7

CATHERINE CONNORS

Epic allusion in Roman satire

One of the things Lucilius, Horace, Persius, and Juvenal have in common is their pleasure in a nice bit of epic furniture about the place. It is easy enough to install, since epic and satire both use the dactylic hexameter. It is fun to hear Horace describe the city mouse and the country mouse going to Rome in the kind of night that falls in Roman epic (Horace, *Sermones* 2.6.98–101). It is amusing to see a decadent Roman aristocrat as a "boy Automedon" (Achilles' charioteer, Juvenal 1.61), or to see the admirable Pyrrha, who helps repopulate the earth after the flood by throwing stones over her shoulder, through Juvenal's jaundiced eyes, looking like a procuress setting out her girls (Juvenal 1.84). And of course everyone enjoys a nice swipe at bad epic poets now and then. But the function of epic allusion in Roman satire should not be understood as exclusively decorative. In many genres, poets use allusions to define their poetic projects and to articulate important themes.[1] It is well understood that the Roman satirists use allusions to or descriptions of their satiric predecessors to articulate their poetic projects.[2] What has been less appreciated is how precisely each poet chooses his allusions to epic to define his poetic project and its political dimension.[3]

Each satirist inhabits a different set of political circumstances. Lucilius, born into a wealthy family as Rome becomes ever more avid in its pursuit of the luxurious prizes of conquest during the second century BCE, plunges into the cut and thrust of Republican politics with direct attacks on a number of important political figures. Horace, son of a freedman, who has had the luck to make his way into the circle of Maecenas, looks back at years of civil war and forward to better times under Octavian and eschews famous names in favor of benighted nobodies as targets of his satire. Seneca, hailing from

[1] Hinds (1998).

[2] On satirists' programmatic allusions to their predecessors see Kenney (1962) and Bramble (1974) 16–23.

[3] Freudenburg (2001) places politics in the foreground of his readings of the satiric tradition.

an extremely wealthy and well-connected family and holding the position of tutor and advisor to Nero, disdains Claudius' arbitrary and high-handed dealings and can hardly contain his glee at Claudius' death. Persius cryptically suggests to his circle of friends that it would be dangerous to speak too openly of Neronian folly. Juvenal portrays himself as in need of a good patron and rails against the tyranny of Domitian for all to hear, once it is safely over. A relatively limited number of epic motifs – mainly from battle scenes and scenes of the gods meeting in council – are the basis of most of satire's epic allusions. Each poet exploits his scraps of epic in different ways, and the differences reflect not just their stylistic choices but their political worlds.

Fish, Politics, Hexameter – and satire

Fish occupy a special category in ancient thinking about food. Not as basic or homegrown as grain and vegetables, fish is unlike meat too: it is not sacrificed, nor need it be consumed communally. The smallest and cheapest fish nourish the poor man, while the rich man can afford the most delicate flavors and exotic varieties. Like satire itself, fish is a private indulgence, not a public shared undertaking. Talking about the fish men eat is in effect talking about the money they spend on themselves for themselves – and this can be a good way of getting at a political target.[4] Ennius' translation of the gourmandizing poem on food – and especially fish – by Archestratus of Gela (in Sicily) should be viewed as part of the literary and cultural context within which Roman satire takes shape. In his *Hedypatheia* ("life of pleasures"), written some time between 390 and 350 BCE, Archestratus used vaguely Homeric hexameters to tell readers where to go to buy the best food and drink in the Mediterranean. During Archestratus' lifetime, Sicily was famous for its rich and elaborately spiced cuisine, which was publicized in the Greek world in several notorious cookbooks.[5] While Archestratus was derided as something of a glutton by some later readers, his recent editors make beautifully clear that he prizes above all simple preparations of high quality ingredients and deplores social climbers who hire (or buy) specialized professional cooks to provide them with the latest fancily spiced Syracusan dishes. As Olson and Sens argue, Archestratus seems to write for an élite, like-minded audience; the easy mastery of Homer his poem displays in its hexameter form and vocabulary marks them all as men educated in a traditional way. While the poem is not exactly satire, it does seem to set an "in group" of truly luxurious people who eat exquisitely simple food and joke

[4] Cf. Davidson (1997) 3–35. [5] Olson and Sens (2000) xxxvi–xxxix.

about Homer (perhaps a traditional aristocracy) against an "out group" of conspicuous and uninformed consumers (perhaps a newly affluent middle or commercial class).[6]

Only one eleven-line fragment survives of Ennius' hexameter translation of Archestratus, the *Hedyphagetica* ("Delicatessen"), but it is a tantalizing one. Skutsch has argued that Ennius makes changes to his model that may reflect his experience in the entourage of Fulvius Nobilior as he waged a military campaign in Aetolia in 189/8.[7] In line 3 of the fragment (Ennius fr. 33–44 Vahlen, which translates Archestratus fr. 7 Olson and Sens = Athenaeus 3.92d–e), Ennius adds *Caradrum*, which seems to be a town name, to describe a precise location in Ambracia where good scallops are found. This detail is not found in the corresponding line of the original Greek, and the place itself seems to have been rather obscure. Ennius may be one-upping his Greek source with the results of his own experience there in Ambracia on the ground. Nobilior's campaign brought heaps of Greek stuff back to Rome. He appropriated statues of the Muses and housed them in a Roman temple of Hercules. He had in his entourage Ennius, a poet who in his *Annales*, which tell Rome's history, up to and including Nobilior's exploits, brings the Homeric hexameter – and the kind of panegyric favored by Hellenistic kings – into Latin. Nobilior's Muses and the hexameters of Ennius' *Annales* are imperial artefacts which celebrate Rome's ability to put the spoils of conquest to its own uses. Ennius' translation of Archestratus, too, transforms a Greek artefact into a document of Roman conquest even in details as small as the scallops at Charadros: the world of the Mediterranean is no longer merely the place where a Sicilian gourmet travels to eat, but from where a Roman general comes home in triumph.

