penis, demanding its reason for "dragging him to hell" and draining him of youthful vigor. The response of the offending member to this verbal barrage is expressed by Encolpius in the form of a cento derived from deeply emotional Vergilian episodes:

> | illa solo fixos oculos aversa tenebat,
> nec magis incepto vultum sermone movetur
> quam lentae salices lassove papavera collo.
> [Petronius, *Satyr.* 132.11]
>
> turning away it held its eyes fixed on the ground,
> nor was its face moved more by the attempted speech
> than pliant willows or weak-stemmed poppies.

The first two lines of this trio are instantly recognizable as a word-for-word reproduction of Dido's rejection of Aeneas in the Underworld (*Aen.* 6.469-70), a sentence which concludes in the original with *quam si dura silex aut stet Marpesia cautes* ("...than if it

[69] Among the most salient connections Dehon (2001, 315-8) presents is the frozen landscape that the castrated Attis confronts in Catullus 63, but he cites a variety of texts to which Petronius appears to respond with this metaphor, from Vergil and Lucan to the *Priapea*.

were hard flint or a Marpessian cliff standing there"). As Courtney (2001, 198) notes, the proverbial hardness of the elements to which Dido is compared are not appropriate to the *mentula*'s offensive flaccidity, and so the character's speech concludes with two Vergilian examples of pliancy, *lenta salix* (from *Eclogues* 3.81 and 5.16) and *lassove papavera collo*, drawn from the description of the death of young Euryalus at *Aen*. 9.436.[70] The clear incongruity between the Petronian narrative situation and the Aeneadic contexts (each serious, and particularly poignant and pathetic) has long been a source of critical discomfort, and understandably so. It is difficult for the reader to avoid retrojecting the new context onto the epic material—the description of Encolpius' impotent body part as the shade of Dido may create an unexpungeable stain on the epic source image—but this may well be part of Petronius' point.[71]

The startling (mis)application of epic pathos to a sordid plot point presents a literary travesty that can be understood only through the lens of the larger function of the Croton episode. Petronius' point here is not simply to degrade a venerable model for the sake of humor alone (though it is funny), nor to deflate a model that has become uncritically revered, but to offer a glimpse at a world in which literary models are so ubiquitous and overworked that they become common and, far from existing as the sacrosanct province of the truly learned, they are available as referents for even the most

---

[70] Verg. *Aen.* 9.435-7: *purpureus ueluti cum flos succisus aratro/ languescit moriens,* ***lassoue papauera collo****/ demisere caput pluuia cum forte grauantur.*

[71] Panayotakis (2009, 58) notably diverges from the majority on this point: "the crudity of the event is not transmitted to the Virgilian models: when I read the fourth book of the *Aeneid*, I do not think about Encopius's penis; but when I think about Petronius's association of Encolpius's penis with Dido, the learned humor dilutes the coarseness of the scene."

vulgar purposes—left like dismembered corpses, as corrupted fodder for scavengers.[72] There is, however, a glimpse of hope for success that may be found in the interstices of this cento, and it is signalled by the two words that receive the least critical attention among these lines—*lenta salix.*

A brief digression on the "pliant willow."

In addition to offering a phonologically similar and metrically identical opposite to the *Aeneid's dura silex*, the phrase resonates with allusive meaning. In all of Vergil there are just two appearances of the phrase *lenta salix*, both of them in the *Eclogues*, in the mouth of the same speaker (Menalcas), and in the same context—an expression of artistic admiration for the (absent) singer Amyntas during a singing contest modeled on Theocritus' *Idylls*.[73] In *Eclogue* 3, itself closely related to Theocritus' *Idyll* 5,[74] Menalcas professes his love for Amyntas by comparing it to several relationships within the natural world: Amyntas alone is to Menalcas as rain (to plants), as the wild strawberry tree to

---

[72] It is worth noting that Petronius' literariness is not of the Alexandrian sort, characterized by recondite arcana, but is rather more democratic, focused on the "greatest hits" of Rome's literary heritage. As Sandy (1994, 1544) puts it: "It is Petronius' practice to incorporate into the texture of his work the 'standard' authors and the conspicuous men of letters belonging to Nero's court: Homer, Virgil, Ovid, Seneca, Lucan."

[73] Scholars have long recognized that *lenta salix* recalls *Eclogue* 5.16, though the connection to *Eclogue* 3 is routinely ignored, and discussions of the phrase's significance are limited in general to a sense of "Vergilian flavor." (Only *Eclogue* 5 is cited by Courtney (2001, 198), Arrowsmith (1959, 190 n.), Connors (1998, 32) and in Müller's apparatus criticus; Walsh (1970, 44 n.2), Schmeling (2011, 508-9) and Panayotakis (2009, 58) cite both *Eclogues* but offer no specific interpretation of the bucolic connection). Rimell (2002, 157) gives some attention to the connection, though her conclusion differs from the one presented here. She interprets the reference as indicating that the "poem is itself fast becoming a live contest between poetic influences and images, while Encolpius' over-flexible, malleable body is again framed as a blatant index of his poor literary performance."

[74] See Clausen 1994, 88.

kids, as the pliant willow to nursing ewes.[75] The comparisons serve to characterize the speaker's admiration as an organic imperative as powerful as plants' reliance on rain and animals' drive for nourishment. Further, the particular animals selected as analogs for Menalcas himself are not only bucolic, but are particularly fertile—young goats fattening on the arbutus, and ewes newly lambed.

Menalcas and the *lenta salix* reappear in *Eclogue* 5, again in reference to admiration for Amyntas. After the genteel Menalcas offers a significant compliment to his young interlocutor Mopsus by comparing him to Amyntas (whom, the reader of the *Eclogues* will recall from poem 3 is the sole object of Menalcas' own admiration), the cocksure young upstart impudently claims superiority over all others, declaring that his skill rivals not only that of Amyntas but of Apollo himself. Menalcas responds graciously at lines 16-18, suggesting that, in his mind, the great Amyntas yields to the young singer *lenta salix quantum pallenti cedit oliuae,/ puniceis humilis quantum saliunca rosetis* ("just as the pliant willow yields to the pale olive, the humble wild nard to the red rose"). The analogues for Amyntas and Mopsus suggest a comparison between natural or inherent quality on the one hand versus cultivated production on the other. The willow is naturally suited to basketry and other weaving,[76] but the primacy of the olive to society is legendary, and its fruit one of the chief commodities of the ancient world. The nard, known for its lovely aroma, is nonetheless "useless for garlands"[77]—the juxtaposition

---

[75] *dulce satis umor, depulsis arbutus haedis,/* ***lenta salix*** *feto pecori, mihi solus Amyntas.* Verg. *Ecl.* 3.82-3.

[76] As Sargeaunt (1969, 119) reminds the reader, in "old days" shields were constructed of willow wickerwork.

[77] Clausen 1994, 158 n.17, citing Pliny *NH* 21.40. Sargeaunt (1969, 117) compares nard to modern wild valerian for its roselike aroma. He disagrees with the idea that Vergil here

apparent here is between plants that are useful in their native state (utilitarian, if unlovely) and those which are strenuously cultivated as agricultural products. Amyntas, then, seems to be characterized not only as a great singer, and well beloved, but as an artist of fertile natural inborn talent, to which Mopsus may provide a counterpoint. In fact, the narrative context of the *Eclogue* itself is concerned with literary appropriation and innovation, as is made clear at line 55, when Mopsus admits that his Daphnis song (performed first in the contest) owes a debt of influence to the older poet's famous version: *et puer ipse fuit cantari dignus, et ista iam pridem Stimichon laudauit carmina nobis* ("both the boy himself [Daphnis] was worthy to be sung about, and Stimichon has long praised that same poem [i.e. Mopsus' version] to me before as well").

Lenta salix thus evokes in the savvy reader not only concerns of artistic admiration and appropriation, but does so in a context of profound organic fertility. Petronius has selected with this word pair not only a Vergilian phrase suited to the requirements of the narrative context (a paradigm of softness to replace the *dura silex* of the *Aeneid* passage), but one with the additional valences of literary succession and the juxtaposition of natural versus cultivated or artificial production. Amid the deadly Aeneadic references (the Underworld of Book 6 and the battlefield of Book 9), Petronius has carved out a fertile and productive pastoral nook, still using the language (literally) of his august predecessor. That this is done through citation of the *salix* specifically is perhaps notable—in his commentary on the *Eclogues*, Clausen (1994, 107) notes the novelty of Vergil's bucolic willow: "the willow is a fairly prominent feature of V[ergil]'s

---

refers to the plant's use in garlands, stating that "the poet seems to be talking of garden beds."

pastoral landscape but does not appear in that of either the genuine or the spurious Theocritus." This may be seen as an example in miniature of Petronius' larger project (and his success)—the author can stake out a space for authentic production even in the literary salvage yard he perceives around him.

Nec minus Encolpius.

Encolpius has imagined that he has been dragged to hell by his penis and its misbehavior, and plays out a distinctly Vergilian underworld scenario in soliloquy, so it is no surprise that he returns to the present moment with a Vergilian verbal cue. The transition from Encolpius' mini-cento back to his narration is accomplished with the phrase *nec minus ego*, which, as Courtney (2001, 199) notes, mimics the *nec minus Aeneas* that marks the end of Aeneas' Underworld encounter with Dido at *Aen.* 6.475. With this signal, we leave the author's carefully constructed and resonant miniature world and telescope back outward, returning to the rush and noise of Encolpius' world (itself, of course, no less carefully constructed a context). To briefly recap the development of the scene to this point: after locking himself in his bedroom, ashamed of his experiences of impotence with Circe, Encolpius has attempted to castrate himself in heroic fashion (a triple-attempt with epic diction), but in an appropriately low meter (sotadeans). By doing so, he has very literally attempted (and failed) to become a dismembered poet himself. When this is unsuccessful, he attempted to shame his penis through verbal abuse, which takes the form of forensic interrogation,[78] to which there is

[78] In addition to the structure of the speech, formed largely of rhetorical questions, the language of the passage is loaded with oratorical significance: *oratione, rogo, apodixin* (= *ἀπόδειξις*, a borrowed Greek rhetorical term, as Panayotakis (2009, 57) notes) <*non*> *defunctoriam redde* "give substantial proof." The phrases *fas est* and the question *hoc de*

also no satisfactory response. The recipient of this abuse is immune to his increasingly emotional utterances, as is described by a Vergilian cento of the most tragic and emotionally charged variety. Having failed to make himself a (literal) dismembered poet, Encolpius cannibalizes Vergil. His presentation of the situation has grown more and more reliant on models from literature, culminating in his adoption of the role of Aeneas himself to express the magnitude of his humiliation. This is followed by a tragic soliloquy that brings Encolpius' literary self-conception to a metaliterary crisis.

> nec minus ego tam foeda obiurgatione finita paenitentiam agere sermonis mei coepi secretoque rubore perfundi, quod oblitus verecundiae meae cum ea parte corporis verba contulerim, quam ne ad cognitionem quidem admittere severioris notae homines solerent. mox perfricata diutius fronte 'quid autem ego' inquam 'mali feci, si dolorem meum naturali convicio exoneravi? aut quid est quod in corpore humano ventri male dicere solemus aut gulae capitique etiam, cum saepius dolet? quid? non et Ulixes cum corde litigat suo, | et quidam tragici oculos suos tamquam audientes castigant? podagrici pedibus suis male dicunt, chiragrici manibus, lippi oculis, et qui offenderunt saepe digitos, quicquid doloris habent, in pedes deferunt:
>
> [Petronius, *Satyr.* 132.12-14]

> Having administered this reproof, no less disgraceful to me than its object, I began to repent of my speech and I was overcome with private shame, since, forgetful of my modesty, I had had words with that part of the body which men of a more serious sort would not usually admit to knowing. After rubbing my forehead for a long time, I said to myself "On the other hand, what evil have I done, if I unburdened my sadness in typical abuse? Or what is it that we are accustomed to say against the stomach in the human body or indeed to the neck or the throat, when one of these frequently hurts? What's the big deal? Did not Ulysses cross-examine his own heart, and certain tragic characters castigate their eyes as if their eyes could hear? The gouty criticize their feet, the arthritic their hands, the

---

te merui both suggest as the context an exercise in legal argumentation—a *controversia*—(as opposed to a *suasoria*, or deliberative debate). The inclusion of *fere* further suggests Encolpius here as one making a legal case—he is careful to clarify the validity of the testimony (against his own body part) that he reproduces from memory here.

> bleary-sighted their eyes and those who stub their toes often, whatever suffering they have, they take it out on their feet.

After burning with shame at his histrionic self-flagellation, Encolpius consoles himself with the recognition that such behavior is perfectly suitable for a literary character, (which of course, *he is*). Petronius has created a character who not only can adopt a Homeric sentiment in a humorous and subversive context, but who is aware, as he does it, that his behavior is modeled on a character written by another author. The degree of literary self-awareness in this scene is extraordinary and illustrates the *mise en abyme* quality of Petronian satire.[79]

Philomela and her children.

As their life in Croton proceeds, Encolpius continues to experience (and lament) his sexual dysfunction and in a particularly fragmentary portion of the novel, becomes the object of a variety of bizarre ministrations by the witches Proselenos and Oenothea, none of which seem to help. At chapter 140, Encolpius (and with him the narrative) returns to find Eumolpus, and it is at his home that the audience meets Philomela, an aged legacy hunter who prostitutes her children now that she is past her prime.

> matrona inter primas honesta, Philomela nomine, quae multas saepe hereditates officio aetatis extorserat, tum anus et floris extincti, filium filiamque ingerebat orbis senibus, et per hanc successionem artem suam perseverabat extendere. ea ergo ad Eumolpum venit et commendare liberos suos eius prudentiae bonitatique . . . credere se et vota sua. illum esse solum in toto orbe terrarum, qui praeceptis etiam salubribus instruere

[79] Another particularly notable Petronian literary hall-of-mirrors moment occurs at 112.2, when the maid of the Ephesian widow recites from the *Aeneid* (4.38ff.)—here Vergil's Anna is "performed" by the maid, herself a character in the story told by Eumolpus, in a scene recalled and narrated by Encolpius, who is himself a literary creation of Petronius. The literary awareness of Vergil is quite deeply embedded within several layers of narrative framing—a particularly Petronian design.

> iuvenes quotidie posset. ad summam, relinquere se pueros in domo Eumolpi, ut illum loquentem audirent . . . quae sola posset hereditas iuvenibus dari. nec aliter fecit ac dixerat, filiamque speciosissimam cum fratre ephebo in cubiculo reliquit simulavitque se in templum ire ad vota nuncupanda. Eumolpus, qui tam frugi erat ut illi etiam ego puer viderer, non distulit puellam invitare ad Aprodisiaca sacra. sed et podagricum se esse lumborumque solutorum omnibus dixerat, et si non servasset integram simulationem, periclitabatur totam paene tragoediam evertere. itaque ut constaret mendacio fides, puellam quidem exoravit ut sederet supra commendatam bonitatem, Coraci autem imperavit ut lectum, in quo ipse iacebat, subiret positisque in pavimento manibus dominum lumbis suis commoveret.
>
> [*Satyr*. 140.1-7]

> Among the chief legacy hunters was a respectable matron named Philomela, who, in her prime had often extorted large legacies through her services. Now an old woman with the bloom of youth faded, she was accustomed to thrust her son and daughter upon childless old men, and through this hereditary succession she continued to ply her craft. It was for this reason she came to Eumolpus' apartments to entrust her children to his wisdom and integrity . . . to entrust herself and her prayers [to him, saying that] he was the only person in the entire world who, through wholesome lessons, would be able to provide her young ones with daily instruction. In sum, she left her children in the house of Eumolpus so that they might hear him speaking . . . which was the only inheritance that could be left to her children. Nor did she do otherwise than she had indicated, and left behind her very beautiful daughter along with her adolescent brother in the bedroom and pretended that she was going to the temple to offer prayers of thanks. Eumolpus, who was so potent that even I seemed a boy to him, did not delay in inviting the girl to join in the rites of Aphrodite. But he had declared himself everywhere to be gout-ridden and beset by loosened loins, and if he did not preserve this deceit intact, he ran the risk of ruining almost the entire tragic production. Therefore, so that he could maintain trust in the lie, he entreated the girl to sit herself upon his well-commended "integrity," while giving orders to Corax to get underneath the bed on which he himself was lying, and with hands pressed on the ground, to thrust his master upward with his own hips.

This is the only specific portrait of any of the companions' captators that the novel provides, and Philomela's mode of legacy hunting is as perverse as the audience should expect in a land as twisted as Croton. Subverting the norm of parents bequeathing

fortunes to their children, this mother prostitutes her biological children to obtain extra-familial inheritance. Rather than leaving her children an inheritance herself, she has taught them to "fish" for old men's wills on her behalf. In the entire Croton episode, this is the only example of biological succession producing any benefit to the parent. Philomela is the only sort of mother who profits in Croton, and Croton is the exact sort of place where a man like Eumolpus can find success.

Eumolpus, by his own admission (in his story of the Pergamene boy related in chapter 85) is accustomed to using his role as a teacher to gain sexual access to children under his care. But his *modus operandi* must be modified to suit the peculiar cultural character of Crotonian society—here, he does not seek out a teaching position, from which to gain both financial support and surreptitious access to a willing young sexual partner, but rather, as a man of means, he is approached by the parent, Philomela, who couches her brazen offer of her children for sexual service in the guise of educational tutelage. In Croton a man like Eumolpus doesn't have to make up a story to have secret sex with students—the parent has to make up a story to conceal her offer of sex with her children. That Philomela's pretext is continually referred to in artistic terms, and her provision of a "tutor" for her children is described as the only *inheritance* she can offer them underscores the ever-present link between artistic production and testamentary succession in the Croton episode.

In fact, Encolpius' characterization of Philomela's agency in the prostitution of her children—*per hanc successionem artem suam perseverabat extendere*—suggests that legacy hunting is parallel to the artistic process (*artem*). This assessment could equally be read as an artistic comment on the role of literary legacies for the Roman author. Through

the succession (to his predecessors) that the author designs for himself through his work, he is able to make a continuing place for his own art. Just as her precocious children are both the products and agents of Philomela's seductive "art," the satiric author's written works serve a dual function—literature is both the outcome of literary inheritance and the means by which artistic heredity is recognized.