Turnips in heaven

It would be nice to know whether Ennius used mock epic elements in his poems in various meters called *saturae*, but the limited fragments do not show clear evidence of this. Much more important for understanding connections between epic and satire is Ennius' epic *Annales*, for satirists often pluck their epic allusions from its grand history of Rome. In the first book of the *Annales*, the gods meet as a divine council to discuss Romulus' fate and are told that he is destined to join them in heaven (*unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli templa*, "there will be one whom you [Mars] will bear aloft to heaven's blue

[6] Olson and Sens (2000) xliii–lv; see also Wilkins (2000) ch. 6, on representations of luxurious eating in Greek comedy, esp. 292–304 on fish, and ch. 7, "The Culinary Literature of Sicily."
[7] Skutsch (1968) 38–9.

realms," *Annales* 54–5 Sk.). Another Ennian fragment, also assigned to the first book of the *Annales*, represents Romulus among the gods (110–11):

> Romulus in caelo cum dis genitalibus aevom
> degit
> Romulus spends his life in heaven with the gods who created him

The picture of the once mortal Romulus among the gods, which seems not to have been part of the story before Ennius, was a powerful one, and it came in for mockery from several later poets. In Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* (to which I shall return below), the motion proposing the deification of Claudius concludes that "the republic needs someone else who can *gobble steaming turnips*" (*ferventia rapa vorare*) with Romulus (Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis* 9.5). The emphasized words are the end of a hexameter; Lucilius is their most likely author. An epigram of Martial likewise vividly pictures Romulus living on cooked turnips (Martial 13.16):

> These turnips [*rapa*] which we give you, delighting in the winter cold,
> Romulus is accustomed to eat in heaven [*in caelo Romulus esse solet*]

The Lucilian line can thus be reconstructed with what Skutsch describes as almost mathematical certainty:

> *Romulus in caelo ferventia rapa vorare.*
> Romulus . . . gobbled steaming turnips in heaven . . .

In response to Ennius' picture of Romulus *living* in heaven (*Romulus in caelo*), a satirist – presumably Lucilius – produces an earthy picture of Romulus *eating* in heaven, and not nibbling at ambrosia, but gobbling the very mundane turnip. The vision of Romulus in heaven also happens to survive in graffiti at Pompeii. The phrase *Romulus in caelo* appears four times on walls in the city (*CIL* IV 3135, 7353, 8568, 8995). Skutsch suspects this line was used (much as the *Apocolocyntosis* used *ferventia rapa vorare*) in some kind of skit mocking the deifications declared by the Julio-Claudian emperors, and he compares Vespasian's deathbed joke *vae puto deus fio* ("alas, I think I am becoming a god," Suetonius, *Vespasian* 23) on June 23, CE 79, just prior to the eruption of Vesuvius on August 24.[8]

Romulus' satiric feast takes on new meanings as political circumstances change. During the Republic, before deified emperors have even been dreamed of, to picture Romulus over his turnips in heaven would be to mock Ennius' gravity and to joke about the role of the *Annales* as an authoritative version of Rome's history by asking what Romulus is *really* up to up there.

[8] Skutsch (1985) on *Annales* fr. 110; Skutsch (1968) 109–12, 30–1.

The picture is funny, and it also resonates with contemporary debates about Roman-ness. The turnip is the most rustic of foods, grown, not purchased, native, not imported. Plutarch reports that the Elder Cato was inspired by the story of Manius Curius Dentatus' conviction that a man who could be satisfied with turnips did not need gold (Plutarch, *Cato Major* 2.2). By eating turnips, even in heaven (where does he *get* them anyway?), Romulus embodies the qualities of sturdy incorruptibility which Cato and those like him had praised so highly – no Greekish nectar and ambrosia for him! But the turnips make that rigid version of Roman-ness – and the passages of Ennius' *Annales* which promoted it – look ridiculously, hopelessly out of date in the cosmopolitan Republic. When deification becomes a regular feature of imperial succession, quoting the epic phrase *Romulus in caelo* becomes a joke about the implausibilities of deification – especially if you remember the Lucilian turnips, as Seneca and Martial evidently expected their audiences to do.

Death by fish sauce

The context in which Lucilius joked about Romulus and his turnips is not known. More can be understood about the ways Lucilius parodies Ennius in an epic council scene modeled on the Ennian discussion of what will become of Romulus. Lucilius' target is Lucius Cornelius Lentulus Lupus, a leading senator, criticized for a decadent lifestyle and for corrupt practices as a judge.[9] From the fragments it is possible to see that the gods assemble to condemn Lupus' luxurious tastes and decide upon his fate. Similar council scenes by Seneca, Juvenal, and Julian introduce – and send up – the deliberators individually; Lucilius likely did this too. Various extravagant luxury objects and practices are mentioned: Lydian cloaks (fr. 12W), soft coverlets (fr. 13W), the use of Greek words instead of Latin (frs. 14 and 15–16W). Lupus' name means "wolf," but it also is used for the bass, known as a rather large and especially voracious (that is, wolfish) fish (cf. Varro, *Res rustica* 3.3.9; Columella, *De re rustica* 8.16.4, Martial 10.30.21). The decision of the gods is framed as a pun on this fishy sense of *lupus*; the *ius* (judicial decision, plural *iura*) is a *ius* (sauce) made from smaller fry (Lucilius, fr. 46W, with Warmington's note): "The juices [*iura*] of the saperda and the silurus [both little fish] destroy you, Lupus." Where Romulus ascends to the heavens to dine with the gods (albeit on turnips), Lupus is to be submerged in the sauce of lesser fish. Persius savors the edible fishiness of Lupus' identity when he says "Lucilius cut the whole city to pieces – you, Lupus, and you, Mucius – and broke his jaw bone on them" (Persius 1.114–15). Lucilius'

[9] Marx (1904–1905) on fr. 3M, fr. 4M; Coffey (1989) 42–3.

council scene has a slapstick side: Apollo objects to being called *pulcher*, apparently sensitive to the epithet's debauched overtones (fr. 28–9W); Lactantius reports that in the council of the gods Lucilius made fun of the fact that all the male gods are called *pater* (fr. 24–7W, = Lactantius, *Divinae Institutiones* 4.3.12). And someone seems to take Apollo to task for speaking in an obscure oracular fashion (fr. 30–32W). Someone even recollects an earlier (more dignified?) assembly (frs. 19 and 20–22W): "I would wish, o dwellers in heaven, we had been present at the council, the earlier council [*priore concilio*], which you say was once held here. . . ." Here, Lucilius may exploit a strategy Ovid later revels in, in which characters in a later poem "remember" what had been said or done in an earlier poem. Indeed, Ovid's most elaborate example of the game may take its cue from Lucilius, for it refers precisely to the Ennian assembly on the fate of Romulus which is evoked in the trial of Lupus. In both the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid has Mars remind Jupiter of the promise to raise Romulus to the heavens which had been made in the *Annales*, and in both versions Mars goes so far as to repeat what Jupiter said to him in the *Annales*: *unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli | templa* ("there will be one whom you [Mars] will bear aloft to heaven's blue realms," *Annales* 54–5 Sk.; cf. Ovid, *Fasti* 3. 487 and *Metamorphoses* 14.814, where Mars introduces the quotation with "For I noted [*notavi*] your virtuous words in my memory [*memorique animo*] and I remind you of them now").[10] A participant in Lucilius' divine assembly, called to solve the latter-day Lupus problem, wishes he had been present at an earlier divine assembly. Which one could be more prominent in readers' minds than Ennius' scene of the gods' discussion of the fate of Romulus? The joke would be even more pointed if the speaker who regrets not being at the earlier council was Romulus himself.[11] It is even possible that the description of Romulus and his turnips belongs in this council scene.

What was Lucilius' purpose in making a meal of Lupus?[12] Even without viewing the surviving fragments as evidence of a narrowly partisan agenda it is still possible to understand them as having a political dimension. Clearly the attack on Lupus' luxurious excess, like the mocking picture of Romulus and his turnips, participates in contemporary discourse about how much

[10] On Ovid's allusions to Ennius, see, with further references, Conte (1986) 57–63 and the response of Hinds (1998) 14–16.

[11] On Romulus' presence in the Lucilian council scene, see Krenkel (1970) vol. 1, 109, Charpin (1978) 201–2, Gratwick (1982) 169–70, Coffey (1989) 43.

[12] Though some have seen Lucilius' satire as designed to advance the political agendas of his patron Scipio Aemilianus (see the remarks of Coffey [1989] 47–8), Gruen (1992) 272–317 argues that Lucilius' attacks on wealth and the excesses of Hellenism are not constrained by narrowly political agendas.

Greek culture is too much for Roman identity to withstand. It may also be useful to consider the trial within the political context of the last decades of the second century BCE. At various points there were proposals to redistribute public lands from aristocrats who held them in excess of legal limits to veterans and the urban poor.[13] Against this background, defining a society-wide problem (the conflict between traditional if not strictly legal aristocratic prerogatives and the immediately pressing needs of veterans and the urban poor) as the foibles of a single wealthy individual of luxurious tastes and corrupt judicial practices could help to make the broad limitations on aristocratic prerogatives that land reform proposals would represent seem an unnecessary and undesirable break with tradition. Despite this fundamentally conservative aspect of the poem in its original context, for Lucilius' satiric successors, attacks such as this one on Lupus and on other leading figures in Rome came to embody Republican *libertas*, the ability to speak freely without fear of undue reprisals, a quality whose loss under tyrannical, paranoid, and vindictive emperors was much lamented.

Lucilius' sword

Lucilius' successors like to think of him as a poet who uses his pen like an epic hero's sword. In the first satire of his second book, Horace stages a dialogue between himself and Trebatius, who recommends against writing satire and suggests that Horace compose an epic in praise of Caesar instead. Horace stubbornly rejects epic and clings to satire, claiming that it pleases him to write "in Lucilius' manner" (*Lucili ritu*, Horace, *S.* 2.1.29). In response to Trebatius' warnings that poets can get in trouble if their satires offend the wrong people, Horace says he'll rely on his pen: "it will protect me like a sheathed sword [*et me veluti custodiet ensis / vagina tectus*]; why should I bother to draw it if I am safe from attackers?" (*Sermones* 2.1.41–2). So Horace imagines the deterrent effects of the aggressive satires he might write if provoked.[14] Of course, implicit in Horace's reference to a sheathed sword

[13] For detailed discussion see Astin (1967) 161–74, 190–210; Stockton (1979) 40–60.

[14] Horace even claims a historical precedent for his deterrent stance, for he explains in an otherwise oddly incongruous digression that his hometown, Venusia, was settled to prevent either Apulians or Lucanians from having an easy path of attack against Rome once the Samnites had been driven out of the area (2.1.34–9; see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae* 17–18 for the foundation of the colony in 291 BCE). The Latin colonists at Venusia do not wage war, they merely plow their fields on the border between Apulia and Lucania (*S.* 2.1.35) in such a way as to deter attacks on Rome (this – pointedly? – whitewashes the fact that in 90 BCE during the Social War Venusia alone of Roman colonies and Latin allies joined the opposition to Rome, cf. Appian, *Bellum Civile* 1.39). So, too, Horace as satirist deters attackers without waging actual war.

within his comparison of Lucilius and himself is the notion that Lucilius did wage war, brandishing his satiric pen like a sword.[15]

Juvenal takes the notion of Lucilius as epic hero implicit in Horace and makes it explicit when he announces in his first satire that he follows in Lucilius' path (Juvenal 1.19–21):

> I will explain why it pleases me to traverse the ground,
> over which the great hero [*magnus*] born at Aurunca drove his horses,
> if you have time and listen calmly to my account.[16]

By naming Lucilius by his birthplace in this indirect way (just as epic poets like to name their heroes) and by figuring his writing as the sweep of a chariot across a battlefield, Juvenal at once alludes to Lucilius' social status as an *eques* (which literally means "horseman" and designates a political class of substantial property holders), and casts Lucilius as an epic hero.[17] Later on in the same poem Juvenal again describes Lucilius' satirical attacks as battles of epic proportions. Here the sword is out of its sheath (Juvenal 1.165–7):[18]

> Whenever raging as though with sword drawn [*ense velut stricto*]
> Lucilius bellows,
> his listener, whose mind shivers over his crimes, blushes hot,
> and his vitals sweat with secret guilt.

Though Lucilius is cast as an epic hero by Horace and Juvenal, it seems unlikely that he would have portrayed *himself* as an epic hero in any but the most ironic way. In the surviving fragments, Lucilius does represent the Roman forum as a battlefield, but it is not the scene of the single-handed swashbuckling sort of battles that Horace implies and Juvenal describes (Lucilius fr. 1145–51W):

[15] On other aspects of Horace's engagement with epic models and with Lucilian critique of lofty panegyric in *S.* 2.1, see Freudenburg (2001) 87–92. Horace elsewhere associates Lucilius with the large-scale and continuous flow of epic poetry by comparing him to a muddy river in an image that alludes to Callimachus' programmatic description of large-scale epic as a muddy river (*S.* 1.4.11, *S.* 1.10.50–1; cf. Callimachus, *Hymn to Apollo* 108–9). Detailed discussion of Horace's strategy of defining his literary, social and political identity through contrasts with Lucilius in Cucchiarelli (2001), esp. 56–83, 84–118.