Literature as children/ children as literature.

Representing literary works metaphorically as children is a familiar *topos* in Classical literature. In his *Idyll* 16, Theocritus had personified his poems (his "Charites") as children venturing forth into the city to seek financial support on the poet's behalf. Their return, unsuccessful and demoralized, cold and shabby, served to preface the author's denunciation of modern greed and the dearth of financial support for poetry. The image of a work of literature as a child leaving home and entering into the public sphere reappears in Horace's *Epistle* 1.20, in which the poet advises his book, eager for adventure, to consider the dangers of public exposure.

> Quod si non odio peccantis desipit augur,
> carus eris Romae donec te deserat aetas.
> contrectatus ubi manibus sordescere vulgi
> coeperis, aut tineas pasces taciturnus inertis
> aut fugies Uticam aut vinctus mitteris Ilerdam.
> [Horace *Epistles* 1.20.9-13]

> But if the prophet does not loose his mind from hatred of sin,
> you will be dear to Rome until youth deserts you.
> When, having been manhandled by the rabble
> you begin to grow filthy, you, silent will feed on sluggish moths
> or go into exile in Utica, or, fettered, you will be sent off to Ilerda.

Just as in *Idyll* 16, the book Horace addresses is imagined as being soiled by contact with the public, but with a notably sexualized dimension. The erotic valence of the term *contrectatus* (which can refer to neutral "handling" but also to erotic "fondling" or even sex itself)[80] in the passage above and the description of the book at line 2 as *pumice mundus* ("buffed smooth with pumice")[81] and *prostes* ("up for sale") serve to characterize the nature of the book's behavior in the public realm as sexual solicitation. The personification of their poems as children under their care in Horace and Theocritus is in each case accompanied by an expression of concern about the corrupting force of the world upon their creations. Poems that are shared with the public, in this view, are in danger of losing their innocent beauty and becoming vulgar and sordid. Horace's way of describing his fears about public reception of his work—suggesting that literature is like a child, subject to corrupting commodification and even sexualization in public Rome—is cleverly and suitably contorted by Petronius. In Croton, prostituted children in the legacy hunting narrative serve as ciphers for literary works.

The sudden silence of the prolific poet: a speculation.

It is worth considering the fact that the object of Philomela's "art," Eumolpus, whose incessant versification had infuriated Encolpius prior to the companions' arrival at Croton, has seemed suddenly to cease to recite. Though Encolpius himself composes no shortage of verses during his time in Croton, (and Oenothea recites verses as well),

---

[80] Adams (1982, 186) notes that the verb *contrecto* and related forms from *tracto* can indicate stroking or fondling, masturbation, penetration, oral stimulation or kissing.
[81] Rudd (1997, 271 n. 2) notes that the reference to smoothing with pumice refers both to the page-trimming of books with the stone and to the use of pumice to remove unwanted body hair. As he states, the pun is part of "an extended double-entendre [in which] the book is represented as a young slave-boy"

Eumolpus' poetic font seems to have run dry. While making an argument *ex silentio* is particularly dangerous with a text as fragmentary as the end of the *Satyrica*, it may still be of use to consider the meaning of Eumolpus' apparent cessation in producing and reciting poetry. If indeed the Croton episode does represent a departure from versification for the poet, as the extant fragments may suggest, that is not without significance for the metaliterary reading of the work. After all, as we've seen, literature can be represented by children (and in Croton, by children "hooking" for legacies), and according to the fictional role that Eumolpus designed for himself just before arriving in town, he is a man who has recently lost a child notably described as "eloquent."

> elatumque ab Eumolpo filium pariter condiscimus, iuvenem ingentis eloquentiae et spei, ideoque de civitate sua miserrimum senem exisse, ne aut clientes sodalesque filii sui aut sepulcrum quotidie causam lacrimarum cerneret.
>
> [*Satyr.* 117.6]
>
> all together we learned that a son had been buried by Eumolpus, a young man of great eloquence and prospects, and for that reason the devastated old man had left his own city, lest he see the clients and associates of his son or the tomb, the cause of his daily tears.

In order to present himself as an attractive *captandus*, Eumolpus had designed a plot in which he had produced and then lost an heir—a child described in terms both literary and financial (*iuvenem ingentis eloquentiae et spei.*)[82] The poet who had to be dragged, still

[82] The term *spes* has dual meaning here, meaning both "promise" in the general sense of expectations for success in life and "prospects," indicating the fortune which Eumolpus' imaginary heir stood to inherit from him in this fiction. For its part, *eloquentia* is a concept that is clearly of great significance in the *Satyrica*, and the nine occurrences of the word in the extant work (five in the opening declamation scene, one in the *Cena*, one when Eumolpus first appears, and two at Croton) warrant further examination,

composing, from the ruins of shipwreck, does seem in Croton to be bereft of his (literary) offspring. It is almost as if Eumolpus has internalized his self-constructed role to such a degree that he has begun to be the man he pretends—perhaps the reader is to imagine that donning the mask of a gouty and moribund *orbus* in a land that is like plague-ravaged fields (*oppidum tamquam in pestilentia campos*) has temporarily cured him of his poetry-disease. Or perhaps this is further evidence that the entire Croton episode is itself meant to be interpreted as a metaliterary construct.

Returning to Captation: Horace *Sermones* 2.5 and Petronius' Croton.

As his poetic philosophy at 118 makes clear, Eumolpus sees Horace as his own poetic progenitor, and it is significant that this literary-historical relationship is established at the outset of the bizarre and intriguing Croton episode. Eumolpus, as the originator of the successful plot to thrive in the land of the captators, provides his poetic pedigree just before his plan for the companions in "Literatureland" unfolds. Horace and the *curiosa felicitas* of his work in general have been praised and elevated by the programmatic message of Eumolpus, but the description of the companions' time at Croton provides clear evidence for an even more specific Horatian connection—between the *Satyrica* and Horace *Serm.* 2.5.

Several points of contact link Horace's satire of Ulysses-as-captator with the events at Croton: in each case a sea storm results in arrival at an underworld space (the Homeric Underworld in Horace; a barren land of corpses and crows in Petronius), in which, it is revealed, fortunes can be secured only through legacy hunting. In order to do

---

particularly since the central characters claim to live by it. Such an investigation, however appealing, is beyond the scope of the present project.

so, the central figures must adopt theatrical roles: Ulysses must play the "comic Davus"; Eumolpus' plan is a "mime" (117.4) and a "tragedy" (140.6). In each work, the Homeric image of Odysseus' parley with his heart is dramatized (*Serm.* 2.5.20-2, *Satyr.* 132.13), and successful captation specifically involves prostitution (of Penelope in Horace; of Philomela's children in Petronius). In each case, the motif of legacy hunting is used to convey authorial anxieties about claiming rights to literary legacies.

Petronius' vision of captation, however, is not identical to that established by his predecessor, Horace. Examination of the metaphors used to describe the practice of satiric captation in the two works reveals that Petronius has modified the Horatian conception and presents in the *Satyrica* a new and more sordid interpretation. The captation-as-fishing metaphor introduced by Horace in *Sermones* 2.5 makes its explicit reappearance in Petronius at 140, when Encolpius declares that captatorial marks (in this case the captators themselves) cannot be caught without baited hooks.

> unde plani autem, unde levatores viverent, nisi aut locellos aut sonantes aere sacellos pro hamis in turbam mitterent? sicut muta animalia cibo inescantur, sic homines non caperentur, nisi spei aliquid morderent.'
>
> [Petronius, *Satyr.* 140.15]

> Moreover, what would charlatans or thieves live on, unless they sent their little boxes or sacks, jingling with coin, into the crowd as bait? Just as the speechless animals are enticed with food, likewise men are not snared unless they have gotten a little taste of hope.

Petronius' captators are not really fisherman like their Horatian counterparts, though. Rather, they are scavengers, or worse—cannibals, living solely off of the decomposing

dead,[83] as indicated by the *vilicus'* description of the city as one in which nothing but crows and corpses reside (*nihil aliud et nisi cadavera quae lacerantur aut corvi qui lacerant*) (116.9).

The Petronian vision of satiric captation reaches a resounding apex in the final passage of the extant work, in which the funeral of Eumolpus is rehearsed. The context suggests that the companions are aware that the captators (who have thus far provided the means for the con-men to live in admirable style during their time in Croton) have become restless awaiting their testamentary compensation. This realization seems to lead Eumolpus to stage his own funeral, complete with a reading of his will, as Trimalchio had done at the conclusion of his disastrous dinner party earlier in the novel.[84]

> 'omnes qui in testamento meo legata habent praeter libertos meos hac condicione percipient quae dedi, si corpus meum in partes conciderint et astante populo comederint.' 'apud quasdam gentes scimus adhuc legem servari, ut a propinquis suis consumantur defuncti, adeo quidem ut obiurgentur aegri frequenter, quod carnem suam faciant peiorem. his

[83] Some (including Rimell (2009, 70) and (2002, 24); have seen the *piscatores* of 114.14 as captators of Croton as well—"fishermen" who don't really fish, but man small boats and make their way to the wreckage of Lichas' ship in order to plunder its remnants. The identification of these individuals as captators (rather than simply opportunists who, as it turns out, do rescue the protagonists and offer them a night's shelter) is not, to my mind, substantiated by the text. Arguing against this reading are the facts that the location from which these men originate is at some distance from Croton, and that the "scoop" on Croton as a center of legacy hunting is not revealed by their interactions with Encolpius's band (the bailiff's description of the character and pursuits of Croton's inhabitants at 116 seems to be new information to the group). Rather, the scene of the fishermen serves as a sort of prefiguration of the Croton episode, just as Lichas' fish-eaten corpse can be seen as a parallel to the (imagined, if unrealized) image of Eumolpus' heir-eaten corpse at 141.

[84] As is widely recognized, several episodes within the *Satyrica* bear striking resemblance to other episodes, among them the recitation of last wishes by Trimalchio and Eumolpus, the aesthetic pronouncements of the novel's opening scene and Eumolpus' diatribe on artistic decline, and, as Schmeling (2011, 532) details in his commentary, Encolpius' encounters with Quartilla (16-26) and Oenothea (133-8). See Rimell (2009) in particular, who sees Petronius' metaphors as "infectious" as they spread through and link different episodes, genres and styles.

admoneo amicos meos ne recusent quae iubeo, sed quibus animis devoverint spiritum meum, eisdem etiam corpus consumant'. . .

excaecabat pecuniae ingens fama oculos animosque miserorum . . .

Gorgias paratus erat exsequi

'de stomachi tui recusatione non habeo quod timeam. sequetur imperium, si promiseris illi pro unius horae fastidio multorum bonorum pensationem. operi modo oculos et finge te non humana viscera sed centies sestertium comesse. accedit huc quod aliqua inveniemus blandimenta, quibus saporem mutemus. neque enim ulla caro per se placet, sed arte quadam corrumpitur et stomacho conciliatur averso. quod si exemplis quoque vis probari consilium, Saguntini obsessi ab Hannibale humanas edere carnes nec hereditatem expectabant. Petelini idem fecerunt in ultima fame, nec quicquam aliud in hac epulatione captabant nisi tantum ne esurirent. cum esset Numantia a Scipione capta, inventae sunt matres quae liberorum suorum tenerent semesa in sinu corpora'

[*Satyr.* 141.2-11]

'Everyone who has a legacy in my will except my freedmen will secure what I gave only by this condition, if they chop up my body into pieces and eat me standing up in front of the public.' 'Among certain peoples we know that even now a law is preserved that requires that the dead be eaten by their close relatives, to such an extent that indeed, often sick men are scolded since they make for spoiled meat. I remind my friends of this lest they object to what I order, but with the same zeal that they will curse my soul, they even still consume my body.

the enormous rumor of wealth completely blinded the eyes and spirits of the wretched men...Gorgias was ready to lead the funeral procession...

'I have no fear about any refusal on the part of your stomach. It will follow orders if you promise it the compensation of many good things in exchange for that one hour of disgust. Just close your eyes and pretend that you are eating not human guts, but one hundred thousand sesterces. It will agree with this, whatever coaxing we can devise by which we mask the taste. For no meat is ever pleasant on its own, but by a certain art it is falsified and a hostile stomach is won over. But if you want this advice to be proven with examples as well: the Saguntines, besieged by Hannibal ate human flesh, and without hope for an inheritance. The Petelians did likewise in the last throes of hunger, and nothing else was won from that dinner except only that they weren't hungry afterward. When Numantia had been seized by Scipio, mothers were found holding the half-eaten bodies of their own children in their laps.'

In the reading of the will and the unsettling provisions contained therein, the many threads of metaliterary captation are drawn together in one tableau: the image of the dismembered poet and legacy hunting as cannibalism are literally realized, and are combined with the metaphors of captation as a means of describing the creation of a literary identity and of literary produce as children to reveal a disturbing and twisted view of the act of writing.

In a land where literature and eloquence are obsolete and organic fertility is especially detested, legitimate literary succession is not possible by any tolerable means, and inheritance becomes a matter of willingness to live off of a degraded *corpus*. The crows of Croton succeed not based on their own sporting skill but rather on the inevitability of their prey's death. Petronius presents a world in which even the most vibrant literature (including Horace and Vergil) is so aggressively mined by hacks that it quickly becomes deformed, bastardized, mutilated, and cannibalized by its own prospective heirs.

In such a setting, there can be no hope of surviving as a captator—the literary legacies of Rome appear to have been spread too thin to support the contemporary author as they could in the Horatian past.[85] There is perhaps some promise in pretending to be a

[85] The unsavory requirement that his heirs eat his flesh in Eumolpus' will is yet another point of contact with, and revision of, satiric captation as presented in Horace *Serm.* 2.5. In the Horatian poem, Tiresias relates the anecdote of an old Theban woman whose unpleasant testamentary conditions punish her captator: *anus improba Thebis/ ex testamento sic est elata: cadaver/ unctum oleo largo nudis umeris tulit heres,/ scilicet elabi si posset mortua; credo,/ quod nimium institerat viventi* (2.5.84-88) "a wicked old woman from Thebes, in accordance with her will, was borne to her grave thus: her heir carried her corpse, greased with plenty of oil, on his bare shoulders—no doubt hoping that dead she would be able to slip away from the one who, I believe, pursued her excessively while alive." The image of a greased corpse, as Roberts (1984) mentions (see

model worthy of captation, or at the very least legacy-*hunter*-hunting. Horace had self-consciously laid claim to literary legacies in creating his brand of satire—and he used the model of captation as a metaphor to describe his process of repurposing predecessors' material to make his own unique *Sermones*. Petronius invents an even more metaphorically resonant use of *captatio*—his satire does not just use other authors' work, but satirizes others' use (or misuse) of literary legacies.

Conclusion.

The *Satyrica* is a hyperliterary work, presenting not only one-directional echoes of other authors' works, but with the amplified and interfering reverberations of the reception and revision of these works. In the course of the novel, the *Satyrica* itself begins to resemble a sort of feedback loop, as episodes mirror and repeat one another. It is no surprise then, that the Croton that appears in the text is not a "real" place, but rather a practice arena in which literary concerns can be dramatized. Here neither biological production nor eloquence is valued, and the bribe-economy of satiric captation is the rule. The city is ultimately barren, and the only change allowed in such a system is the redistribution of the same limited resources from one party to another. Croton is, then, a zero-sum game—some can survive there for a time, but nothing can flourish. The literary message is clear: in Petronius' world, the ubiquity of "Great Literature" is a problem, as it has gone from being an artistic product (to be studied, performed, enjoyed, analyzed) to

---

my discussion in Chapter 2, above), appears immediately after a description of a person (Penelope herself) as a dog gnawing on a greasy hide, creating a lurid cannibalistic cast to the passage. Petronius has brought that suggestion to the forefront in his interpretation of a similar situation.

being the currency of social life—a signifier of culture—and in the process has been recycled, reappropriated and debased to the point of moribundity.

In presenting this vision of artistic reception gone wrong, Petronius has recourse to the model set by Horace in his *Sermones*—he adopts the metaphor of captation to describe and examine the process of participating in literary history, but from his own perspective. Petronius reinvents Horace's Ulysses by degrees in the Croton passage. First, Encolpius and his companions arrive at a Croton that looks more like Carthage or Scheria than the Italian city it is claimed to be. As the description of the place proceeds, the image darkens to reveal it may most resemble the land of the cannibalistic Laestrygonians. Nonetheless, the companions sally forth, armed with fake identities (not unlike Odysseus' own tendency to present himself dishonestly), including Encolpius' "Polyaenus" (he adopts as his slave-name an epithet of Odysseus). During his time in Croton, Encolpius' narrative continues to interact with Odysseus' (the affair with Circe is particularly notable here), culminating in his own recognition that he has been essentially "playing the role" of Odysseus in his conversation with himself at 132. The situation provided by Horace (Ulysses as a legacy hunter), derived from Homer (Odysseus in the Underworld) has been dramatized by Petronius (a legacy-hunter-hunter acts out an Odyssean role in a cannibalistic and Underworld-like setting).

In light of the long-recognized influence of another Horatian *Sermo*—2.8 (the banquet of Nasidienus)—on the *Cena Trimalchionis*,[86] the legacy hunters of Croton may be seen as a more significant and artistically coherent part of the *Satyrica*. Bodel (2003, 11) suggests that "recognizing the link between Petronius' vision of *captatio* and its

[86] See especially Coccia (1993) and Sullivan (1968, 125-39).

Horatian model enhances our understanding of the broader thematic and structural connections between the Croton episode and the Banquet of Trimalchio, both inspired by specific satires of Horace's second book in conjunction with Virgil's *Aeneid* and each serving in certain respects as a mirror image of the other." Petronius' engagement with Horatian satire is manifest and significant, and while the scenario of the Croton episode illuminates the (perceived) problems of the state of literary production and reception in the contemporary world, the virtuosic use to which Petronius' own literary forebears are put is a testament the author's creativity and success in staking his own claim to literary history.