[16] Braund (1996b) on these lines and 21–2.

[17] On Juvenal's view of Lucilius in this passage, see further Bramble (1974) 169–70, Cucchiarelli (2001) 205, Rudd (1966) 110.

[18] On precise epic parallels for Juvenal's language here see Virgil, *Aen.* 10.711–15 and others discussed by Braund (1996b).

> but now, from morning till night, on holiday and work day,
> the whole people and likewise the senators too
> flaunt themselves in the forum [*indu foro*] and never leave it;
> and they dedicate themselves to one and the same pursuit and practice,
> namely to be able to make false promises with impunity, fight deceitfully,
> rival each other in ingratiating speech, act the good man,
> and lay ambushes as if all of them were enemies to all men.

Lucilius' phrase *indu foro*, an archaic version of *in foro*, looks back to an important and well known passage of Ennius (*Annales* 268–86 Sk.). Ennius describes Geminus Servilius, a leading citizen who, "when tired from spending the greater part of the day in the direction of matters of highest importance by advice given in the wide forum and the sacred senate" (*consilio indu foro lato sanctoque senatu*), likes to relax with his trusted friend, a thoroughly admirable man thought to represent a self-portrait of Ennius himself (Gellius 12.4.4). As Skutsch remarks, the description of the two men exchanging conversation at table seems "more appropriate to Satire than to the Epic":[19] the patron would speak to his friend "without restraint of matters great and small and make jokes" (*res audacter magnas parvasque iocumque / eloqueretur, Annales* 273–4 Sk.) and he would "spew forth (*evomeretque*) things that are good and bad to say" (*Annales* 274–5 Sk.). Horace noticed the satiric qualities of Ennius' picture of patron and friend for he alludes to it in describing his own relationship with Maecenas (*Sermones* 1.3.63), where *saepe libenter* at line end echoes the same phrase and position at Ennius, *Annales* 268 Sk. (see Skutsch on this and on *Annales* 280). And Horace's picture of how Scipio and Laelius were "in the habit of exchanging trifles and witty remarks" (*nugari et . . . ludere . . . soliti*) in private with Lucilius after their public activities "while the cabbage was cooking" (*Sermones* 2.1.73–4) also seems to owe something to Ennius. Horace thus acknowledges the satiric qualities of the Ennian passage by incorporating allusions to it within his satiric descriptions of the relations of patrons and poets. By contrast, Lucilius reverses Ennius' satire-into-epic trajectory when he casts satire's forum as a version of an epic battlefield. Whether or not the phrase *indu foro* is felt as a direct allusion to the Ennian passage, the constant and universal bad behavior in Lucilius' forum pricks the bubble of Ennius' idealistic vision of great men ethically directing Rome's affairs.

Horace's road warriors

Allusions to epic allow satire to juxtapose the realm of high, important, national matters with the realm of low, trivial, and private matters. Lucilius

[19] Skutsch (1985) 451.

can make the trivialities of Lupus' private life into a matter of national consequence by having the gods discuss them. Horace moves in the other direction. Just as he gives the city mouse and the country mouse an epic night to walk through that makes them look all the smaller, he emphasizes his own lowly status and the privacy and intimacy of his satires with self-deprecating epic allusions. These allusions operate within an overall strategy of self-presentation, a project carefully designed to flatter Maecenas: what a discerning man he must be who can appreciate someone as understated and relatively unimportant as Horace.

When Horace takes the road to Brundisium in satire 1.5, lofty epic models are evoked along the way to ensure that Horace's journey looks humble.[20] The poem's opening, "Aricia welcomed me with modest hospitality when I set out from great Rome" (*egressum magna me accepit Aricia Roma / hospitio modico*) has been thought to evoke the beginning of Odysseus' tale to the Phaeacians ("the wind carrying me from Troy brought me to the Cicones," *Odyssey* 9.39).[21] At the next stop, he declares war – on his belly (*ventri / indico bellum*, 1.5.7–8). Night falls in a decidedly epic fashion: "now night was preparing to draw shadows over the earth and scatter the constellations in the sky" (*iam nox inducere terris/ umbras et caelo diffundere signa parabat*, 1.5.9–10. But the battle that ensues is one of abusive language (*convicia*) hurled back and forth by boatmen and the boys alongside the canal (1.5.11). Cucchiarelli makes the very appealing point that the frogs that disturb Horace's sleep at 1.5.14–15 evoke the comic version of the heroic descent into the underworld staged in Aristophanes' *Frogs*.[22] Later on, Caudium is the scene of an epic "single combat" between the Oscan rustic Messius Cicurrus and the urban Sarmentus which entertains the party. Horace plays Homer to their heroes (1.5.53–54):

> Muse, please recall also, born from what father did each engage in – dispute.

At Beneventum a kitchen fire of epic proportions (especially signaled by saying "Vulcan" instead of simply "fire") breaks out (1.5.73–76):

[20] On epic parody in Horace, *S.* 1.5 see Sallmann (1974) 200–6, and Gowers (1993b) 55–6, 59; Reckford (1999) 538–43.

[21] Ehlers (1985) 80–1. *Odyssey* 9.39 is quoted verbatim in Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis* 5.4.

[22] Cucchiarelli (2001) 25–33. Note too his observation at 23–4 that the names of the hosts Murena and Capito in *S.* 1.5.37–8 are both words that are used for fish: as he remarks, in a contrast typical of Horace's overall relationship to Lucilius, Horace's fishmen are benevolent friends while Lucilius' fish-man Lupus is a target of angry mocking attack.

> for when Vulcan escaped [*dilapso . . . Volcano*], the flame darted through the old kitchen and hastened to lick the high roof. Then you could see the greedy guests and the frightened slaves snatch up the meal, and everyone wanting to put out the flames.

In the epic tradition the westward voyages of the Greek heroes are the sequel to the burning of Troy. In Horace's version of the tradition, after the epic-tinged fire at Beneventum he subsequently stops at Canusium, which he is careful to mention was founded by Diomedes after his return from Troy (1.5.91–92).

If in 1.5 Horace offers a portrait of the satirist as an Odyssean hero in miniature, in 1.9 he sketches an Iliadic scene as he playfully imagines his extrication from an annoying encounter in the street as a rescue by Apollo.[23] A certain man (*ille*) falls upon Horace as he strolls the Via Sacra and tries to use him to secure access to Maecenas; Horace tries unsuccessfully to escape. Finally, to the poet's relief, the man is summoned for a court appearance. In the poem's last line, Horace says "thus did Apollo save me" (*sic me servavit Apollo*, 1.9.78). The line alludes to Apollo's rescue of Hector from the attack of Achilles on the plain of Troy (*Iliad* 20.443), as was noticed by Porphyrio, an early third century CE commentator on Horace. Porphyrio also reports that Lucilius quotes the Homeric line in Greek in his sixth book (fr. 267–8W):

> nil ut discrepat ac τὸν δ' ἐξήρπαξεν Ἀπόλλων
> fiat
> so that there may be no dispute and it may become a case of "and Apollo rescued him"

This Horatian allusion to Homer via Lucilius has led some critics to see a Lucilian model in the background of Horace's street scene;[24] on this basis a fragment describing a street scene in which Scipio Aemilianus has sharp words for someone (fr. 254–8W) has also been ascribed to Lucilius' sixth book. It is especially tempting to see an allusive connection between this Scipio scene and Horace, *Sermones* 1.9 because the phrase describing Scipio's progress, *ibat forte domum* ("he happened to be on the way home," Lucil. fr. 258W), is so close to the opening of Horace's poem (*Sermones* 1.9.1–2):

> I happened to be on the Sacred Way [*Ibam forte Via Sacra*], as is my habit, thinking of something trivial [*nescio quid meditans nugarum*], all absorbed in it . . .

[23] On Horace's use of the imagery of the epic battlefield throughout 1.9 see Anderson (1956).

[24] Fiske (1920) 330–6, Fraenkel (1957) 118.

If indeed Horace frames his street scene with reminiscences of Lucilius, one in the first line and one in the last line, perhaps there is even a self-reflexive wink in "thinking over something trivial" (*nescio quid meditans nugarum*) in Horace's line 2; Horace was thinking of some light or trivial poetry (*nugae*) on the Sacred Way – Lucilius' (the word *nugae* is associated with Lucilius at Horace, *Sermones* 2.1.73). Unlike Scipio, who speaks boldly, embodying the concept of *libertas*, at the man in the street, Horace hurls no public abuse at the pest, ineffectually attempting to put him off and rolling his eyes; he has us watch him saving the scene to smirk over with Maecenas in private. The epic allusion allows Horace to cite Lucilius as a source and to "correct" his stylistic flaws by clothing the Greek line in decent Latin garb. Moreover, the Horatian rewriting of Lucilius in this poem, as elsewhere, redefines *libertas* as something to be enjoyed in private rather than embodied in frank public exchanges. As DuQuesnay has argued, Lucilius' close association with *libertas*, which had been appropriated by the Pompeian faction (Cicero, *Ad familiares* 12.16.3), becomes a valuable piece of political capital to be put to use in Horace's indirect but pervasive suggestions that Maecenas and Octavian – and not Octavian's defeated opponents, especially the supporters of Sextus Pompey – are the true protectors of *libertas*.[25]

In 1.5 and 1.9, allusions to epic contrast the heroic and national with the everyday and inconsequential. But even these inconsequentials have consequences. Every time Horace's epic allusions help make his relationship with Maecenas look private and ordinary, he fosters the impression that the world Octavian is building is a world where sensible men can enjoy sensible friendships – instead of the destructive factionalism of civil war.[26] The same strategy is at work in satire 1.7, a mock epic account of an exchange of insults. The half-Greek Persius engages in a battle of insults with Publius Rupilius Rex, a former praetor proscribed by Antony and Octavian, who took refuge with Brutus in Clazomenae in Asia Minor before the battle of Philippi in 42 BCE. Horace compares the contest to the epic encounters between Achilles and Hector or Diomedes and Glaucus on the plains of Troy (*Sermones* 1.7.10–18). But when Persius turns boldly to Brutus and tops Rex's insults with "why don't you kill this king [*rex*]?" (*cur non | hunc Regem iugulas*, *Sermones* 1.7.34–5), he jokes about the ancient Brutus' murder of the king Tarquinius Superbus and the present Brutus' participation in the murder of Caesar (amid rumors that he sought the title "king", Suetonius, *Julius Caesar* 79). Allusions to epic and distant history juxtapose the grand

[25] So argued by Du Quesnay (1984), esp. 27–32; and see too the further comments of Kennedy (1992) 29–33, and Henderson (1994) 81.

[26] See Cucchiarelli (2001) 84–118, esp. 100, 117.

with the trivial: if the Brutus joke is not grand, it must be trivial. But here again, something inconsequential has consequences: Horace was with Brutus in Asia, and therefore the inclusion of the Brutus joke in a collection dedicated to Octavian's friend Maecenas fosters the notion that even the conflict between Brutus and Octavian – and Horace's presence on the side of Brutus – ultimately has no lasting consequences for the poet's ability to make his way back from the side of Brutus into the circle of Octavian's intimates.[27] Now as then, a troublesome episode in the east (the Greeks in Troy, Brutus in Clazomenae) is merely one step on the way to Rome's eventual triumph (Rome's foundation by Aeneas and eventual refoundation by Octavian).

Satires 2.5 stages a mock epic version of Ulysses' conversation with Teiresias in the Underworld. Teiresias tells Ulysses how to flatter the rich into bequeathing him their wealth. The punchline of the poem is a prophecy of the unsuccessful legacy hunting of one Nasica, which will happen "when a youth, a terror to the Parthians, descended from ancient Aeneas, will hold sway over land and sea" (Horace, *Sermones* 2.5.62–4). Having a debased Teiresias prophesy the victories of Octavian "descended from ancient Aeneas" parodies a moment in the *Iliad* when Poseidon, as he decides to rescue Aeneas from Achilles, foretells a lasting and powerful future for the descendants of Aeneas (*Iliad* 20.302–8). The Homeric prediction does not mention Italy, and indeed this was felt to be a problem by those who sought to trace Rome's origins to Troy;[28] Horace's Teiresias clarifies the situation nicely by referring directly to Octavian's military success.[29] At first sight, the third person mock epic narrative of 2.5 seems quite different from the self-deprecating allusions in the first person narratives of 1.5 and 1.9 which measure little Horace against the epic heroes of the past. But Oliensis has recently argued that in this mock epic treatment of attempts at social advancement, Horace is satirizing his own ascent into Maecenas' inner circle as set forth in the first book of satires; he strengthens his position in the inner circle by being the first to make fun of how he got there.[30] Horace's satires share the multivalent qualities of other literature produced in the orbit of Octavian /Augustus.[31]

[27] Du Quesnay (1984) 36–8. Henderson (1994) 156, referring to the fact that Glaucus traded his gold arms for Diomedes' bronze arms, a trade Horace mentions at *S.* 1.7.15–18: "poem 1.7 offers us Horatian 'gold', the representation and its work of re-presentation, in lieu of the nasty Civil War 'bronze'." See too the perceptive discussion of Schlegel (1999), esp. 344–7.