CHAPTER 4

Success(ion) in Sacrifice: Juvenal's *Satire* Twelve

In Juvenal's twelfth satire, the speaker relates the preparations he is making—among them, a public sacrifice—to celebrate the safe return of his friend after surviving a near-shipwreck. The work is composed of roughly four parts: an introduction describing the present sacrifice preparations (lines 1-16); an account of the storm and the ship's catastrophe (17-82); a brief return to present ritual preparations (83-92); and finally, a denunciation of legacy hunting (93-130).[87] The poem is among the least remarked upon—and indeed least cherished—of Juvenal's works, chiefly because of complaints of internal disunity and a general lack of stylistic refinement in comparison to the poet's other works.[88] Macleane (1867, 277), for example, can admit only the final section (line 93 onward) worthy of being "properly" considered satire, and Knoche (1975, 149) considers it "probably the weakest" of Juvenal's satires. Though he grants that the work contains "some playfulness," he concludes that "the whole composition cannot have cost the writer much labour, and does not offer much entertainment."[89] Coffey (1976, 133) is likewise able to find some charm in it, though he judges it "not a poem of high distinction." Helmbold finds the poem irritating enough that he is grateful for its brevity

[87] Braund (2004, 419) counts five sections, subdividing this final part in two: she separates the speaker's preemptive refutation of the charge of legacy hunting from the screed to follow.
[88] Ribbeck (1865) was not convinced of the authenticity of Juvenal's later satires, including poem 12, noting in them a distinct lack of vigor and vividness, though this conclusion has been universally dismissed.
[89] In contrast, Knoche praises the opening poem of book four (*Sat.* 10) as "much more clearly...organized than all the satires which precede it," noting that it contains plenty of "evidences of the genius of the great satirist."

(and even eager to increase the virtue of the work in this very regard),[90] and concludes that "it seems to be a joke, and not a very good one." For his part, Courtney (1980, 517-8) grants *Sat.* 12 "more unity than has usually been recognised," but complains that "it has wrapped up its point too much to impress it on the reader with any vigor. The more relaxed manner of writing which Juvenal announced at the beginning of this book here degenerates into slackness, and this is not only his shortest complete poem, but also his weakest." Rudd (1986) and Freudenburg (2001) do not find cause to mention the poem at all.[91]

Some scholars have been able to find more to admire in the poem in recent decades, and their efforts have yielded significant contributions to our understanding of the work. The first to offer a focused and unified analysis of the poem as a whole is

---

[90] Helmbold 1956, 16: "The work is, fortunately, Juvenal's shortest, except for 16; and will, it is hoped, be rather shorter before we are done with it.".

[91] Some have, rather curiously, labeled the poem epistolary (among them Macleane (1876, 277), Pearson and Strong (1892), Coffey (1976, 133)). There is no internal evidence that indicates such a context, and on the contrary, there are several deictic cues that the poem is to be considered as having an oral expressive setting (not to mention a clear declamatory and rhetorical style best suited for speech). Lindo (1974, 26) suggests that Juvenal's final three books largely "reproduce the form, tone and spirit of a Horatian epistle," on the grounds that many of the later poems are addressed to an individual named in the first verse and open with either a rhetorical question or "a proposition advanced for the sake of argument." One of the chief characteristics of epistolary form that Lindo identifies is "the author's tendency to maintain the fiction of a personal letter by small touches designed to emphasize the individuality of the supposed recipient...[including] references to the age, personal preferences, social circumstances, and special interests of the addressee." In the case of *Sat*. 12, such characterization of the addressee is notably entirely absent, and it is hard to see how the speaker's opening comment—"today is happier than my birthday"—qualifies as a proposition up for argument. Though Lindo does include the poem as one of his "eight epistolary Satires" (*Sat.* 8-16, except for *Sat.*10), he does not address it specifically at all. Ramage (1978, 222) signals awareness that *Sat.* 12 fails to benefit from Lindo's direct attention, though he nevertheless accepts Lindo's assessment that the poem possesses a "loose epistolary form."

Ramage (1978), who responds to the prevailing disregard of the piece by asserting a balanced four-part arrangement and unified purpose for the poem—as "a study of friendship in which the extremes of altruism and utility are contrasted."[92] He sees the work as a combination of *prosphonetikon, soteria*, satire and philosophy, all united by the theme of true friendship. Though the conclusion represents rather an oversimplification of the poem, his close reading presents many useful observations that have helped to bring more serious scholarly study to the text.

Smith (1989) revises the friendship-focused reading of Ramage, with a keen focus on the poet's subversion of the avowed friendship. In the description of the high-risk lifestyle of the luxury-goods merchant Catullus and his cowering behavior during the sea storm, Smith sees the poet undermining the sense of respect that such a thanksgiving poem normally allows its celebrand. The deflating characterization of the merchant coincides with the absence of some expected elements of traditional poems of thanksgiving and welcome (namely, indications of admirable traits in the person celebrated, and a focus on the physical reunion of the two friends—often in a sympotic context—that is expected to follow quickly upon the conclusion of the poem). The result is a subtle analysis of the ways in which the friendship Ramage saw as the heart of the poem is not as rosy as it appears. Smith finds thematic unity in the portrayal of greed as a motivating (and indeed, corrupting) factor in contemporary Rome, asserting that the

[92] Ramage (1978, 223). A prevailing previous view on the poem's arrangement can be found in Helmbold (1956, 18): "the simplest way of reconciling oneself to the whole is to assume the bipartite structure of the early Satires, postulating that Part II (93 to end) contains the real point of the work...Part I, though unusually long by comparison with what follows, is merely a preparation for an *aprosdoketon* conclusion." As Ramage admits, the quadripartite format had been previously noted by de Decker (1913) and followed by Highet (1954).

merchant himself can be read as a man living solely for profit no less than the disreputable captators who populate the poem's last section.

Ronnick's (1993a) very short article directly refutes the notion that the poem is about friendship specifically, asserting that at its foundation, *Satire* 12 is about "*religio* in the broadest sense, and deals with the ties that bind—men to gods, men to men and men to themselves." She sees the various sacrifices present in the poem (intended to secure human safety, goodwill or even material gain) as satirizing the different uses (some quite unsavory) to which the *do ut des* concept can be put. She finds verbal echoes that provide further unity to the poem beyond the *religio* theme as well. In addition, she is the first of the commentators on the poem to explicitly draw a distinction between the poet and the speaker of the poem, and she sees a relationship between the speaker and the merchant more characteristically satiric and self-interested than had been previously suggested.

Rainer Henke (2000) builds upon Smith's work, (and largely argues against Adamietz's (1983) presentation of the merchant as a noble figure, a cynic/stoic wiseman), arguing that the poet creates ironic distance through his use of epic-tragic parodic elements. He suggests that the friendship between the speaker and the merchant, so lauded as the central theme of the poem by earlier critics, is no more than a means to a literary end—it is a device to achieve his real satiric aim. The first half of the poem, Henke believes, is no more than an introduction to set up the satire's main purpose, which is the outburst against legacy hunting. He sees a desire to outdo rivals by any means (rather than greed, or true vs. false friendship, for example) as the theme of the critique of captation.

Larmour (2005) sees threatened (or perhaps lost) masculinity as the central issue of Juvenalian satire in general, and his interest in *Sat.* 12 is particularly focused on the nexus of wealth and masculinity present in the symbolic castration of the merchant through the loss of his cargo. The metaphor of the beaver at 34-5 is, for Larmour, the "ideological 'ground zero'" of the poem. He draws on a prodigious range of comparanda (some more clearly to the point than others), the most convincing of which are Juvenal's own *Sat*. 14 (on storm and shipwreck) and Catullus 63 (on the castration of Phrygian Attis). Though the argument wanders so broadly as to become at points quite tenuous, Larmour's investigation focuses much needed attention on the issue of threatened masculinity that is clearly evident in the poem. His attentions underscore this (previously isolated) poem's thematic consistency with the rest of the Juvenalian corpus.

Among recent treatments of the poem, Littlewood's 2007 article stands out as presenting a particularly intriguing reading. Responding to the myriad generic and specific literary allusions within the poem, he finds in the work a tension between Horatian bucolic and epic bombast, as the materialistic present intrudes upon the poet's efforts to create an idyllic literary space. In addition to many keen insights into individual points within the poem, Littlewood's examination applies a metaliterary perspective to *Sat.* 12, so long disregarded as being subpar and only just beginning to receive serious critical attention in its own right.

Through most of the history of modern philological scholarship, the poem has been considered at best a straightforward (if unsatisfying) moralistic treatment of the topic of friendship, and legacy hunting as a suitably satiric perversion of it. The disjuncture between its sections—the current sacrifice of thanksgiving, the shipwreck,

and the misdeeds of captators—has appeared to many as a weakness, and the pervasive presence of the literature of other authors in such a hodge-podge has further confounded the poem's critics. Perspectives on the work offered by the scholars discussed above, and arising from a wide range of approaches, have contributed significantly to our understanding of aspects of the poem, but these disparate perspectives have not yet amounted to a unified reading of the whole. The satire's use of others' literature, themes of exclusion and frustration, and legacy hunting are all part of one cohesive artistic message. Further, by taking up the topic of legacy hunting as a metaphor for participating in literary history, the poem contributes to the conversation begun by Horace and taken up by Petronius after him, as discussed in the previous chapters.

It will be useful to take as a starting point the speaker himself.[93] The narrating voice of the poem has historically been considered to be Juvenal's own, though persona theory has helped modern critics to understand the pitfalls of such an assumption, particularly in the notoriously complex context of satire. Much of a satirist's message is conveyed by the discrepancies between his avowed position or adopted persona and the "reality" which the audience perceives through his presentation of himself. Recognizing the discrepancies between the stated and the revealed character of the speaker will allow

[93] The advent of *persona* theory in scholarship on Roman satire, thanks chiefly to Anderson (1964b and elsewhere) opened avenues of critical interpretation which did not rely upon (and indeed might in fact be directly incompatible with) the previous historicist variety of scholarship. By removing the expectation that the voices of the author and the speaker be identical, (and the inherent expectations for meaning that the known, or speculated, biography of the poet entails), further flexibility in characterization can be imagined and additional insights discovered. Braund's 1988 study of Juvenal's third book of *Satires* is particularly notable in that it suggested a varied *persona* through the Juvenalian corpus as an explanation for the marked difference in tone between the poet's first two books and those that followed, a discrepancy which had long been recognized and caused critical discomfort.

for a more sophisticated understanding of the targets of the satiric criticism and the literary message that underlies (and motivates) the effort.

The speaker's "narrative."

Taking the speaker's self-presentation innocently at face-value—as has often been done—the poem appears to relate an instance of true friendship demonstrated in appropriate and religiously significant ways (through suitable, if humble, sacrifices of thanksgiving and festive celebration), contrasted with the opportunistic and mercenary brand of "friendship" practiced by legacy hunters like Novius and Pacuvius. There is, however, reason to suspect that the speaker is not as virtuous as he suggests, since significant discrepancies exist between his avowed motivations and the character unwittingly revealed through his speech and actions.

The speaker's explicit self-presentation is fairly straightforward: He is a genuine friend of Catullus and is grateful for his return home. He considers Catullus brave, his profession daring, and he respects his friend's choice to sacrifice his belongings to ensure his safety. He is himself of humble means, but is virtuous and doesn't care overmuch about acquiring wealth. He is not a legacy hunter, as is demonstrated by his friend's circumstances. He sarcastically praises legacy hunters, whom he despises out of deep distaste for their behavior. In fact, the speaker's inadvertant revelations within the poem reveal that none of this is precisely true. His preoccupations, his attitudes, and his own words betray a much different reality.

The poem opens with a statement unique among Juvenal's satires for its upbeat tone: namely that today is sweeter to the speaker than his own birthday.[94] The reason for the celebration is not readily apparent, and when it is given, is presented obliquely, in the form of a subordinate clause: *ob reditum...amici* ("on account of a friend's return"). The object of all the speaker's elaborately narrated celebratory preparations is only hinted at (as the unnamed "friend") and not until the end of line 16. The revelation of this man's name is further delayed, not appearing until the conclusion of line 29, (by contrast, the name of the satire's silent addressee is the poem's second word). The focus of the work's first section is squarely on the speaker's intentions, emotions, and actions, the inspiration for which (the shipwreck) will be narrated in the second. Though postponement of essential information in a poem can serve to heighten the tension of the narrative, here the intervening imagery is so abundant and so much more lively than the delayed information ("the return of my friend Catullus") that the speaker's own activities (his preparations) are emphasized at the expense of their avowed purpose (his friend's return). The speaker's self-interested focus is demonstrated from the first lines of the poem, and undercuts his sincerity: today is for him sweeter than his own birthday, not (as one might expect, given the circumstances) because it is the day on which his friend returned safe and sound, or because it is the day on which they will reunite, but rather because it is the day on which *he is offering public sacrifice* for his friend's homecoming.[95] We are told only that Catullus has returned "recently" (the unspecific *nuper*), but the suggestion that

[94] Ramage (1978, 223-4) goes so far as to call this opening "a little startling, since nowhere else does the satirist begin one of his poems in such a positive, lyrical way. For that matter, such expressions of joy are rare anywhere in Juvenal."
[95] As Smith (1989, 295) recognizes, the "narrator's friendship with Catullus fails to convince; he has given no plausible reasons for it."

he is "still" (*adhuc*) emotionally recovering from the events indicates that at least some time has passed. The importance of this day is not that it marks the homecoming of Catullus after his ordeal, but that it is the day on which the speaker gets to *demonstrate* his devotion before others. The central interest of the speaker's introduction is neither Catullus' safety nor his own relief at learning of it—in fact the speaker does not express any personal emotion over the merchant's return, aside from the bland (and potentially ambiguous) *adfectibus* ("goodwill" or "feelings"/"taste").[96] Catullus, we are told, is shaken by his experience and amazed to have survived, while the speaker is clearly giddy with excitement at the prospect of distinguishing himself by displaying friendly concern through sacrifice.

The speaker's narration of the storm and shipwreck further illuminates his character, as his preoccupation with the merchant's cargo over the man himself exposes his attitude toward Catullus. The onset of the storm and resulting fire aboardship, dramatically described at line 17 and following, culminate in the near capsizing of Catullus' ship and his unenviable decisions to jettison his cargo and lower the mast in the hope of surviving.

---

[96] Smith (1989, 290) cogently argues against the legitimacy of the "expressions of affection" that Courtney (1980) and Cairns (1972) find (in lines 16, 19 and 1, 16, 93-5, respectively), on the grounds that these passages can only constitute "lip-service" to the professed friendship when set alongside the many deflating remarks about Catullus (in particular his timidity in the face of the storm—not to mention the use of the term *amicus*, notoriously ambivalent in Juvenal). Even *nostro...Catullo* (29) is less affectionate than has been previously surmised by, for example, Ramage (1978, 226): "underlining the fact of their friendship as he refers to the other man as 'my Catullus.'" Placed as it is, immediately after a digression, Smith sees *nostro* as being "deprived of all its full emphasis by the syntactical need for it to convey the additional neutral meaning of 'Catullus who is the subject of our poem' (as opposed to the generalized *multis* of 26)."

cum plenus fluctu medius foret alueus et iam
alternum puppis latus euertentibus undis
arbori incertae, nullam prudentia cani
rectoris cum ferret opem, decidere iactu
coepit cum uentis, imitatus castora, qui se
eunuchum ipse facit cupiens euadere damno
testiculi: adeo medicatum intellegit inguen.
[*Sat*. 12.30-6]

When the middle of the hold was filled with surge and with the waves already heaving the ship on one side and then the other, and when the white-haired helmsman's ingenuity brought no help to the uncertain mast, he began to bargain with the winds through jettisoning: imitating the beaver, who makes himself a eunuch, desiring to escape danger by the loss of his testicles—so well does he understand his medicinal groin.

The metaphor chosen by the speaker to describe the merchant dumping his freight is particularly memorable—Catullus is likened to a beaver, which, when cornered by hunters seeking the *castoreum* it produces, castrates itself to escape. The link that this metaphor makes between luxurious material possessions and sexual and reproductive potency has been recognized by scholars,[97] but it also produces two other effects—it diminishes Catullus' status and reveals the source of his value in the speaker's mind. Anthropormorphic animal imagery is found elsewhere in the poem,[98] but this is the most extended example, and the fact that it concerns Catullus makes it worthy of special attention as well. The comparison of Catullus to the beaver cannot but be insulting—aside from its suggestion that his "friend" has been emasculated, any comparison of a

[97] Larmour (2005) in particular.
[98] Zoomorphic humans significantly present in the work include artists fed like herd animals (*pasci*) by Isis (28); the legacy hunter's mark caught in fishtraps (123); the addressee, named Corvinus, meaning "Mr. Crow." Anthropomorphized animals are significantly present in the poem as well: the *embarrassed* bull in lines 8-9; elephants "prepared to serve Caesar" and "accustomed to obeying" Hannibal (106-9).

free man (particularly a successful one) to an animal can be read as impugning the legitimacy of his free status.[99] That the speaker imagines the merchant as quarry being hunted further undermines his pose of respect and affection for Catullus, and it provides an unintended glimpse of the speaker's true interest in the merchant: as prey to be hunted for his wealth.

The speaker's descriptions of the items jettisoned confirms his mercenary attitude—the lost items he wistfully describes are not only very luxurious, but are each given a detailed provenance.

> 'fundite quae mea sunt' dicebat 'cuncta' Catullus
> praecipitare uolens etiam pulcherrima, uestem
> purpuream teneris quoque Maecenatibus aptam,
> atque alias quarum generosi graminis ipsum
> infecit natura pecus, sed et egregius fons
> uiribus occultis et Baeticus adiuuat aer.
> ille nec argentum dubitabat mittere, lances
> Parthenio factas, urnae cratera capacem
> et dignum sitiente Pholo uel coniuge Fusci;
> adde et bascaudas et mille escaria, multum
> caelati, biberat quo callidus emptor Olynthi.
> sed quis nunc alius, qua mundi parte quis audet
> argento praeferre caput rebusque salutem?
> [non propter uitam faciunt patrimonia quidam,
> sed uitio caeci propter patrimonia uiuunt.]
> [*Sat.* 12.37-51]

> "Toss my belongings overboard—all of it!" Catullus said,
> willing even to hurl away the most lovely things, purple
> clothing suitable even for delicate Maecenases, and other
> textiles the very wool of which the nature of the noble grass
> has dyed, but the excellent water, with its hidden power
> helps too, along with the Baetic atmosphere. Nor did he
> hesitate to let go his silver, platters made for Parthenius, a

[99] See Fitzgerald (2005).