[28] See Gruen (1992) 12–13.

[29] Horace may also be making an ironic reference to a famous story that when Octavian was born the astrologer Nigidius Figulus said "now is born the master of the world" (*dominus terrarum orbi natus*, Suetonius, *Augustus* 94.5).

[30] Oliensis (1998a) 57.

[31] Kennedy (1992) is a good starting point for embarking upon this vast topic.

Readers optimistic about the measures Octavian had taken to quell civil strife could find celebrations of *libertas* flourishing among friends in peaceful times. Those more paranoid, suspicious or caught up in their memories of war might see what Freudenburg (2001) calls "the totalitarian squeeze" (71) or "the hissings of compliance" (108).[32]

Persius and the battlefield of the soul

Persius writes during the reign of Nero, who himself liked to indulge in epic-tinged chariot racing and the extravagant composition of poetic treatments of mythological themes. Like Horace, Persius rejects the drawn epic sword of Lucilius and Juvenal. More secretive in his epic allusions than Horace, Persius seeks out epic descriptions of severe introspection and thwarted utterance to adorn his cryptic and crabbed verses. When he sets out to praise his friend Cornutus in the fifth satire, he disavows the poetic custom (which goes back to Homer, *Iliad* 2.488–90) of asking for many mouths to meet the descriptive demands of his topic (Persius 5.1–4).[33] After Cornutus interrupts to praise Persius' terse style, Persius resumes to say that he would ask for a hundred throats to say all that would otherwise remain unsayable about Cornutus. Both Homer and Persius use the topos to describe the limits on what they can say, but where the effect of the Homeric lines is to convey the grandeur and magnitude of their subject, Persius' lines convey the impression that it is nearly impossible for him to write at all.

In his third satire Persius stages a dialogue between a lazy writer and a friend who offers bracing advice to get to work. The poet narrator complains about the difficulty of working – even his pen gives him trouble! In one of his many rebukes, the friend castigates the narrator for sleeping late (Persius 3.58–9):

> you are still snoring, and hanging slack, its hinge loose, your head [*caput*] gapes [*oscitat*] in yesterday's yawn with jaws completely unfastened.

As Barr and Lee (1987) astutely note in their commentary, in this picture of a head released from its fastenings Persius reworks a famously gruesome Ennian line about a man decapitated in battle: "the head torn off from its neck gapes on the ground" (*oscitat in campis caput a cervice revolsum*, *Annales* 483 Sk.). A Virgilian decapitation imitated this Ennian line too ("then Aeneas knocks to the ground the head [*caput*] of the man begging in vain and getting ready to say more," *Aeneid* 10.554–5).[34] It is typical of

[32] See, too, Henderson (1994). [33] On the many-mouthed topos, see Hinds (1998) 34–47.
[34] Cf. Skutsch (1985) 645–6 on Virgil's use of Ennius in this context.

Virgil's tongue-tied version of epic heroism that the warrior's decapitation is figured as an interruption of his speech. Ennian death on the battlefield, poignantly reworked as Virgilian thwarted speech, becomes the satiric version of thwarted speech, the lazy poet's snore. Persius elsewhere even makes Ennian epic itself the product of snoring. In his prologue he says he has not dreamed (*somniasse*) he was on Parnassus. This alludes to, among other things, the beginning of the *Annales* in which Ennius apparently said that he had a dream that revealed he was descended from Homer through a sequence of reincarnation that included a peacock (*Annales* 2–11 Sk., and see Skutsch [1985] 147–53 and 164–5). And in his letter to Bassus from his winter retreat in Luna on the Ligurian coast, Persius quotes an Ennian line, "Get to know Luna's port, citizens, it's worth it," with the footnote that "So Ennius' heart bid him, after he snored off (*destertuit*, only here in Latin as Barr and Lee [1987] note) being Quintus son of Homer descended from the Pythagorean peacock" (Persius 6.9–11).

Persius' fullest refashioning of epic motifs happens in his first satire.[35] Persius' poetry may have scant appeal, he admits, to audiences besotted with exotic treatments of mythological themes (Persius 1.1–5):

> O the cares of men! o what emptiness there is in the world!
> "Who will read these words?" Are you saying that to me?
> Nobody, certainly. "Nobody?" Two or nobody. "A wretched and pathetic thing." Why? That "Polydamas and the Trojan Women" should prefer Labeo to me? Not important.

Persius here measures himself against Attius Labeo, a Neronian poet who translated the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* word for word. Only a line of Labeo survives (given by the scholiast on this passage) but from it we can get an idea of what Persius is so annoyed about: *crudum manduces Priamum Priamique pisinnos*, "you will chew on Priam raw, and Priam's little children" translates *Iliad* 4.35 (see Courtney [1993] 350). The words *manduces* ("you will chew on") and *pisinnos* ("little children," perhaps a piece of baby-talk, *OLD s.v.*) undoubtedly struck Roman readers as exotically "low" and everyday, creating a piquant contrast with Homer's epic grandeur. Calling the Roman audience "Polydamas and the Trojan women" alludes to the Homeric account of Hector's decision to stay and fight Achilles because he would feel shame before his brother-in-law Polydamas and the women of

[35] On Persius' rejection of epic in the choliambic verses which serve as a prologue to the collection, see Cucchiarelli (2001) 191–2; Freudenburg (2001) 134–5. On epic in Persius 1 see further Sullivan (1985) 92–114 (on the possibility that Persius is mocking Nero's own treatments of epic themes in his poem on Troy and elsewhere), and Freudenburg (2001) 151–8.

Troy if he yielded the field (*Iliad* 20.100, 105). The moment of epic Persius here imports into satire is not the battle itself but Hector's decision to stay and fight to avoid the shame of flight. Moreover, women are not regularly pictured as the audience for poetry; the reference to the women of Troy is Persius' nasty jab at effeminate customs popular among Roman men who like the poetic thrills that someone like Labeo has on offer.[36] Persius' lesson here: do not waste time putting the *Iliad* literally into (deliciously "low") Latin; transform it to attack what is wrong with Rome. His own book, even if he has to keep it completely secret, is worth more than any *Iliad* (Persius 1.119–23).