> crater large enough to hold 5 gallons[100] and worthy of thirsty Pholus or the wife of Fuscus; add also baskets and a thousand serving trays, many embossed items, from which the crafty purchaser of Olynthus had drunk.[101] But who else these days—in which part of the world would anyone dare to prefer his head to his silver, his safety to his possessions? [Certain men build their patrimony not to benefit their lives, but blinded by vice, they live to increase their inheritance.][102]

The loving detail with which these items are depicted notably contrasts with the absence of comparably emotional language from the speaker about Catullus himself. Each sort of item is given a careful description and even a pedigree or provenance. Not only are the textiles fine, some are woven from the wool of specialty stock native to a specific area, others have been treated with the most expensive dyes and are further characterized by consumer demographics—they are luxuries that only the most elegant

---

[100] Pearson and Strong (1892, 246): "the *urna* was half an *amphora* or *quadrantal*, which contained rather more than 5 gallons and 2 quarts."

[101] Philip the Great. Macleane (1867, 283) notes that "Olynthus in Chalcidice was besieged by Philip BC 348, and taken through the treachery of two of the inhabitants, Lasthenes and Euthycrates, whose services Philip bought. The city was destroyed and the inhabitants sold. All the cities in Chalcidice he gained at the same time and in the same way. He acted universally on the principle laid down for him by the oracle, *ἀργυρέαις λόγχῃσι μάχου καὶ πάντα κρατήσεις*. Philip had the reputation of being a hard drinker." Courtney (1980, 523) believes that "the point of the periphrasis here is to reduce everything to the mercantile level and link luxuries with corruption."

[102] Courtney (1980, 523 n.50-1) and most others (following Bentley on Horace *Ars Poet.* 387) have wanted to delete these lines as an interpolation on the basis that they are not sufficiently elegant and are too unsubtle. This is, to me, not sufficient justification for deletion, particularly given Juvenal's regular use of similarly aphoristic statements elsewhere (see Courtney (1980, 44) for *sententiae* as a particularly characteristic feature of Juvenal's style). Green (1998, 199) argues that omitting lines as interpolations on the grounds of "feebleness" suggests that an author is internally consistent in the quality of his verses, and notes that as a criterion for authenticity, this allows sufficiently "ingenious" interpolations to safely avoid excision, getting us no closer to the original text. Though he considers their removal no loss, Macleane (1867, 283, n.48) notes that the scholiast and all manuscripts do contain the lines in question.

citizens would wear. The value of the silver serviceware lost to the catastrophe is likewise qualified through association with its past or prospective owners: platters made for an imperial chamberlain,[103] a drinking vessel worthy of a famous drinker (be it mythic centaur or contemporary woman), and items once handled by Philip the Great. As Courtney (1980, 522) has noted, in the Roman mind, possession by a famous former owner added to an artwork's value.[104] This keen interest in pedigree is reminiscent of the poem's opening, in which the speaker describes the animal he would have liked to offer for slaughter—one that would have cost a great deal due not only to its prodigious size, but also because it had been raised on the banks of the river Clitumnus, an area which famously produced sought-after victims.[105] Even the speaker's unflattering comparison of Catullus to the beaver reveals an interest in the production of luxury goods, as the *castoreum* for which he is hunted was used in perfumes and ointments.

The speaker's interest is in certain sumptuous sorts of possessions, and no less on their places of origin and means of valuation—he knows what makes one fancy cup worth more than others, where and how the most valuable animals are raised. Furthermore, his characterization of Catullus' decisions at the height of the catastrophe provides some insight into his worldview. The crisis point in the storm prompts Catullus

---

[103]The temptation to take *lances Parthenio factas* as indicating the maker of the objects ("platters made by Parthenius,") is convincingly refuted by Courtney (1980, 522), following Friedlaender (1969). He reads "made for Parthenius" on the grounds that Parthenius is unknown as an artisan, and the name-dropping in which the speaker is engaged requires a well-known referent.

[104] At *Satire* 6.155-6 the covetous Bibula purchases (among a great many other luxury items) a ring more valuable for having been worn by Berenice: *deinde adamas notissimus et Beronices/ in digito factus pretiosior*.

[105] Per Courtney (1980, 519): "for the famous white oxen of the luxuirant pastures by the Clitumnus in Umbria, which were choice victims, cf. Verg. *Georg*. 2.146-8 with Servius, Prop. 2.19.25-6, Nissen 2.401-2, *RE Clitumnus* (I)."

to make two desperate resolutions: to jettison his expensive wares to lighten the ship's load, and to cut down the mast. Contrary to expectation, it is the first of these actions that is compared to emasculation, not the severing of the mast—throwing his goods overboard is his attempt to "bargain" with the winds, and the deed that prompts the speaker to liken him to a beaver. The animal's self-castration is intended to preserve its life by reducing its value to the hunter, though at the expense of its procreative power. The fact that Catullus' choice makes him like the beaver, not only equates wealth to sexual and reproductive potency, but demonstrates that his value, at least in the speaker's mind, lies in the goods he possesses. That the speaker's perspective on Catullus' shipwreck is essentially mercenary is also revealed by the financial language he employs to describe it: *decidere...cum uentis* (33-4) (he "made a bargain with the winds") 33-4, *damno* (35) and *damna* (53) ("loss," often as financial damages or fines assessed). The narration of Catullus' final act of desperation—cutting down the ship's mast—highlights the ambivalence of the situation: it is the "last resort" to save the ship by making it smaller (*discriminis ultima, quando/ praesidia adferimus navem factura minorem*) (55-6). Just as the ship is lessened by the loss of the mast, the man, at least from the speaker's perspective, has been lessened by the loss of his possessions. Worst of all, it seems that these sacrifices have actually done no good. The speaker's narration indicates that the storm simply abated shortly thereafter, and attributes the survival of the ship's crew not to the merchant's decisive action, but to fate.

> sed postquam iacuit planum mare, tempora postquam
> prospera uectoris fatumque ualentius euro
> et pelago, postquam Parcae meliora benigna
> pensa manu ducunt hilares et staminis albi

lanificae, modica nec multum fortior aura
uentus adest, inopi miserabilis arte cucurrit
uestibus extentis et, quod superauerat unum,
uelo prora suo.

[*Sat*. 12.62-9]

But after the sea lay flat, after there were fortunate times
for the traveler and a destiny stronger than the east wind or
the sea: after the Fates, smiling and spinning, draw out by
hand a better, kinder lot of white wool, and there is a wind
not much stronger than a moderate breeze, the miserable
ship runs incompetently with clothing billowing and the
one thing which survived, the prow with its own sail.

The sense of Catullus' humiliation is emphasized by the description of his return to port, as the ship limps along, mastless and denuded of all but one sail and with its crew likewise stripped, having strung up their own clothing in an attempt to make use of any favorable breeze. The ship at last reaches the port at Ostia and makes its way into the innermost harbor, where even lake-paddling dinghies are safe. That the once-robust commercial vessel must now use the rowboat lanes illustrates the degree of its diminution. The sailors, giddy and garrulous from their narrow escape offer their hair in thanksgiving for their safe return, and it is at this point in the account that the speaker abruptly remembers his present purpose—his own thanksgiving sacrifice—and breaks off his narration to provide instructions to his slaves.

ite igitur, pueri, linguis animisque fauentes
sertaque delubris et farra inponite cultris
ac mollis ornate focos glebamque uirentem.
iam sequar et sacro, quod praestat, rite peracto
inde domum repetam, graciles ubi parua coronas
accipiunt fragili simulacra nitentia cera.
hic nostrum placabo Iouem Laribusque paternis
tura dabo atque omnis uiolae iactabo colores.

> cuncta nitent, longos erexit ianua ramos
> et matutinis operatur festa lucernis.
> [*Sat*. 12.83-93]
>
> Go then, boys, and refraining from ill-omened words and thoughts, place garlands on the shrines and spelt on the sacrificial knife and decorate the soft altar made of green turf. Then I will follow and once the sacred rite has been carried out—which is the most important step—I will return home, where the little statues shining with brittle wax will receive modest garlands. Here I will appease our own Jupiter and I will give frankincense to the ancestral Lares and I will scatter out violets of every color. Everything will look bright, the door has raised long boughs and celebrates the holiday with the lamps of early morning.

Once he has accomplished the sacrifice mentioned at the poem's opening, the speaker plans to continue his display of celebration by decorating the exterior of his home, and will offer garlands to his household gods in honor of the occasion. While these activities are intended to be evidence of his altruistic aims, the speaker's perspective reveals itself as anything but selfless.

First, the fact that his mind is brought back to the present with the remembrance of the sailors recounting their experience is itself a sign of the opportunism motivating his display. Survivors of shipwreck frequently made offerings of their shorn hair in thanks, but as Pearson and Strong (1892, 249, citing Lucian *de Merc. Cond.* 1)[106] note, this practice also served as public evidence of their ordeal and a means of evoking pity in others. Scenes of sailors noisily reliving the disaster (and perhaps embelishing it somewhat, once safely on land) appear regularly in ancient sources, and such expressions may even have proven financially advantageous to them. As Huxley (1952, 124)

[106] See Courtney (1980, 624-9) for a discussion of Lucian's debt to Juvenal, especially with regard to *Satires* 3 and 5.

explains, "It was the common practice of those who, spared by Neptune, could not or would not turn an honest penny, to seek a livelihood by begging. The tools of their trade were a vivid if crude painting of the storm they had survived (sometimes executed on what purported to be a spar of the lost ship) and a lusty singing voice."[107] The speaker's own vivid narration of the storm is made suspect by the inclusion of the familiar image of the shorn sailors spinning yarns for pity and profit.

The speaker's actions are also a bit curious—it is traditional to make offerings to one's household gods on holidays (such as cardinal days of the month,[108] and upon one's own return from abroad),[109] but the occasion of a *friend's* successful return from a dangerous voyage is a strange one to commemorate by garlanding the shrine of the gods who protect one's own home. As Courtney (1980, 528) notes, the *Laribus paternis* of line 89 "can hardly mean just *familiaribus*; it must indicate that Juvenal has inherited this house."[110] Indeed, the two sets of Roman household gods—the *Lares* and the *Penates*—as Bodel and Olyan (2008) note, are distinct: the former are shared by all in the household, whereas the latter are "personal, inherited—and thus familial—images and tokens cultivated by individuals." Since Catullus is not part of his family or household,

---

[107] An incautious and overambitious merchant suffers shipwreck after sailing into a storm and becomes just this sort of panhandler at *Satire* 14.300-3: *...frigida sufficient velantes inguina panni/ exiuusque cibus, mersa rate naufragus assem/ dum rogat et picta se tempestate tuetur.*

[108] Cato *de Agricultura* 143.1-2.

[109] See Catullus 31: *peregrino/ labore fessi venimus larem ad nostrum* as Courtney notes, citing *RE Lares* 814.61 and 815.62*,* Latte 93-4, Wissowa 169*, RSV* 3.128.

[110] Courtney refers to the speaker by the poet's name throughout, and seems to be interested in this detail as a point of the poet's biography. Though I do not consider any of Juvenal's poems to directly represent the poet's own personality or opinion, the value of his note for the present argument remains when "the speaker" is understood as a substitute for Courtney's "Juvenal." This is the speaker's own inherited home that will be the locus of celebration for a man he claims he is not captating.

that the speaker of the poem includes burning incense for the *Lares* of his own *domus* in his plans for the day suggests that Catullus' return is not simply an occasion of significance to him personally, but offers some benefit to his (inherited) estate as well.

Indeed, the speaker has invoked his estate and inheritance in general elsewhere in the poem to this point: both at line 10 (*si res ampla domi similisque adfectibus esset...*), when he laments that the limited wealth of his household (rather than a lack of affection) precludes a more expensive victim, and in the aphorism at 50-1 (*non propter vitam faciunt patrimonia quidam,/ sed vitio caeci propter patrimonia vivunt*). The speaker's estate is on his mind, and he seems to realize that that fact may be apparent, as he hastens to clarify his intentions to his addressee, Corvinus.

> neu suspecta tibi sint haec, Coruine, Catullus,
> pro cuius reditu tot pono altaria, paruos
> tres habet heredes. libet expectare quis aegram
> et claudentem oculos gallinam inpendat amico
> tam sterili;
>
> [*Sat.* 12.93-7]

> In case these deeds seem suspect to you, Corvinus, Catullus—for whose return I put in place so many offerings—has three young heirs. Let's just wait and see who would spend even a sick hen about to keel over on a friend so barren...

If the preparations themselves were appropriate to the circumstance and the speaker's motivations were purely altruistic, there should be no cause for suspicion. His own admission that his actions could perhaps be viewed as captatorial launches the speaker into a rant against legacy hunters that ultimately reveals that he "doth protest too much" to truly be innocent. Moreover, his description of Catullus as "barren" (*sterili*) because he is a father—intended as a sarcastic jab at the perverse value system of the legacy

hunter—cannot but remind his audience of his own previous characterization of Catullus "made a eunuch" by the loss of his wealth in the beaver simile.[111] The speaker has yet again unwittingly betrayed his motives. As is often the case with Juvenal's satiric speakers, the object of his bile reveals a great deal of truth about his character.

The speaker's description of the captators' behavior not only demonstrates that he is in the habit of paying close attention to the sacrifices made by and for others, but furthermore reveals that his own behavior thus far has actually corresponded closely with that of the individuals he criticizes.

> uerum haec nimia est inpensa, coturnix
> nulla umquam pro patre cadet. sentire calorem
> si coepit locuples Gallitta et Pacius orbi,
> legitime fixis uestitur tota libellis
> porticus, existunt qui promittant hecatomben,
> quatenus hic non sunt nec uenales elephanti,
> nec Latio aut usquam sub nostro sidere talis
> belua concipitur, sed furua gente petita
> arboribus Rutulis et Turni pascitur agro,
> Caesaris armentum nulli seruire paratum
> priuato, siquidem Tyrio parere solebant
> Hannibali et nostris ducibus regique Molosso
> horum maiores ac dorso ferre cohortis,
> partem aliquam belli, et euntem in proelia turrem.
> [*Sat.* 12.97-110]

> Nay, even this is too great an expense, not so much as a cheap
> quail is ever sacrificed on behalf of a father. But if wealthy
> childless types—say Gallitta or Pacius—begin to be affected by
> fever, the entire portico of the temple is properly outfitted with
> little petitions for his wellbeing fastened up, then appear those who
> promise a hecatomb, only because there aren't elephants here for
> purchase and no such beast has ever been conceived in Latium or

[111] The portrayal of a father as "barren" recalls the contempt for fatherhood in Petronius' Croton, a place in which those who have children are treated as pariahs and not welcome to participate in society (see chapter 3 above).

> anywhere in our climate, but sought from darkest Africa[112] they graze on Rutulian trees and the fields of Turnus, [they are] the herd of Caesar, prepared to serve no private citizen, since indeed their ancestors once were accustomed to obey Tyrian Hannibal and our generals and the Molossian king, to bear on their backs cohorts, a fair part of the combat, and towers marching into battle.

The speaker is an expert on the ways of legacy hunters, and has made careful note of their techniques. He claims that he is alone (and hence heartfelt) in offering thanksgiving gestures on behalf of a man with living children, contrasting this to legacy hunters' haste at displaying goodwill toward the childless wealthy at the slightest opportunity. The speaker not only knows exactly the sort of individuals targeted by captators, but has some specific names ready off the top of his head: Pacius and Gallitta. The display that opportunists would use to woo such marks is described sarcastically (*legitime*, *tota porticus*) but in fact sounds not dissimilar to the preparations made by the speaker to impress Catullus: he has not only arranged for an animal sacrifice, but also will decorate turf altars, hang garlands on the shrines, scatter flowers about, deck his door with lanterns and generally make everything sparkle (*cuncta nitent*). Clearly this is meant to be as conspicuous a presentation as that created by the captators.

Legacy hunters, the speaker continues, will offer whole hecatombs to the *orbus*, though they would prefer elephants instead. The thrust of this image is clear: captators can be relied upon to take displays of sacrifice to an absurd, and even hubristic level.

[112] I translate "darkest Africa" here after Green (1998, 96) for "from the race of dark-skinned people" which Courtney (1980, 529) acknowledges indicates Moors, Ethiopians, or Indians elsewhere in Juvenal.

Hecatombs are appropriate offerings only for the most momentous religious occasions,[113] for which an old man's fever certainly does not qualify. The misuse of the practice of animal sacrifice in the hands of these opportunists perverts the system—if hecatombs are offered for a headcold, the currency of exchange between man and gods has become destabilized. As absurd as the image is, the speaker clarifies that even a hecatomb is less than what this sort of captator prefers to offer—he would have sacrificed elephants, but there are none to be had for purchase in Rome. The speaker's rhetoric approaches a crescendo here, when he abruptly slips into a digression on the natural history of elephants. This departure from his rant has struck most scholars as a flaw in the satire, on the grounds that it "undoubtedly strays into irrelevance and goes on for too long."[114] This assessment, however, does not take into account the fact that the excursus here creates a striking parallel with the speaker's earlier discussion of his own preferred sacrificial victim at lines 10-16. The nasty captator, we are told, offers an overlarge sacrifice to curry favor with his mark, though he wishes he could make an even more ludicrous offering. The speaker himself has behaved very similarly, if on a more modest scale. The speaker's own self-defense at lines 95-98 (that a sick chicken or a cheap quail is more than most would offer on behalf of a man like Catullus), intended to show that his

---

[113] Hecatombs were a particularly ostentatious offering, even for a public occasion. By comparison, when the Arval Brothers had to offer sacrifices of expiation after lightning damage to a sacred grove necessitated the replacement of several of its trees in AD 224, the goddess associated with the grove received the *suovetaurilia* (the sacrifice of a pig, a ram, and a bull). Other gods received two animals apiece, while the emperor himself and the *divi* received one bull each. The Lares of Rome were offered two castrated rams (Beard, North and Price 1998 v.2, 6.2). At Augustus' great Saecular Games in 17 BC the sacrifices offered were of similar scale—one or two large animals each were offered to the chief dieties, with several smaller animals for collective entities such as the *Moirai* (ibid. 5.7). As Ramage (1978, 233) observes, "a hecatomb is not only gross, it is Greek!"