Juvenal's fire

Where Horace and Persius use allusions to epic to express how small, intimate, and personal their satires are, Juvenal uses epic allusions to make a claim to something big.[37] As Bramble puts it, when Juvenal rejected epic themes in his first satire: "Roman vice became as monstrous and portentous as anything in the fictions of epic or tragedy."[38] In his first satire, as noted above, he imagines Lucilius as a sword-wielding, chariot-driving epic hero. Unlike Lucilius, who satirized the living, Juvenal chooses targets who are dead; this will be safer, he says. But the scale of his poems and the totality of his denunciation of Roman life make satire into something that Juvenal, too, wages on an epic scale. Hardie has suggested that even the fury of Juvenal's denunciation of contemporary epic in the first satire shares epic's tendency to locate its beginnings in an explosion of rage he describes as "the energy of Hell."[39] Juvenal likes to assert the decadence of the present by measuring its distance from the epic past. In the fifteenth satire, Juvenal tells a tale of real-life cannibalism in Egypt so outrageous that Ulysses would have been laughed out of Alcinous' court as a "lying teller of tales" (*ut mendax aretalogus*, Juvenal 15.16) if he had tried to tell the Phaeacians any such thing. The stone-throwing violence which begets the cannibalistic excess is described with an epic footnote (Juvenal 15.65–71):

[36] Bramble (1974) 69 also sees an allusion to Virgil, *Aen.* 9.617, a denunciation of effeminacy among the Trojans.

[37] Braund (1996b) 21–4; see also Bramble (1974) 164–73, and, on Juvenal's use of mock tragic elements, Smith (1989). Scott (1927) offers a comprehensive approach to Juvenal's use of the grand style, though her distinction between "humorous" and "sincere" imitation is problematic.

[38] Bramble (1974) 172.

[39] Hardie (1993) 65. On Juvenal's detailed engagement with epic models in the first satire, especially with Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*, see Henderson (1995).

> not the kind of stone Turnus and Ajax threw,
> nor the kind with which Diomedes smashed Aeneas' hip,
> but the kind today's right hands – different from theirs –
> are strong enough to throw. For while Homer was alive the human
> race was already in decline,
> now earth brings forth wicked and puny men . . .

Homer's Diomedes smashes Aeneas' hip with a stone "no two men could carry such as men are now" – in Homer's time (*Iliad* 5.303–4). Men have weakened still further by Virgil's time: Virgil restages Aeneas' peril at the hands of Diomedes when Turnus hurls a stone at him which *twelve* latter-day men could not carry (*Aeneid* 12.899–900).[40] Juvenal impudently authenticates his tale of decline – even for Homer, things are not what they once were.

Juvenal's third satire has an especially detailed epic texture.[41] Umbricius meets the poet by the Capena gate at Rome (where the Camenae, Rome's spirits of poetic inspiration, who breathed life into its earliest epics, used to live, Juvenal 3.16) and declares his plan of moving to Cumae, gateway to the Underworld. His journey reverses Aeneas' foundational journey from Troy to Rome via Cumae, where the hero entered the Underworld and was shown the truth of Rome's future. Juvenal had just alluded to the heroic Underworld – and how its denizens would be shocked by modern Romans – at the end of the second satire (Juvenal 2.154–9). Where Anchises shows Aeneas a pageant of all that is admirable in Rome's history to come, Umbricius (whose name carries associations of *umbra*, "ghost") catalogues Rome's rogues, from shifty immigrants and hypocritical flatterers to street thugs and criminal aristocrats. In the *Aeneid*, a newly created Roman identity was forged in the flames of Troy. Juvenal makes everything go backwards: Rome burns with flames that are, in their allusion to Virgil, distinctly Trojan (Juvenal 3.198–202):

> iam poscit aquam, iam frivola transfert
> Vcalegon, . . .
> ultimus ardebit quem tegula sola tuetur
> a pluuia
> Now Ucalegon demands water, now he hauls out his worthless
> possessions. . . .
> He will burn last whom only the roof tiles protect from the rain. . . .

Juvenal designs his *ultimus ardebit* (Juvenal 3. 201) to create a satiric sequel to Virgil's lines (*Aeneid* 2.310–12):

[40] See Courtney (1980) on 15.63–4 and 65 for further references.

[41] Motto and Clark (1965), Staley (2000).

iam Deiphobi dedit ampla ruinam
Volcano superante domus, iam proximus ardet
Vcalegon . . .
now the spacious house of Deiphobus produced ruin,
with Vulcan overwhelming it, now Ucalegon burns next . . .

In addition, these very lines of the *Aeneid* already have a connection to satire.[42] Virgil's *Volcano superante* is noticeably similar to Horace's *dilapso . . . Volcano* in his mock-epic account of the kitchen fire at Beneventum in *Sermones* 1.5 (quoted above).[43] Since Virgil is actually along for the ride in Horace's poem, there is every reason to think he nods to Horace in *Volcano superante*. In the flickering shadows around Ucalegon, Juvenal looks back with a fierce nostalgia to a time when epic was admirable and epic poets paid attention to satirists and they both enjoyed the support of powerful political friends.

The gods in epic – and in satire

Lucilius' trial of Lupus made a big impression on his poetic successors. Even epic poets paid attention. The ancient commentator Servius remarks that Virgil's whole account of a divine council in *Aeneid* 10.104ff. is "transferred" from Lucilius' council on the fate of Lupus. The politics of the Virgilian assembly are recognizably Augustan. Venus and Juno offer partisan complaints about the setbacks and difficulties of the Trojans and Italians whom they respectively favor; Jove announces that he is impartial, and that "the fates will find a way" (*Aeneid* 10.113). Virgil thus makes the entire history of Rome, from its earliest beginnings to Augustus' victories, look foreordained, and ensures that the king of the gods (or their emperor) is not

[42] So argued by Austin (1964) on *Aen.* 2.312.