[114] Courtney (1980, 517).

feelings are genuine, in fact reveals similarities with the behavior of the captators. He has selected as his offering a young bull when a small votive would have been suitable, and like a captator, he laments that he could not sacrifice an enormous animal of the most illustrious stock. The knowledge of elephant husbandry and social history is another example of his preoccupation with the provenance and valuation of luxury items, as was seen in the catalog of Catullus' lost cargo and the discussion of the Clitumnian bull. The speaker's luxurious tastes and his propensity for ostentation (accompanied by a grasping desire for even more absurdly elaborate display) will not be the only points of parallel between himself and those he criticizes. The captators' actions, as the speaker proceeds to describe them, follow the same general order in which he has presented his own.

> nulla igitur mora per Nouium, mora nulla per Histrum
> Pacuuium, quin illud ebur ducatur ad aras
> et cadat ante Lares Gallittae uictima sola
> tantis digna deis et captatoribus horum.
> alter enim, si concedas, mactare uouebit
> de grege seruorum magna et pulcherrima quaeque
> corpora, uel pueris et frontibus ancillarum
> inponet uittas et, si qua est nubilis illi
> Iphigenia domi, dabit hanc altaribus, etsi
> non sperat tragicae furtiua piacula ceruae.
> [*Sat.* 12.111-20]

> No delay, however, for Novius--no delay for Pacuvius Hister before that ivory would indeed be brought to the altars and only a victim worthy of such "gods" and their captators would fall before the Lares of Gallitta. Indeed, if you'll let him, Novius will vow to slaughter the greatest and most handsome bodies from the mass of slaves, he would put fillets on the slave boys and the foreheads of maidservants and, if there is any marriageable Iphigenia in Pacuvius' household, he will give her to the altars, though he doesn't hold any hope for a secret substitution of a tragic hind.'

The captator's order of operations is as follows: upon learning of the orbus' infirmity, he plasters the temple portico with votives; he promises an outsize animal sacrifice, but with an admission that he would prefer an even more extravagant victim (a claim that is attended by a demonstration of his expertise on the topic); he makes a(n inappropriate) sacrifice to the Lares. Up to this point, each step of the captatorial strategy outlined has been (or soon will be) executed by the speaker himself, from decoration of public spaces through the sacrifice to the Lares, with the only difference between the captatorial model and the speaker's actions being the scale of the offerings. The details of the captators' sacrifice to the Lares must give the reader pause, however, as two significant differences emerge: first, it is the *orbus*' (not his own) Lares to whom the sacrifice is made by the captator, and second, the sacrifice itself is an animal victim. As Pearson and Strong (1892, 250) note, "the Lares and Penates received no blood offerings"—the suggestion that elephants or any animal should be a suitable offering to household gods is an indication of the degree to which captatorial grasping can befoul traditional Roman institutions. A bloodied household altar is a powerfully ominous image in Roman literature,[115] and the discrepancy between the scales of victim and altar add to the perversity of the prospect. Such a great victim inflates the significance of the deity—the humble household gods of the captatorial mark are blown up to Olympian size, and the *orbus* himself, as the speaker hints, becomes a sort of god. This hubris is not sufficient, however, for the captator Novius, who will one-up his competition by offering

[115] Most vividly in the *Aeneid*: Priam at 2.550-7 and Sychaeus at 1.348-52.

human sacrifice in the form of his choicest slaves, and Pacuvius will raise the stakes again by vowing even a daughter.[116]

Though there seems no danger that the speaker himself will make a sacrifice of his own kin, or anything near so extreme, the coincidence of the successful legacy hunters' actions and his own is clear, despite the fact that he does stop short of outright sacrilege. Nonetheless, it is notable that even the crazed captators described here have a remarkable practical advantage over the speaker: in order to sacrifice to the *orbus'* Lares, one must have direct access to the man. The speaker of *Satire* 12 has presented no evidence of a personal relationship with the individual whose return he celebrates. Aside from his reference to Catullus as an *amicus* at line 16, the speaker provides no corroborating details to support this claim. The only information offered about the merchant is, in fact, the sort of information in which a captator would be most interested: his family situation and financial disposition—that is, his "stats" as a potential target. The speaker is aware that Catullus is a father of three and has detailed knowledge of the entire ship's manifest, but never relates any personal or emotional history between himself and the merchant. No shared experience is recalled, no access to the merchant's private life is evident, no description of the man himself is provided. In light of the loving description

---

[116] Henke (2000, 211) makes a compelling argument for attributing these outrageous offerings to Novius and Pacuvius, respectively, (rather than attributing them all to Pacuvius as, for example, Courtney does). He reads *alter...illi* (115 and 118) as equivalent to *alter...alteri* (citing Florus on such usage in Cicero and Juvenal), and hence not as "the latter" and "that same guy" (both referring to Pacuvius) but "one" (Novius) and "the other" (Pacuvius). From this clarification, he makes a case for reading the final lines of the poem as relating a contest between Novius and Pacuvius, rather than elaborating purely upon Pacuvius' outrageous offers. This is indeed consistent with the pervasive interest in competition and one-upmanship in the poem.

Catullus' lost goods receive by comparison, even the one emotional term the speaker uses—*adfectibus* at line 10—rings hollow in retrospect. Given what the speaker has revealed about himself, the phrase *si res ampla domi similique adfectibus est...* could perhaps be correctly read as "If there were ample wealth in my household and resources equal to my *taste*" rather than "my *goodwill*."[117]

When the speaker's claim to friendship is examined, even the source of his vivid account of the shipwreck proves suspicious. From his authoritative presentation, the audience may assume that he has heard the tale directly from Catullus himself, but the speaker never actually makes that claim. In fact, the narration of the wreck ends with the image of the chatty sailors regaling others with the story, which reminds the speaker to return to the present and to the preparations at hand. There is no reason not to imagine that the speaker, who has otherwise revealed himself as opportunistic and captatorial, overheard the talk of the rowdy sailors and took advantage of the occasion by quickly arranging an outsized and conspicuous demonstration of thanksgiving aimed to attract the attention of the unfortunate merchant. Given that so much of his behavior has mimicked that of the captators he criticizes, it is no wonder that such false prayers for a man who survives would be a functional element of the legacy hunter's arsenal.

> laudo meum ciuem, nec comparo testamento
> mille rates; nam si Libitinam euaserit aeger,
> delebit tabulas inclusus carcere nassae
> post meritum sane mirandum atque omnia soli
> forsan Pacuuio breuiter dabit, ille superbus
> incedet uictis riualibus. ergo uides quam
> grande operae pretium faciat iugulata Mycenis.

[117] Courtney (1980, 519) notes that the word is used as the neutral "feelings" (including both positive and negative) at 6.214, though he takes it with its positive valence here "as often in Silver Latin" (and cites 15.150 and 8.161 as Juvenalian examples).

> uiuat Pacuuius quaeso uel Nestora totum,
> possideat quantum rapuit Nero, montibus aurum
> exaequet, nec amet quemquam nec ametur ab ullo.
> [*Sat.* 12.121-30]

> I praise my fellow citizen, and I do not consider even a thousand ships equal to a legacy; for if that sick man escapes Libitina, he will erase the will, caught in a prison of fishtraps after a job well worthy of admiration and perhaps he will quickly give everything to Pacuvius as sole heir—that fellow will march along proud, his rivals conquered. You see, then, how powerful a return on investment a butchered Iphigenia will make. I pray that Pacuvius may live even an entire Nestor's lifetime, that he may possess as much as Nero stole, that his gold pile rival a mountain, that he love no one and be loved by no one in return.

False sacrifice, then, can be a win-win venture: Pacuvius knows that either the old man will succumb to his fever (and the deceased's "friend" may receive the benefit of a small legacy sooner, and focus his energy on acquiring new targets) or he will overcome his illness, and, touched by the display offered on his behalf, will perhaps erase his previous will and promote Pacuvius to sole heir. The former results in a quick payout, but the "long con" can pay greater dividends.

Scholars have recognized the angry sarcasm in line 121's *laudo meum civem* and in the scathing blessing/curse for Pacuvius' final success, but have generally explained this section as a true friend's indignance toward con artists operating under the guise of friendship. In light of the unwitting revelations the speaker has made regarding his character and motivations throughout the poem, however, this traditional explanation for his vitriol must be reconsidered. His interest in Catullus is mercenary and his aim is to *seem*—not necessarily to *be*—a concerned friend. The speaker has followed the basic order of operations modeled by Novius and Pacuvius, but because of his humble means and his unsuitable target, he is unlikely to realize any similar benefit. He cannot offer

even one large bull, but must settle for a newly weaned calf as his ostentatious sacrifice. He does not have access to Catullus' household (as clients would) to propitiate the mark's household gods, so he must settle for decorating his own *lararium*. His resources (and perhaps skill) exclude him from competing with successful captators, who can hunt all the "big game." As a result, he is left to pursue subprime targets like Catullus, a man who already has three young heirs, whose wealth has just been quite significantly diminished, and who may not even know that the speaker exists. The speaker of *Satire* 12 is ultimately not unlike the speaker of Juvenal's programmatic first satire, a man who is fed up with the terrible poetry he hears everyone else creating and is frustrated that he is excluded from participation—in both cases the behavior targeted by the satire is criticized at length, but more out of bitter jealousy than disapproval.

His preoccupations and underlying interests have revealed the speaker's true attitudes toward Catullus, and it is fitting at this point to juxtapose his explicit self-presentation in the poem with the real position that he has unwittingly unveiled.

Speaker's explicit self-presentation	**Speaker's inadvertant revelations**
He is a genuine friend of Catullus and is grateful for his return home.	He is not a genuine nor close friend, evinces no emotional attachment to him and may not even know the merchant personally. He is grateful only for the opportunity the shipwreck has provided for him to conspicuously demonstrate devotion to Catullus.
He considers Catullus brave, his profession daring, and the speaker respects his friend's choice to sacrifice his belongings to ensure his safety.	He feels contempt for Catullus, whose profession is not particularly respectable, and he values Catullus' belongings above his life. Catullus' value to the speaker is his wealth.
He is a true friend and doesn't care overmuch about acquiring wealth.	He is a calculating opportunist with a keen attention to the trappings of luxury and expertise concerning their valuation.
He is not a legacy hunter, as is demonstrated by his friend's circumstances. He sarcastically praises captators, whom he despises out of distaste for their behavior.	He is an unsuccessful legacy hunter, as is demonstrated by his friend's circumstances. He bitterly praises captators, whom he despises out of jealousy at their success.

The poem, the topic of which seemed so noble at first glance, ultimately concludes with the speaker espousing familiar Juvenalian vinegar, and the contrast between the two moods (not to mention the confounding mix of praise and subversion of the celebrand between) has left critics uneasy and dissatisfied. Since the speaker is guilty of the same mercenary approach to friendship as men like Pacuvius, whom he criticizes, the purpose of the satire cannot be simply a castigation of vice, as has long been thought. Close inspection has shown that the poem offers a revealing and subverting self-presentation by a characteristically Juvenalian speaker: a self-interested opportunist not unlike satiric figures in Juvenal's other poems. As elsewhere in his oeuvre, Juvenal here employs his satire to discuss underlying anxieties about living and writing in contemporary Rome.

Sacrifice and Writing in Juvenal *Satire* 12.

Since the speaker is neither the "true friend" that he would like others to believe him to be, nor a reliable narrative figure as scholars have long assumed, the poem is clearly not simply an examination of true vs. opportunistic friendship.[118] Though this dichotomy, as we've seen, is not the clear-cut *raison d'etre* that some have wished, the poem is nonetheless a unified whole with an artistic and metaliterary (rather than social-moralistic) message.

The poem reveals, bit by bit, that the speaker is actually pursuing his merchant "friend" as a captator, though he is irritated by the reality: that he is ill-situated for success and certainly cannot compete with the likes of Novius and Pacuvius. There is a

[118]Interpreting this contrast as the poem's central feature has persisted as the standard view even up to quite recently. In her introduction to the poem Braund (2004, 419) sums it up thus: "the realisation that friendship is the central theme—true friendship, as shown by Juvenal in his celebration of his frend's survival, and false friendship, as shown by the legacy hunters—gives the poem shape and coherence."

pervasive sense of frustration and exclusion throughout the poem that resonates with the satirist's artistic impetus as presented in his first satire. In *Satire* 1, Juvenal explains that he has been subjected to the overwhelming flood of others' terrible compositions for so long that he can no longer tolerate the situation. His wish, however, is not to suppress the awful onslaught, but to participate in it himself. The entire world is creating intolerable literature but even as he criticizes it, he cannot stand to be excluded from participation. *Satire* 12 presents an almost identical nexus of exclusion and competition, and can be read as a metaliterary meditation on the artistic concerns of the satirist in a world overflowing with literary competition.

Of the many indications supporting this metaliterary interpretation, perhaps the clearest appears in the opening lines of the shipwreck passage.

> nam praeter pelagi casus et fulminis ictus
> euasit. densae caelum abscondere tenebrae
> nube una subitusque antemnas inpulit ignis,
> cum se quisque illo percussum crederet et mox
> attonitus nullum conferri posse putaret
> naufragium uelis ardentibus. omnia fiunt
> talia, tam grauiter, si quando poetica surgit
> tempestas. genus ecce aliud discriminis audi
> et miserere iterum, quamquam sint cetera sortis
> eiusdem pars dira quidem sed cognita multis
> et quam uotiua testantur fana tabella
> plurima: pictores quis nescit ab Iside pasci?
> accidit et nostro similis fortuna Catullo.
>
> [Juvenal *Sat.* 12.17-29]

> For in addition to the calamity of the open sea he even escaped lightning strike. Dense clouds swallowed up the sky in a uniform gloom and a sudden bolt struck the yardarm, so that everyone believed himself stricken by that blow and soon would have thought it impossible for any shipwreck to compare to [the danger of] the burning sails. If ever a poetic storm welled up, all of the same things happened in this case, and just as violently. Lo! Hear

> another danger and pity this journey once more—although the remainder is part of the same misfortune, a dreadful one, yes, but one familiar to many people, and to which many a shrine attests with votive tablets: [after all,] who is not aware that painters are fed by Isis? A similar fortune befell even my own friend Catullus.

Clearly the severity and scope of the catastrophe here described is meant to be impressive, but the account begins just as would any clichéd storm scene. The speaker, realizing that he cannot escape activating his audience's pre-existing familiarity with storm narratives from literature, explicitly evokes them with *si quando poetica surgit tempestas.* That a character within the poem can recognize the universality of the literary *topos* of the epic storm in the midst of narrating his own storm story pulls the reader through the dramatic illusion and cues examination of the speaker as a creator of literary narrative. The scrim between author and audience has become transparent at this point, and immediately the speaker redirects the audience's gaze to the poem's outer narrative layer with *ecce* and *audi* at line 24. These two instructions serve a deictic function, drawing attention back to the storm at hand, but specifically as the events of a *story being told*. This framing of the narrative context (i.e. that the storm is not an event that the audience experiences vicariously at first-hand, but a story) is further highlighted by the speaker's signposting—he indicates that there is even more tragedy to come (a sort of "teaser," alluding to the mutilation of the ship and the jettisoning of cargo). Before continuing on to those details immediately, however, the poem offers another strange and revealing moment—just as the audience is told to "pity anew" the extraordinary trials of the speaker's friend, the uniqueness of the situation is again undermined by the claim that

the events described to this point will not, in fact, be unfamiliar to the audience—who hasn't heard of a terrible shipwreck, or seen evidence of one outside the temple of Isis?

Though he is perhaps doomed to fail, the speaker nonetheless tries to make his storm narrative vivid and compelling. Doing so will distinguish him as a true, concerned friend, one who has earned a place in the social sphere of his mark, Catullus.[119] But success in this endeavor requires distinguishing himself from others, and doing so from a significant disadvantage. Indeed, such comparison and competition are themes which pervade the shipwreck scene and extend throughout the poem: just as the speaker's narrative competes with poetic storms (and with visual images of storms), likewise the damage caused by the storm competes with that caused by fire; Catullus' garments are fine enough for Maecenas, his krater large enough for Pholus, his cup great enough for Philip; Catullus' destiny is stronger than the winds; Alba Longa is preferred by Iulus over Lavinium; the artificial port is more impressive than any natural one; the bay as calm as a lake. Even the decision to take down the ship's mast is described as the *ultima discriminis*—the *final* crisis—because no greater disaster could have been survived. Catullus' decision to eject his cargo is characterized as a compromise—a bargain between two competing forces—as is the beaver's compromise with his pursuers.

The speaker's presentation of the shipwreck reveals a desire to achieve real emotional effectiveness in conflict with an overwhelming sense that originality is not possible. He hopes to evoke wonder and sympathy in his audience but is helpless to avoid the well-trod cliché of the epic storm. Making his work more difficult is the fact that the

[119] *Satire* 9 presents a similar attitude held by the deluded gigolo Naevolus, who, presenting himself as a *cliens* expects that his sordid services to a stingy *amicus* will earn him both wealth and social recognition.

epic storm image exists as a cliché not only in literature, but in visual art at well, as is indicated by the reference to survivors' votive paintings. Likewise, any poet presenting a storm tale in a culture immersed in bombastic literature must recognize the epic storm *topos* as an elephant in the room—he must either address it and perhaps fail to move beyond it or ignore the issue and risk the automatic subsumption of his work into the cliché. This passage suggests that there may be no room left for the contemporary artist's expression. That this sense of resignation is particularly literary is indicated by the revelation of Catullus' name for the first time at this very moment: the *captandus* who had suffered a *poetica tempestas* has a famous Latin poet's name.

The emphasis on comparison and competition evident in the poem can be read as a reflection of the author's struggle to produce new literature in a world oversaturated with the work of literary giants and poetasters alike. The conflict that Littlewood (2007) sees in the poem, between the desire for a remote, Horatian bucolic poetics and the venal reality of the commodified present that intrudes upon it can be seen as one facet of the author's conundrum. Just as the speaker is engaged in competitive sacrifice in the hopes of making himself a legitimate heir to a merchant's estate, the author is engaged in a similar endeavor: striving to distinguish himself among others as a legitimate heir to the literary legacy of Rome. Success appears only a remote possibility for either, as is represented by the circumstances of the sacrifices offered.

Sacrifices of various sorts abound in Juvenal 12. Contained within its 130 lines appear an astounding variety of offerings, from the strictly religious and concrete (the speaker's own animal victims, garlands and flowers, the painted shipwreck plaques, the sailors' hair) to the metaphorical (the beaver's testicles, Catullus' belongings, and his

ship's mast) to the hypothetical (a bull as fat as Hispulla, a sick hen, hecatombs, elephants, slaves, children) and the literary-allusive (Iphigenia, the white sow of the *Aeneid*). The theme at the heart of the poem is not friendship but sacrifice, and unsatisfying sacrifice in particular.[120] Those making sacrifices in the poem offer less than they would like and lose more than they had expected in the exchange. The speaker and the captators alike are forced to present offerings much less grand than they claim their celebrands deserve (a calfling rather than a hulking mature bull; hecatombs rather than elephants), and those in the poem whose sacrifices appear to have been accepted find the outcomes unsatisfying nonetheless. In the poem, survival is accomplished only through significant diminution of essential value: by poem's end Catullus has lost his wealth, his ship its mast, the crewmembers their hair, clothing, and perhaps dignity, and the speaker any hope of inheriting.

The poem's hopeful opening gives way to resigned pessimism as the work unfolds, as is evident in the speaker's (rhetorically intended) challenge to the audience at 57-61.

> i nunc et uentis animam committe dolato
> confisus ligno, digitis a morte remotus
> quattuor aut septem, si sit latissima, taedae;
> mox cum reticulis et pane et uentre lagonae
> accipe sumendas in tempestate secures.
>
> [Juvenal, *Sat.* 12.57-61]

[120] M. Ronnick (1993) recognized that sacrifice was a central interest of the poem and that by presenting opportunists motivated by an "ever so human affection for things and/or people" committing "rash desperate actions...Juvenal satirizes the old religious formula *do ut des*, I give that you might give" (10). While the argument is otherwise convincing, I do not follow her in her conclusion that "our protagonist [the speaker] is clearly some sort of egomaniacal, unrequited lover." The metaliterary interpretation of the poem presented in the current chapter coincides with the general thrust of her article and benefits from her observations, but offers a conclusion quite different.

> Go now and entrust your spirit to the winds, confident in hewn timber, only separated from death by fingers-widths of pine, four or seven, at the widest! Pretty soon, along with the fishnets and bread and the belly of the wine flask, [you'll] pack axes to take up in a storm.

The speaker's apostrophe here conveys a keen awareness of the risk and likely futility of the task. Not only is the act of setting sail on the sea dangerous because of the tenuous protection of just a few inches of wood, but there is so little hope for success that a wise man must be prepared to violate even that flimsy defense by the axe in order to save himself. It is notable that the ship is described as *dolato ligno*—the adjective emphasizes that the edifice is a work of human craftsmanship, and the noun is used elsewhere in Juvenal to describe documents suspected of forgery.[121] It is risky to the point of folly to throw oneself to the mercy of inexorable epic forces protected only by a manmade craft (in the sense of ship and also of art), and even then, one must be prepared to cut his losses by sacrificing the vessel. Read as a literary message, this apostrophe reveals a deep ambivalence about the prospect of venturing into the poetic fray—it is daring and ill-advised and risks all for a slim chance of success.

Contrasting with this view of the modern world as a treacherous and debased environment is the remembrance of an illustrious and meaningful past. As a historical phenomenon, this is most clearly manifest in the passage on elephants (ll.101-10), of which some critics have so roundly disapproved.[122] The elephants brought from distant

---

[121] *uana superuacui dicens chirographa ligni* at 16.41 and *uana superuacui dicunt chirographa ligni* at 13.137.

[122] Courtney's (1980) dismissal of this passage is cited above. Pearson and Strong (1892, 240) are particularly irritated by these lines, which they judge are in "Juvenal's worst

and dangerous lands and once trained to serve the greatest conquerors in history as massive marching bulwarks in war are now lazily grazing in the emperor's private game park. These are no longer living war machines employed in the expansion of empire, but symbols of outrageous waste and acquisitiveness. It is notable that the beasts are described with reference to great generals defeated by Rome—Hannibal of Carthage and Pyrrhus of Epirus were each particularly formidable opponents, and as such increased the glory of their Roman conquerors.[123] In the case of the elephants, Rome had encountered foreign giants, laid claim to them, and put them to use effectively in the past, but now they survive as idle, oversized pets—from fearsome and majestic legends of national battle to expensive and exclusive personal possessions. To the contemporary author, the story of Rome's literary inheritance might seem to be similar: the giants of the past, imported from elsewhere (namely, Greece) were once put to robust purpose in Roman hands, highlighting and underscoring Roman achievement. But now, having outlived their novelty and lacking fresh relevance to contemporary life, they survive only as relics and clichés, signifiers of past greatness. The reference to the lineage of elephants (*horum maiores)* emphasizes that it is not only the passage of time, but also the intervening generations that have debased their stock. As the world becomes clogged with the

---

style.. [as they] seem dragged in forcibly, and have no merit of their own to plead as an excuse."

[123] My reading coincides with that of Henke (2000, 210), who asserts: "Die Tatsache, daß der Satiriker die Elefanten hier mit Turnus, Pyrrhos sowie Hannibal zusammenbringt, darf übrigens nicht dazu verführen, in der Nennung dieser Feinde Roms eine Hindeutung auf die Erbschleicher zu sehen und das Monströse, Nichtrömische dieser Tierart als Negativum herauszustreichen, da ja Juvenal ausdrücklich sagt, daß Elefanten auch den römischen Heerführern (vgl. V. 108 *nostris ducibus*) zu dienen pflegten. Im Gegenteil: Durch die Assoziation mit der altehrwürdigen Geschichte Roms will Juvenal die Elefanten als erhabene, fast sakrosankte Sondererscheinung in der Tierwelt verstanden wissen, deren Bereich für den Normalbürger tabu ist."

overproduction of subpar literature, Homeric epic and high tragedy have given way to their domesticated and ennervated cousin: bombast, derivative and dull. Of the literary luminaries of the past, it is perhaps Juvenal's point here that *nec Latio aut usquam sub nostro sidere talis belua concipitur*—"not in Latium nor anywhere under Rome's sky is such a beast (now) conceived."

Other contrasts are presented in the poem between the epic past and the degraded present circumstances. The discussion of Iphigenia is one such nexus.[124] Someone like the legacy hunter Pacuvius, we are told, would sacrifice even a marriageable Iphigenia (if he happened to have one in his household) to curry favor with a *captandus*. Given that this captator is given the name of a tragic poet whose work concerned the myths of Troy,[125] it would be difficult not to read these lines as a literary-critical statement[126]—and understanding the significance of the excursus on elephants helps to shed light on its meaning. The present reenactment of Agamemnon's sacrifice of Iphigenia is more base than its epic/tragic predecessors in every way: it is an offering made to a man rather than

---

[124] Another sign of the cheapening of elements from the high-literary past can be seen in lines 72-4, in which the prodigious fecundity of the *Aeneid*'s white sow with thirty piglets becomes a sort of side-show oddity—a white pig with thirty teats. The deflating terms *scrofa* and *sumen* (73) make clear that the image is not of noble epic swine, but humble hog.

[125] Pacuvius wrote a *Doulorestes* as well as a *Chryses*, which recounts events after Orestes spirits Iphigenia away from Tauris. As Conte (1994, 104) states, Pacuvius's style "was heavily criticized by the satiric poet Lucilius, and later too; he was branded as contorted, bombastic, and reckless with neologisms." This criticism of Pacuvius and his contemporary (and sometime rival) Accius and their "lofty literary genres is another important point of convergence between Lucilius and Callimachean taste and another link connecting Lucilius to neoteric poetry" (Conte 1994, 115).

[126] It may also be worth noting that the king of captators is named not only for a literary figure of Rome's past, but one who is himself a biological successor of one of Roman literature's founding figures—Pacuvius was the nephew of the epicist and tragedian Ennius.

a god, motivated by personal avarice rather than religious necessity, it lacks both the palliative pretext of heroic marriage and the salvific substitution of an alternate victim. The moral and emotional complexity of the epic/tragic Iphigenia story—with its ambiguous outcome for both sacrificer and sacrificed, its archetypal significance, its profound *pathos*—has become simply a shorthand way of signifying "daughter-killing for profit." Iphigenia, like the epic storm, has become drained of color and left as a sort of proprietary eponym for a (now) "stock" situation.

Belatedness is a constant anxiety of Roman authors writing in the shadow of predecessors,[127] and this concern manifests itself in *Satire* 12 through sacrifices offered that are too little and too late to succeed. This poem presents the contemporary author's drive to write despite an almost overwhelming sense of exclusion and futility, revealing his self-doubt as he participates in an endeavor that has become a seedy and opportunistic version of its idealized past. Writing now is a debased and demoralizing prospect, he realizes as he writes. The excitement of the opportunity to win himself a place in history (the sacrifice at the beginning of the poem) dulls into hypocritical bitterness as this realization develops. By poem's end the author who had been so eager to enter into the world of letters, driven by his frustration at others' failure, finds that he is no better off than those he despises.

Competitive Sacrifice: a new captation metaphor.

Captation characterized in *Sat.* 12 as unsavory and unsuccessful sacrifice can be seen as an extension of the captation metaphors of other satiric authors. By employing satiric

[127] Littlewood (2007, 414) emphasizes belatedness as a feature of the "Juvenalian programme" specifically.

captation in this poem as a means of addressing anxieties concerning writing itself and the author's place in literary history, Juvenal participates in a conversation begun by Horace in *Serm.* 2.5 and continued by Petronius in the Croton section of the *Satyrica*. Significant allusions in *Sat.* 12 to both Horatian and Petronian legacy hunting scenes signal Juvenal's continuation of this tradition, and it is to these that we now turn.

That the work of Horace is a primary referent for *Sat.* 12 is clear from its very first line. The comparison of a friend's return to one's own birthday (*natali, Corvine, die mihi dulcior haec lux*) famously echoes Horace's *Ode* 4.11.17-20, in which the poet prepares a celebratory sacrifice in honor of Maecenas' birthday (*iure sollemnis mihi sanctiorque/ paene natali proprio, quod ex hac/ luce Maecenas meus affluentis/ ordinat annos*). As a result, one cannot but contrast the relationship presented in the Ode with that presented in Juvenal 12, (in each case between a poet-client and his wealthy and discerning patron), and the significant discrepancy in authenticity between the two is highlighted. The notable intimacy of *Maecenas meus* at Horace 4.11.19[128] contrasts with the *nostro...Catullo* of Juvenal 12.29 (discussed above), and of course, Maecenas himself is mentioned in Juvenal's poem as well—at line 39 as an archetypal consumer of elegant goods. The many correspondences between elements of Horatian lyric and the pastoral descriptions of the speaker's sacrifices in this poem are well documented,[129] but beyond

[128] Commager (1962, 304) finds signs of "an association more profound than friendship, however close" in the unusual intimacy of Horace's language (*meus*) and in the linking of the destinies of the two men in the passage. The relationship Horace presents between himself and Maecenas is undoubtedly close, as the entire poem attests, while the phrase *nostro Catullo* in Juvenal is a lonely and unconvincing piece of evidence for any personal relationship between the speaker and Catullus.

[129] The preparations made by the speaker in *Satire* 12 and those made in *Ode* 4.11 are similar: slaves make a turf altar ready for a victim, the house is decorated gaily, wine is

the general Horatian flavor of the poem's opening, *Sat*. 12 looks back specifically to Horace's *Serm.* 2.5. In addition to their shared topic, legacy hunting, the two poems are linked by a good deal of signficant imagery in common. In each case, a poetic shipwreck (Ulysses' in Horace, the *poetica tempestas* in Juvenal) leaves a character to arrive on shore nude and destitute. Horace's Ulysses describes himself arriving home "naked and resourceless" (*nudus inopsque,* 6) and asks for help renewing his lost fortune by means of some "art" (*artibus*, 3). This image is repurposed in Juvenal to describe both Catullus' ship and its occupants arriving at Ostia "miserable and proceeding artlessly" (*inoperi miserabilis arte*, 67) with the sailors' clothes in place of sails (*vestibus extentis*, 68).

Specific connections to the Croton episode of the *Satyrica* also exist in *Sat.* 12, most strikingly in the description of the storm at sea, which is closely modeled on the storm at *Satyr.* 114, as Courtney (2001, 174) recognizes: the Petronius passage "is described in the high-flown language and conventions of a *poetica tempestas* (Juv. 12.23...), particularly that opposing winds blow simultaneously, thick clouds black out the sky, and the helmsman is helpless." To this list of similiarities between the storm scenes, the rhetorical flourish of competing dangers should also be added. In Petronius (114.3) there is a contest between gale-force winds and pitch darkness: *et quod omnibus procellis periculosius erat, tam spissae repente tenebrae lucem suppresserant, ut ne proram quidem totam gubernator videret* ("but more treacherous than all of these strong

---

prepared. As Courtney (1980, 519) points out, both the Juvenal poem and another *Ode*, 4.2, share the feature of a *vitulus* as a *votum ob reditum* (in *Ode* 4.2, this is the return of Augustus). Interestingly, both *Odes* 4.2 and 4.11 present admonitions against unequal comparison that involve the speaker of the poem (in the former, Horace compares his poetry to that of Pindar; in the latter, Phyllis is encouraged to abandon her love of Telephus, who is out of her league, and settle for Horace).

winds, was a darkness so dense that it immediately suppressed all light, so that even the helmsman could not see the entire prow"). In Juvenal's account, it is the fire aboard ship that competes with the storm in terrifying the passengers and crew.

In addition to the similiarities in the descriptions of seastorms in Juvenal and Petronius, animal imagery appears similarly in each episode. The storm which shipwrecks Encolpius and his companions is one that coincides with the furious production of poetry, as Eumolpus is later found manically scribbling verses in a piece of the destroyed ship (115.2-3): *invenimus Eumolpum sedentem membranaeque ingenti versus ingerentem. mirati ergo quod illi vacaret in vicinia mortis poema facere* ("We found Eumolpus sitting and heaping up verses onto a huge parchment. We were amazed he had found spare time in the very face of death to compose a poem.") Encolpius had discovered Eumolpus only after hearing a roaring sound (115.1): *audimus murmur...quasi cupientis exire beluae gemitum* ("We heard a roar...just like the groan of a wild beast wishing to escape,") which continues all the way to shore (115.5): *in terram trahere poetam mugientem* ("we hauled the bellowing poet to dry land.") In light of the close correspondence between other aspects of the description of Petronius' great storm and of Juvenal's, the coincidence of the *poetica tempestas* and the comparison of a man whose livelihood is threatened by a storm to a cornered wild animal (the beaver in in *Sat.* 12) seems significant as well.

Other similarities between the circumstances of the two storm narratives may be usefully pointed out as further support of the connections suggested above. The self-castration of the beaver and voluntary head-shaving of the surviving sailors in Juvenal 12 can be recognized as corresponding to Eumolpus' shaving of his friends' heads (in an

unsuccessful attempt to hide them from Lichas) and Giton's subsequent threat of self-castration aboard the ship.[130] In each work, the seastorm itself precedes the introduction of a survivor as a target for captation. In the *Satyrica*, Eumolpus chooses to restyle himself as a *captandus* after the shipwreck. Likewise in Juvenal *Sat.* 12, it is only after Catullus' storm-wracked ship limps back into port that the speaker's suspicious denial introduces the concept of Catullus as a *captandus*.

Taken individually, these correspondences may suggest merely a set of shared conventions for satiric storms, but taken together with the entirety of evidence, a thread of intentional reference linking Juvenal *Sat.* 12 to Horace *Serm*. 2.5 and Petronius' Croton episode becomes apparent. Narrative and verbal echoes, shared referents, and allusions both direct and indirect bind Juvenal 12 to the legacy hunting presented in Horace and Petronius, and provide evidence of Juvenal's participation in the tradition of satiric captation as a metaliterary tool for examining concerns about literary legacies.

[130] Smith (1989, 293) recognizes Juvenal's self-castrating beaver as a "possible Petronian reminiscence" but I find the connection convincing enough to state without equivocation.

CHAPTER 5

Horace, Petronius and Juvenal: The Captation Conversation

Long regarded as no more than a *topos* of social decline, legacy hunting reveals itself as a window into metaliterary facets of Roman satire. Satirists, writing in a genre specifically Roman and exceptionally nebulous, felt unique pressure to define the limits and character of the literary form as they were creating it. There was no Greek model for satire, no undisputed model form to look back to—rather, satirists, writing in a chaotic and lively upstart genre, had both the burden and the opportunity to actively assert their relationships to literature of the past. It is no surprise, then, that satiric authors found a suitable metaphor for their endeavor in legacy-hunting, involving as it does the attempt to establish a legitimate claim to a heritage not directly assured. That captation is described in satire using terms related to skill, art, and performance suggests its resonance as a metaliterary device. In turn, the metaphors used to describe captation in each text can be seen as revealing the authors' concerns about the task of writing satire and the prospect of earning the literary legacies of Rome.

Beginning with Horace, *Sermones* 2.5, legacy hunting appears in a context deeply resonant with literary significance. The poem presents the familiar Homeric scene of the *Nekyia*, but with a satiric punchline—Ulysses learning to become a Roman captator. Tiresias' instruction on the art of conning one's way into wills takes epic Ulysses to comic and farcical lows, blending together the elements of a variety of literary genres and signalling key pieces of Horace's own poetic agenda from other programmatic works. Captation is presented in *Serm.* 2.5 through the metaphors of fishing and hunting, just as captation itself is a metaphor for securing a place in literary history.

In Petronius' *Satyrica*, captation appears again, and Horace is explicitly evoked as the chief poetic influence of the poet Eumolpus—the author of the captation plan at Croton. However, the practice of legacy hunting is characterized quite differently at Croton than it appeared in Horace. It is a land populated exclusively by legacy-hunters and *captandi*, and their interactions are depicted metaphorically not as "fishing" but as cannibalism. The metaliterary message of Petronius' much darker version of legacy hunting is that writing in an environment oversaturated in literary production (as the entire *Satyrica* certainly is) is more like dismemberment and cannibalism than anything so wholesome as fishing.

In *Satire* 12, Juvenal takes up the metaphor of captation to express concerns about literary production, but in this incarnation, satiric captation is competitive and fruitless sacrifice. The *topos* of the epic storm is signalled as a locus of artistic competition, as the narration of the tempest is beset by internal and external rivals. In this poem, captation appears as a contest in which legacy-hunters compete for recognition, but with ever-escalating stakes (up to and including human sacrifice) and slim chances of any success. The speaker finds himself poorly matched to his competition and ill-equipped for his task, and the literary interpretation of this scenario offers only a dismal outlook for success in earning the title of heir to the literary giants of the past.

All three captation narratives discussed here, Horace *Serm*. 2.5, the Croton episode of the *Satyrica*, and Juvenal *Sat.* 12 share some basic features (e.g. the presence of shipwreck, references to crows and close interaction with episodes from Homer's *Odyssey*), which may, on their own seem merely coincidental. However, when considered together with other shared elements, an intentional intergenerational

association among these authors and their captation texts becomes increasingly apparent. A closer look at some shared features may help illustrate this, beginning with appearances of fishing in each text.

The advice that Horace's Tiresias gives shipwrecked Ulysses is to take up legacy hunting, which he describes as "fishing" with "a baited hook" (*captes,* 23*; praeroso hamo,* 25). In Petronius' Croton, a recently shipwrecked Encolpius reiterates this language in describing the work of con artists: *unde plani autem, unde levatores viverent, nisi aut locellos aut sonantes aere sacellos pro hamis in turbam mitterent?* ("how would con men and pick-pockets survive unless they sent little boxes or tiny purses jingling with coin out into the crowd to serve as bait?"). The image persists into Juvenal's *Satire* 12 in the form of the "prison of fishtraps" (*carcere nassae*, 123) in which Pacuvius catches a captatorial mark after near-shipwreck. The appearance of fishing images serves to link the Petronian and Juvenalian passages with Horace *Serm.* 2.5, since aside from these instances, the metaphorical presentation of legacy hunting is not centered on hunting or fishing in the two later texts.

Another salient feature of each of the three treatments of captation is that in each case, a female mythological figure is mentioned in association with a violation of family relationships for the purpose of legacy hunting. In Horace *Serm.* 2.5, Tiresias recommends that Ulysses offer the womanly charms of his long-suffering wife Penelope to help woo his mark. When the hero balks at the idea, on the grounds that she is too virtuous to consent to such a plan, Tiresias explains that she will be eager to participate and earn a share in the loot. In Petronius' Croton, Eumolpus is courted by an aging legacy-hunter named Philomela, who, with her own beauty fading, now uses her

children's bodies for testamentary profit. She offers a daughter and a son to the *orbus* as wards to be "educated" (a guise that thinly conceals her real offer of their sexual services, and only until Philomela's quick departure from Eumolpus' apartments). At the apex of outrageous sacrifice described in Juvenal *Sat.* 12, Pacuvius is described as ready to offer even his own Iphigenia to the altar of his mark, in the hopes of securing a legacy. It is of note that in each case, the mythological woman invoked is associated with particularly close family ties. In myth, Penelope is the epitome of the faithful wife, rejecting the advances of her legion of suitors, and weaving and raveling the same garment for three years to postpone having to select a replacement for Odysseus. Philomela is a model of sisterly devotion: having been raped, imprisoned and made mute by her brother-in-law Tereus, she weaves a tapestry illustrating her story for her sister, who rescues her and together the two avenge Tereus' wrongdoing by arranging for him to eat his own son.[131] Iphigenia is offered as a propitiating sacrifice to Artemis by her own father, under the guise of an honorable marriage to Achilles, though in most versions she is spirited away by the goddess to Tauris. In Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*, her brother Orestes, having arrived to save her, convinces his sister of his identity in part by demonstrating his familiarity with a particular tapestry that she had woven at home in Mycenae (ll. 808-17). In each captation narrative, the mythological figure invoked represents a particularly sacred familial relationship (wife, sister, daughter) that is violated by the mercenary interests of the legacy-hunter: Penelope becomes a willing prostitute, Philomela pimps

[131] It is no accident, surely, that Philomela's myth, which culimates in familial cannibalim, is referenced in Petronius' Croton, a place in which legacy-hunters are described as carrion crows feeding on corpses and where a man like Eumolpus will require his own heirs to eat his body.

her own children, and Iphigenia is sacrificed, but not without a sexual dimension to the circumstances, as *nubilis* ("marriageable") attests. It is perhaps significant that the myths of each of these heroines features as a key plot point her creation of a woven artwork: Penelope's weaving of Laertes' shroud demonstrates her uxorial devotion symbolically, and at the same time functions as a bulwark against the suitors' advances; Philomela's tapestry reveals to her sister both her own suffering and the crimes of Procne's husband, but weaving seemed to Tereus so innocuous that it was never suspected to become a vector for communication and revenge; Iphigenia's weaving, depicting the generations-old source of strife between the brothers Atreus and Thyestes, proves to be the evidence that helps reunite her with her brother, who will ultimately avenge her father's murder. Each of these mythic women uses the traditional womanly craft of weaving to define and communicate her identity, just as each satirist's use of these characters in captation narratives helps to define and communicate his relationship with those whose literature brought Penelope, Philomela, and Iphigenia to life.

Horace, Petronius, and Juvenal each repurposes the material of his literary predecessors, creating for it new interpretations and new contexts, in some cases activating the audience's own memory of great literature of the past and in other cases reinventing it. Through this process, each author in turn creates a place for himself in the literary history of Rome, using metaphors for captation which reveal his perspective on that endeavor. The satiric *topos* of legacy hunting is, for these writers, a way of communicating about the state of their literary world and a means of exploring their roles as both its beneficiaries and contributors.

Through these three works, the metaphors of captation have evolved from hunting/fishing in Horace to the cannibalism of Petronius' Croton to the barren and hopeless sacrifice imagined by Juvenal. In Horace's narrative, a captator is physically present with his mark, invited into his inner circle—he is respected enough to provide legal services, sufficiently participating in the *orbus*' daily routine to need to remember to "give him the wall" on their walks, and enough involved in his private affairs to arrange for sexual services.[132] Petronius imagines the captator as maintaining close proximity to the *orbus*, (and flattery, sexual favors, and general obsequiousness remain features of the relationship), but the demands on the legacy-hunter have become increasingly sordid and onerous (culminating in cannibalism of the mark upon his death). Juvenal, in turn, envisions legacy-hunting as a competition in which increasingly outrageous sacrifices are demanded and victory is all but impossible. The speaker of *Sat.* 12 finds himself without resources equal to his intentions, and so cannot offer as great a display as he would like—but even so, his most extravagant *imagined* sacrifice still falls far short of the bar set by successful legacy-hunters like Pacuvius and Novius. Men like them will not just "hunt" or "fish" for legacies, they aren't even estate-scavengers, they are twisted suppliants, willing to abandon normative Roman values in order to serve as acolytes to an elevated

[132] Tiresias suggests that Ulysses offer the mark access to Penelope, but more commonly in Juvenal, it is the captator himself who provides sexual services. The speaker of *Satire* 1 complains of those who "earn their legacies at night" and receive bequests in proportion to their anatomical assets: *cum te summoueant qui testamenta merentur/ noctibus, in caelum quos euehit optima summi/ nunc uia processus, uetula uesica beatae?/ unciolam Proculieus habet, sed Gillo deuncem,/ partes quisque suas ad mensuram inguinis heres* (37-41). In *Satire* 9, the gigolo Naevolus not only has sex with his "*patronus"* Virro (*an facile et pronum est agere intra uiscera penem/ legitimum atque illic hesternae occcurrere cenae?/ seruus erit minus ille miser qui foderit agrum/ quam dominum,* 43-6) but has also fathered the children that Virro claims as his own (*quanto/ metiris pretio quod, ni tibi deditus essem/deuotusque cliens, uxor tua uirgo maneret?*, 70-2).

orbus. The importance of the mark has become larger than life, and access to such men has grown increasingly difficult for the average person to achieve. Juvenal's speaker finds himself failing in every respect: he has chosen an unprofitable target (who is not only a father, but who has recently lost significant wealth), he offers less than he'd like and much less than is required to succeed, and he begins his effort at the distinct disadvantage of having no real connection to the mark, who is neither suitable nor amenable to him.

Far from being simply one entry in the roster of social misbehaviors enumerated by satirists to suggest modern moral decline, captation can be seen as a tool employed by satiric authors to address specific anxieties about the production of literature. Just as the epic ecphrasis highlights the role of literary creation through an impossibly detailed, almost interactive description of a work of visual artistic creation, discussions of problematized biological and testamentary succession in satire serve as an arena in which concerns of legitimate literary inheritance can be examined. Attention to the metaliterary dimension of these works reveals a conversation in satire over the course of a century and a half, in which authors use captation narratives as a way of dramatizing their efforts and struggles in creating footholds for themselves in Roman literary history. In this way, legacy-hunting, liberated from its status as merely a topic for satiric discussion or even an element of satiric "color" in literature, can be used as a lens through which a particular set of interests can be examined. Captation in satiric texts is not simply a subject for discussion of Roman social degradation, as has long been assumed, but a language in which artistic concerns are vividly presented and discussed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adamietz J. 1983. "Juvenals 12. Satire." In *Hommages à Jean Cousin: Rencontres avec l'Antiquité Classique.* [Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besançon 273] Paris: 237-248.

_____. 1995. "Circe in den Satyrica Pentrons und das Websen dieses Werkes." *Hermes* 123, 3: 320-334.

Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary.* Baltimore.

Alexander, S. 1999. *The Complete Odes and Satires of Horace.* Princeton.

Anderson, W. S. 1963. "The Roman Socrates: Horace and his Satires." In J. P. Sullivan (Ed.), *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Satire.* London: 1-37.

Anderson, W. S. 1964a. "Anger in Juvenal and Seneca." *California Publications in Classical Philology* 19: 127-96. [Reprinted in W. S. Anderson, *Essays on Roman Satire.* (1982) Princeton: 293-363.]

_____. 1964b "Roman Satirists and Literary Criticism." *Bucknell Review* 12, 3: 106-13. [Reprinted in W. S. Anderson, *Essays on Roman Satire.* (1982) Princeton: 3-12.]

Armstrong, D. 1989. *Horace.* New Haven.

Arrowsmith, W. (Trans.) 1959. *The Satyricon of Petronius.* Ann Arbor, MI.

_____. 1966. "Luxury and Death in the *Satyricon*." *Arion* 5: 304-31.

Astbury, R. 1977. "Petronius, P.Oxy. 3010, and Menippean Satire." *CP* 72: 22-31. [Reprinted in S. Harrison (Ed.) *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel.* (1999) Oxford: 74-84.]

Auerbach, E. 1953. (Trans. W. R. Trask) *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature.* Princeton.

Beard, M., North, J. and S. Price. 1998. *Religions of Rome* [2 vols.]. Cambridge.

Beck, R. 1973. "Some Observations on the Narrative Technique of Petronius." *Phoenix* 27: 42-61. [Reprinted in S. Harrison (Ed.) *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel.* (1999) Oxford: 50-73.]

Bettini, M. 1982. "A Proposito de Versi Sotadei, Greci e Romani." *MD* 9: 59-105.

Bloom, H. 1997. (2nd Ed.) *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. New York and Oxford.

Bodel, J. P. 2003. "*Captatio* at Croton: Petronius and Horace." In J. Pucci (Ed.) *O qui complexus et gaudia fuerunt: Essays Presented to Michael C. J. Putnam by his Brown Colleagues on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday.* Providence: 1-15.

Bodel, J. and Olyan, S. 2008. *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity.* Malden, MA.

Boll, F. 1913. "Die Anordnung im zweiten Buch von Horaz' Satiren." *Hermes* 48: 143-5.

Branham, R. B. and Kinney, D. (Trans.) 1996. *Satyrica: Petronius*. Berkeley, CA.

Braund, S. 1988. *Beyond Anger: A Study of Juvenal's Third Book of Satires*. Cambridge.

_____. (Ed.) 1989. *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome.* Exeter.

_____. 1992. *Roman Verse Satire.* Oxford.

_____. 1996. *Juvenal: Satires Book I.* Cambridge.

_____. 1997. "A Passion Unconsoled? Grief and Anger in Juvenal *Satire* 13." In Braund, S. M. and C. Gill, (Eds.) *The Passions in Roman Literature and Thought*. Cambridge: 68-88.

_____. 2004. *Juvenal and Persius.* Cambridge, MA.

Brown, P. M. 1993. *Horace: Satires I*. Warminster, England.

Brunt, P. A. 1988. *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*. Oxford.

Bücheler, F. 1862. *Petronii Arbitri Satirarum Reliquiae*. Berlin.

Buckland, W. W. 2007. *A Text-book of Roman Law: from Augustus to Justinian.* Cambridge.

Burman, P. 1743. (2nd Ed., Rev. J. Reiske) *Titi Petronii Arbitri Satyricon Quae Supersunt*. Amsterdam.

Cairns, F. 1972. *Generic Composition in Greek and Latin Poetry.* Edinburgh.

Casa, A. D. 1965. "*Mens sana in corpore sano.*" *Maia* 17: 78.

Champlin, E. 1989. "Creditur Vulgo Testamenta Hominum Speculum Esse Morum: Why the Romans Made Wills." *CP* 84, 3: 198-215.

_____. 1991. *Final Judgements: Duty and Emotion in Roman Wills, 200 BC-AD 250*. Berkeley, CA.

Clausen, W. 1992. *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis. Saturae*. Oxford.

_____. 1994. *A Commentary on Vergil, Eclogues.* Oxford.

Coccia, M. 1993. "*Cena* di Nasidieno e *Cena* di Trimalchione." In R. Uglione (Ed.) *Atti del Convegno Nazionale di Studi su Orazio*. Turin: 131-148.

Coffey, M. 1976. *Roman Satire.* London.

Collignon, A. 1892. *Étude sur Pétrone: La critique littéraire, l'imitation et la parodie dans le Satiricon*. Paris.

Colton, R. E. 1971. "Some Rare Words used by Martial and Juvenal." *CJ* 67: 55-57.

Commager, S. 1995 (2nd Ed). *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*. Norman, OK.

Connors, C. 1998. *Petronius the Poet: Verse and Literary Tradition in the* Satyricon. Cambridge.

Conte, G. B. 1987. "Petronius, *Sat*. 141.4." *CQ* (NS) 37, 2: 529-532.

_____. 1994. (Trans. J. Solodow). *Latin Literature: A History*. Baltimore.

_____. 1996a. (Trans. E. Fantham). *The Hidden Author: An Interpretation of Petronius' Satyricon.* Berkeley, CA.

_____. 1996b. *The Rhetoric of Imitation.* New York.

Courtney, E. 1962. "Parody and Literary Allusion in Menippean Satire." *Philologus* 106: 86-100.

_____. 1980. *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal.* London.

_____. 1987. "Petronius and the Underworld." *AJP* 108: 408-10.

_____. 1991. *The Poems of Petronius.* Atlanta, GA.

_____. 2001. *A Companion to Petronius.* Oxford.

Dalby, A. 2005. "The *Satyrica* Concluded." *Gastronomica* 5: 65-72.

Damon, C. 1997. *The Mask of the Parasite: A Pathology of Roman Patronage*. Ann Arbor, MI.

D'Arms, J. H. and Kopff, E. C. (Eds.) 1980. *The Seaborne Commerce of Ancient Rome: Studies in Archaeology and History.* [Memoirs of the American Academy at Rome 36] Rome.

Daube, D. 1964-5. "The Preponderance of Intestacy at Rome" *Tulane Law Review* 39: 253-61.

de Decker, J. 1913. *Iuvenalis declamans.* Ghent.

Dehon, P-J. 2001. "A Skilful Petronian Simile: *Frigidior rigente bruma* (*Sat*. 132.8.5)." *CQ* (NS) 51, 1: 315-318.

Dell'Era, E. 1970. *Problemi di lingua e stile in Petronio.* Rome.

Edwards, C. 1993. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome.* Cambridge.

_____. 2007. *Death in Ancient Rome.* New Haven, CT and London.

Fantham, E. 1996. *Roman Literary Culture: From Cicero to Apuleius.* Baltimore.

Fedeli, P. 1994. *Q. Orazio Flacco. Le Opere II: le Satire*. Rome.

Ferguson, J. 1987. *A Prosopography to the Poems of Juvenal.* Brussels.

Fiske, G. C. 1920. *Lucilius and Horace.* Madison, WI.

Fitzgerald, W. 2000. *Slavery and the Roman Literary Imagination.* Cambridge.

Fränkel, E. 1957. *Horace.* Oxford.

Freudenberg, K. 1993. *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire.* Princeton.

_____. 2001. *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal.* Cambridge.

_____. (Ed.) 2005. *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire.* Cambridge.

_____. (Ed.) 2009. *Horace: Satires and Epistles*. [Oxford Readings in Classical Studies] Oxford.

Friedländer, L. 1969. (Trans. J. R. C. Martyn) *Friedländer's Essays on Juvenal.* Amsterdam.

Gillette, P. 1965. *Petronius: Satyricon*. Los Angeles.

Gold, B. K. 1998. "'The House I Live in Is Not My Own': Women's Bodies in Juvenal's Satires." *Arethusa* 31: 368-86.

Gowers, E. 1993. *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature.* Oxford.

_____. 2005. "The Restless Companion: Horace, *Satires* 1 and 2." In K. Freudenburg (Ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire.* Cambridge: 48-61.

Green, P. 1998. (3rd Ed.) *Juvenal: The Sixteen Satires.* London.

Gunderson, E. 2003. *Declamation, Paternity, and Roman Identity: Authority and the Rhetorical Self.* Cambridge.

Habermehl, P. 2006. *Petronius: Satyrica 79-141: Ein philologisch-literarischer Kommentar. Bd. 1: Sat. 79-110.* Berlin.

Habinek, T. 2005. *The World of Roman Song: From Ritualized Speech to Social Order.* Baltmore.

Hägg, T. 1983. *The Novel in Antiquity*. Oxford.

Hallett, J. P. 2003. "Resistant (and Enabling) Reading: Petronius' *Satyricon* and Latin Love Elegy." In C. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, and W. Keulen (Eds). *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*. Leiden: 329-43.

Halporn, J. W., Ostwald, M., and T. G. Rosenmeyer 1963. *The Meters of Greek and Latin Poetry*. London.

Hardwick, L. 2003. *Reception Study*. [Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics 33] Oxford.

Harrison, S. J. (Ed.) 1999. *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel*. Oxford.

Helmbold, W. C. 1956. "Juvenal's Twelfth Satire" *CP* 51: 14-23.

Henderson, J. 1989. "Not 'Women in Roman Satire' but 'When Satire Writes "Woman."'" In S. Braund (Ed.) *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*. Exeter: 89-125.

_____. 1998. *Fighting for Rome: Poets and Caesars, History and Civil War.* Cambridge.

Henke, Rainer. 2000. "Elefanten, Tochtermörder und Erbschleicher : Juvenal, *Sat*. 12, 93-130." *Hermes* 128. 2 : 202-217.

Highet, G. 1954. *Juvenal the Satirist: A Study.* Oxford.

_____. 1974. "Masks and Faces in Satire." *Hermes* 102, 2: 321-37.

Hinds, Stephen. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry.* Cambridge

Holzberg, N. 1995. (Trans. C. Jackson-Holzberg) *The Ancient Novel: An Introduction*. London.

Hooley, D. 2007. *Roman Satire.* Malden, MA.

Hooper, R. W. (Trans.) 1999. *The Priapus Poems: Erotic Epigrams from Ancient Rome.* Urbana, IL.

Hope, V. M. 2007. *Death in Ancient Rome: A Sourcebook*. London.

Huxley, H. H. 1952. "Storm and Shipwreck in Roman Literature." *G&R* 21: 117-24.

Iddeng, J. 2000. "Juvenal, Satire, and the Persona Theory: Some Critical Remarks." *Symbolae Osloenses* 75: 107-29.

Jensson, G. 2004. *The Recollections of Encolpius: The* Satyrica *of Petronius as Milesian Fiction*. [Ancient Narrative Supplementum 2]. Groningen.

Johns, C. 1982. *Sex or Symbol? Erotic Images of Greece and Rome*. Austin, TX.

Jones, F. 1982. "A Visual Pun at Juvenal 12.81." *LCM* 7: 140.

_____. 2007. *Juvenal and the Satiric Genre*. [Classical Literature and Society] London.

Keane, C. 2006. *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire.* [American Classical Studies 50] Oxford.

Kennedy, G. 1978. "Encolpius and Agamemnon in Petronius." *AJP* 99: 171-8.

Kenney, E. J. 1963. "Juvenal, Satirist or Rhetorician?" *Latomus* 22: 704-20.

Kernan, A. 1959. *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance.* New Haven.

Kiessling, A. (Rev. R. Heinze). 1910. *Q. Horatius Flaccus, II : Satiren*. Berlin.

Klebs, E. 1889. "Zur Composition von Petronius *Satirae.*" *Philologus* 47: 623-35.

Knoche, U. 1975. (Trans. E. Ramage). *Roman Satire.* Bloomington, IN.

Konstan, D. 1995. "Patrons and Friends (in Horace *Epist.* 1.18 and Juvenal 5)." *CP* 90: 328-42.

_____. 1997. *Friendship in the Classical World.* Cambridge.

Larmour, D. H. J. 2005. "Lightening the load : castration, money, and masculinity in Juvenal's Satire 12." *Syllecta Classica* 16: 139-172.

Last, H. 1934. "The Social Policy of Augustus" in S. Cook, F. Adcock, and M. Charlesworth (Eds.) *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. X. Cambridge: 425-64.

Lefèvre, E. 1997. *Studien zur Struktur der 'Milesischen' Novelle bei Petron und Apuleius.* Stuttgart.

LeJay, P. 1911. *Œuvres, Texte Latin avec Commentaire Critique et Explicatif: Odes, Epodes et Chant séculaire*. Paris.

Lindo, L. I. 1974. "The Evolution of Juvenal's Later Satires." *CP* 69: 17-27.

Littlewood. C. 2007. "Poetry and friendship in Juvenal's Twelfth Satire." *AJP* 128: 389-418.

Locandro, N. 2008. *Le Satire di Orazio: Varietà di Temi e Unità d'Ispirazione*. Cosenza, Italy.

Lucas, D. W. 1968. *Aristotle: Poetics*. Oxford.

Mack, M. 1951. "The Muse of Satire." *Yale Review*, 41: 80-92.

Macleane, A. J. 1867. *Juvenalis et Persii Satirae*. London.

MacMullen, R. 1974. *Roman Social Relations, 50 B.C. to A. D. 284.* New Haven, CT and London.

Maine, H. 1864. *Ancient Law.* New York.

Marchesi, I. 2005. "Traces of a Freed Language: Horace, Petronius, and the Rhetoric of Fable" *CA* 24, 2: 307-330.

Macleane, A. J. 1867. *D. J. Juvenalis et A. Persii Flacci: Satirae*. London.

Mansbach, A. R. 1982. *Captatio. Myth and Reality.* (PhD diss.) Princeton.

Marmorale, E. V. 1948. *La Questione Petroniana*. Bari.

Mayer, R. 1982. "Neronian Classicism." *AJP* 103 (3): 305-18.

_____. 1989. "Friendship in the Satirists." In S. H. Braund (Ed.) *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*. Exeter: 5-21.

McMahon, J. M. 1998. *Paralysin Cave: Impotence, Perception, and Text in the Satyrica of Petronius.* Leiden.

Miller, P. A. 1998. "The Bodily Grotesque in Roman Satire: Images of Sterility." *Arethusa* 31, 3: 257-83.

Morgan, J. R. 2009. "Petronius and Greek Literature." In J. Prag and I. Repath (Eds.) *Petronius: A Handbook.* Oxford: 32-47.

Morris, E. 1909. *Horace: Satires and Epistles.* London.

Morter, J. (Ed. J. Robb). 2010. *The Chora of Croton 1: The Neolithic Settlement at Capo Alfiere.* Austin, TX.

Most, G. "*Disiecti membra poetae:* The Rhetoric of Dismemberment in Neronian Poetry." In R. Hexter and D. Selden (Eds.) *Innovations of Antiquity*. London: 391-419.

Muecke, F. 1995. "Law, Rhetoric, and Genre in *Sat.* 2.1." In S. J. Harrison, Ed. *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*. Oxford: 203-18.

_____. 1997. *Horace: Satires II*. Warminster, England.

Müller, K. 2003. (4th Ed.). *Petronius: Satyricon reliquiae*. Munich.

Mynors, R. A. B. 1969. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera.* Oxford.

Newman, J. K. 1967. *The Concept of* Vates *in Augustan Poetry*. [Collection Latomus 89] Brussels.

O'Neal, W. J. 1976. "Vergil and Petronius: The Underworld." *Classical Bulletin* 52: 33-4.

Oniga, R. 2000. “La création lexicale chez Pétrone.” In M. Fruyt and C. Nicolas (Eds.) *La Création Lexicale en Latin: Actes de la table ronde du IXème Colloque international de linguistique latine.* Paris: 155-66.

Palmer, A. 1891. *Satires of Horace*. London.

Palmer, L. R. 1954. *The Latin Language.* London.

Panayotakis, C. 1995. *Theatrum Abitri: Theatrical Elements in the Satyrica of Petronius*. Leiden.

_____. 2009. “Petronius and the Roman Literary Tradition.” In J. Prag and I. Repath (Eds.) *Petronius: A Handbook.* Oxford: 48-64.

_____, Zimmerman, M., and W. Keulen (Eds.) 2003. *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*. Leiden.

Parsons, P. J. 1971. “A Greek *Satyricon*?” *BICS* 18: 53-68.

Pearson, C. H. and Strong, H. A. 1892. (2nd Ed) *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae XIII*. Oxford.

Pernot, L. 2005. (Trans. W. E. Higgins) *Rhetoric in Antiquity.* Washington, D. C.

Petersmann, H. 1999. (Trans. M. Revermann) “Environment, Linguistic Situation, and Levels of Style in Petronius’ *Satyrica*.” In S. J. Harrison (Ed.) *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel.* Oxford: 105-23. [Revised version of *Petrons urbane Prosa: Untersuchungen zu Sprache und Text (Syntax)*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 323. Vienna.]

Potts, L. J. 1968. *Aristotle on the Art of Fiction.* Cambridge.

Ramage, E. S. 1973. Urbanitas*: Ancient Sophistication and Refinement.* Norman, OK.

_____. 1978. “Juvenal *Satire* 12: On friendship true and false.” *ICS* 3: 221-37.

_____. 1989. “Juvenal and the Establishment: denigration of predecessors in the *Satires.*” *ANRW* II 33.1: 640-707.

Reeve, M. D. 1983. “Petronius.” In L. D. Reynolds (Ed.) *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*. Oxford: 295-300.

Révay, J. 1922. “Horaz und Petron.” *CP* 17: 202-12.

Ribbeck, O. 1865. *Der echte und der unechte Juvenal.* Berlin.

Richlin, A. 1992 (2nd ed.) *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor.* New York.

_____. 1993. "Not before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the *Cinaedus* and the Roman Law against Love between Men." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 3, 4: 523-73.

_____. 1997. "Gender and Rhetoric: Producing Manhood in the Schools." In W. J. Dominik (Ed.) *Roman Eloquence*. London: 90-110.

_____. 2009. "Sex in the Satyrica." In J. Prag and I. Repath (Eds.) *Petronius: A Handbook.* Oxford: 82-100.

Rimell, V. 2002. *Petronius and the Anatomy of Fiction*. Cambridge.

_____. 2005. "The Satiric Maze: Petronius, Satire, and Novel." In K. Freudenberg (Ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire.* Cambridge: 160-73.

_____. 2007. "The Inward Turn: Writing, Voice and the Imperial Author in Petronius." In V. Rimell (Ed.) *Seeing Tongues, Hearing Scripts: Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel* [Ancient Narrative Supplementum 7]. Groningen: 61-85.

_____. 2009. "Letting the Page Run On: Poetics, Rhetoric, and Noise in the *Satyrica.*" In J. Prag and I. Repath (Eds.) *Petronius: A Handbook.* Oxford: 65-81.

Roberts, D. 2006. "Petronius and the Vulgar Tongue: Colloquialism, Obscenity, Translation." *CML* 26, 1: 33-55.

Roberts, M. 1984. "Horace *Satires* 2.5: Restrained Indignation." *AJP* 105, 4: 426-433.

Ronnick, M. V. 1993a. "Form and Meaning in Juvenal's Twelfth Satire." *Maia* 45: 7-10.

_____. 1993b. "Juvenal, *Sat*. 12, 32 : Catullus' Shipwreck." *MH* 50: 223-224

_____. 1995. "Juvenal, Satire 12.81 : ubi est « ibi » ?" *Scholia* 4: 105-107.

Rudd, N. 1966. *The Satires of Horace*. Cambridge.

_____. 1986. *Themes in Roman Satire.* Norman, OK.

_____. 1997. *The Satires of Horace and Persius.* London.

Ruden, S. (Trans.) 2000. *Satyricon*. Indianapolis, IN and Cambridge.

Russell, D. A. 1979. "*De Imitatione."* In D. West and A. J. Woodman (Eds.) *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*. Cambridge: 1-16.

Rutherford, R. 2007. "Poetics and Literary Criticism." In S. Harrison (Ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*. Cambridge: 248-61.

Sage, E. T. and Gilleland, B. B. 1969. *Petronius: The Satiricon*. New York.

Saller, R. P. 1982. *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire.* Cambridge.

_____. 1983. "Martial on Patronage and Literature." *CQ* 33: 246-57.

Sandy, G. N. 1969. "Satire in the *Satyricon.*" *AJP* 90: 293-303.

_____. 1974. "*Scaenica Petroniana." TAPA* 104: 329-46.

_____. 1994. "Apuleius' *Metamophoses* and the Ancient Novel." *ANRW* II 34.2: 1511-74.

Sargeaunt, J. 1969. *The Trees, Shrubs, and Plants of Virgil.* Freeport, NY.

Schanz, M. 1911. *Geschichte der römischen Literatur.* Munich.

Schlegel, C. 2005. *Satire and the Threat of Speech: Horace's* Satires *Book I.* Madison.

Schmeling, G. 1971. "The *Exclusus Amator* Motif in Petronius." In *Fons Perennis: Saggi critici di filologia classica in onore del prof. Vittoriio d'Agostino.* Turin. 333-57.

_____. 1996. "Genre and the *Satyrica*: Menippean Satire and the Novel." In C. Klodt (Ed.) *Satura Lanx: Festschrift für Werner Krenkel zum 70. Geburtstag*. Hildesheim: 105-17.

_____. (Ed.) 2003 (Rev.). *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Leiden.

_____. 2011. *A Commentary on the* Satyrica *of Petronius.* Oxford.

_____, and Stuckey, J. H. 1977. *A Bibliography of Petronius*. Leiden.

Schmid, D. 1951. *Der Erbschleicher in der antiken Satire*. (PhD Diss.) Tübingen.

Schnur, H. C. 1959. "The Economic Background of the *Satyricon.*" *Latomus* 18: 790-9.

Selden, D. 1994. "Genre of genre." In J. Tatum (Ed.) *The Search for the Ancient Novel*. Baltmore and London: 39-64.

Sellar, W. Y. 1891. (2nd Ed.) *Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Horace and the Elegiac Poets.* Oxford.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. 2001. (4th Ed.) *Horatius: Opera.* Munich and Leipzig.

Slater, N. W. 1990. *Reading Petronius*. Baltimore.

_____. 2009. "Reading the *Satyrica.*" In J. Prag and I. Repath (Eds.) *Petronius: A Handbook.* Oxford: 16-31.

Smith, M. 1975. *Petronii Arbitri Cena Trimalchionis*. Oxford.

_____. 1985. "A Bibliography of Petronius (1945-1982). *ANRW II* 32.3: 1624-65.

Smith, W. S. 1989. "Greed and Sacrifice in Juvenal's 12th Satire." *TAPA* 119: 287-98.

Soverini, P. 1985. "Il problema delle teorie retoriche e poetiche di Petronio." *ANRW II* 32.3: 1706-79.

Sullivan, J. P. (Ed.) 1963. *Critical Essays on Roman Literature, II: Satire.* London.

_____. (Trans.) 1965. *Petronius: The Satyricon and the Fragments.* Harmondsworth.

_____. 1968. *The Satyricon of Petronius: A Literary Study*. London.

_____. 1985a. *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nero.* Ithaca, NY.

_____. 1985b. "Petronius' *Satyricon* and its Neronian context." *ANRW II* 32.3: 1666-86.

Swanson, D. C. 1963. *A Formal Analysis of Petronius' Vocabulary*. Minneapolis, MN.

Tatum, J. (Ed.) 1994. *The Search for the Ancient Novel*. Baltimore and London.

Townend, G. B. 1973. "The Literary Substrata to Juvenal's Satires." *JRS* 63: 148-60.

Tracy, V. 1980. "Aut captantur aut captant." *Latomus* 39: 399-402.

Vannini, G. 2007. "Petronius 1975-2005: bilancio critico e nuove proposte." *Lustrum* 49: 7-512.

van Rooy, C. A. 1965. *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory*. Leiden.

Verboven, K. 2002. *The Economy of Friends: Economic Aspects of Amicitia and Patronage in the Late Republic.* Brussels.

Wallace-Hadrill A. 1981. “Family inheritance in the Augustan marriage-laws.” *PCPS* 27: 58-80.

_____. (Ed.). 1989. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London and New York.

Walsh, P. G. 1968. “Eumolpus, the *Halosis Troiae*, and the *de Bello Civili*.” *CP* 63, 3: 208-212.

_____. 1970. *The Roman Novel: The “Satyricon” of Petronius and the “Metamorphoses” of Apuleius*. Cambridge. [Reprinted by Bristol Classical Press. 1995].

_____. 1974. “Was Petronius a Moralist?” *G&R* 21, 2: 181-90.

_____. (Trans.) 1996. *The Satyricon.* Oxford.

Winkler, M. M. 1983. *The Persona in Three Satires of Juvenal.* Hildesheim.

Wooten, C. 1976. “Petronius, the Mime, and Rhetorical Education.” *Helios* 3: 67-74.

_____. 1984. “Petronius and ‘Camp.’” *Helios* 11: 133-9.

Zeitlin, F. 1971. “Petronius as Paradox: Anarchy and Artistic Integrity.” *TAPA* 102: 631-84. [Reprinted in S. J. Harrison (Ed.) *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel*. (1999) Oxford: 1-49.]

Zumpt, K. G. 1843. “Über das Leben des Horaz, und die Zeitfolge seiner Gedichte, namentlich der Satiren” in E. F. Wüstemann (Ed.) *Des Q. Horatius Flaccus Satiren erklärt von L. F. Heindorf.* Leipzig: 1-42.