[43] It may also be the case that in addition to using Horace as a source Virgil also has an Ennian source in common with Horace. When the fatal night falls at Troy (*vertitur interea caelum et ruit Oceano nox*, "meanwhile the heavens turn and night rushes from Ocean," *Aen.* 2.250), Virgil borrows from a line of Ennius' sixth book (*vertitur interea caelum cum ingentibus signis*, "meanwhile the heavens turn with their huge constellations," *Ann.* 205 Sk.). This Ennian line is plausibly attributed to a description of the night that Pyrrhus tried to take the Roman forces by surprise at Beneventum; in the darkness his troops lost the way. When the night ends they have lost the advantage of surprise, and their subsequent defeat by the Romans marked the end of Pyrrhus' campaigns in Italy (Plutarch, *Pyrrhus* 25). It would make sense for Virgil to allude to the end of this chaotic night (at the aptly named Beneventum, "it turned out well") at the beginning of the night of the fall of Troy. So perhaps Horace's chaotic kitchen fire at Beneventum is not just any old bit of mock epic but a latter-day version of chaotic night-time events there described by Ennius.

seen – at least here – to impose his will ruthlessly upon the world. In Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Jove convenes the gods to hear the crimes of the egregious Lycaon, whose name derives from the Greek *lukos*, wolf, and who is turned into a wolf for offering human flesh to Jove (Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.163–243). By Varro's time, Lucilius' books 1–21 were circulating as a unit (distinct from two other units, books 26–30, composed before 1–21, and books 22–5).[44] Therefore, the wolf-men Lupus and Lycaon each appear as the first narrative episode in the first book of a large poetic work which is a collection of separate episodes. Each embodies a decadent age and by his crimes brings the cosmos itself into danger. Each is punished for excessive, inappropriate episodes of consumption – Lupus for his own excesses, Lycaon for serving human flesh to Jove. Where Lupus is singled out for destruction to ensure that the rest of Rome survives, Lycaon's crime comes to stand for all human decadence and wickedness and is punished by Jove with the universal flood. Hellenistic models perhaps lay behind Ovid's version of the Lycaon story as prelude to universal destruction in the flood; if they did, Lucilius likely knew them too, and they would certainly sharpen the cosmic dimensions of his tale of the gods deliberating how to punish Lupus without destroying Rome. Lucilius' gods exist in a fundamentally Republican world: there are speaking roles for Apollo (Lucilius fr. 28–9W), Neptune (fr. 35W, saying that even if the philosopher Carneades came back from the dead he would not be able to sort out the present question), and presumably Jove. Ovid's gods are definitely living in an empire. Jove consults the other gods not in a heavenly senate house, but in a "marble chamber" (Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.177) on the "heavenly Palatine" (the heavenly equivalent to Augustus' home on the Palatine, Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.176), where he sits above them (*celsior*, *Metamorphoses* 1.178). Their horror at Lycaon's crimes is compared explicitly to the way the whole world felt upon the assassination of Julius Caesar (*Metamorphoses* 1.199–203). In Ovid's version of divine deliberations, only Jove speaks and the other gods merely murmur in response to authorize his universal destruction of the human race.[45]

The transformation of the divine process of deliberation is taken even further in Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* when the emperor Claudius arrives in heaven after his death and the gods meet as a senate to decide whether he should be deified. Jupiter sends Claudius away because non-senators are not permitted in the senate house (*curia*, Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis* 9.1) during

[44] Varro, *De lingua Latina* 5.17, and Gratwick (1982) 168.

[45] Feeney (1991) 199–200 describes Ovid's strategies for heightening the subordinate relation of the other gods to Jove, especially at *Metamorphoses* 1.244–5.

deliberations. Janus speaks against deification of any mortals. Diespiter speaks in favor of Claudius; in what is most likely a nod to Lucilius, he is the one who says that heaven needs someone who can "gobble steaming turnips with Romulus" and he adds that the deification should be appended to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis* 9.5). Finally Augustus himself, making his first ever speech in the divine senate (Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis* 10.1), denounces Claudius as a murderer and rails: "while you make such gods, no one will believe that you are gods" (*Apocolocyntosis* 11.4). Voting with their feet like Roman senators, the gods move to Augustus' side to express their support and Claudius is expelled from heaven (11.6). As Eden observes, the idea of projecting contemporary procedure in such full detail upon the divine assembly probably descends from the satires of Menippus, but in Seneca's hands it becomes a pointed commentary upon the actual senatorial proceedings in which Claudius was deified (Tacitus, *Annales* 13.2).[46] Politics and satire are inseparable when Nero's subsequent neglect and cancellation of the divine honors voted Claudius by the senate (Suetonius, *Claudius* 45) mirrors Seneca's satirical vision of him banished to the underworld.

Though it does not showcase the gods in council, Juvenal's fourth satire nevertheless stands firmly within the tradition of satiric divine councils established by Lucilius.[47] The poem begins with a denunciation of the decadent habits of the greedy Crispinus, especially his purchase of a fantastically expensive mullet. Juvenal brings the epic council scene down to earth as the emperor, not Jove, confers with advisors, not gods. Their subject is not the fishy Lupus, but an actual fish, a huge turbot. At the start of the turbot narrative, Juvenal invokes Calliope, the Muse of epic (Juvenal 4. 34–6):

> Begin, Calliope. It's ok to be seated; it's not a matter for
> singing, it deals with what really happened. Tell the tale,
> Pierian girls (may it do me good to have called you girls).

The fish's magnitude, its capture near Ancona, and its swift transport to Domitian's villa at Alba Longa, just south of Rome (where a temple of Vesta still preserved the flames of Troy, Juvenal 4. 61–2) are all described in expansive epic style, and Domitian's eleven courtiers are described in an epic catalogue.[48] The scholiast tells us that in the catalogue Juvenal is parodying an epic poem on Domitian's war in Germany, almost certainly Statius' *De bello Germanico* (*Scholia*, Juvenal 4.94; cf. Statius, *Silvae* 4.2.65–7, Coleman, *Statius Silvae IV*, p. xvii). In Juvenal's version of the epic council scene, the political dynamics are different again from Lucilius' and from Seneca's. Instead of the open debate of Lucilius' senatorial gods, or the authoritative imperial pronouncements of Ovid's Jove before those he pretends are his peers, or Seneca's fully detailed mock senate, in Juvenal "the senators, shut out, watch the meal be admitted" (*exclusi spectant admissa obsonia patres*, Juvenal 4.64), courtiers are solicited for their advice, and the emperor does not speak directly at all except to ask whether the fish should be cut up (Juvenal 4.130). The fish becomes a figure for the city itself when Montanus says that what it needs is a specially made dish "which can enclose its huge circumference with a delicately worked wall" (*quae tenui muro spatiosum colligat orbem*, Juvenal 4.132). Though the craftsman to make this giant dish is called Prometheus (Juvenal 4.133), the ghost of Romulus, ancient builder of the wall that marked Rome out as Rome, hovers here too.

The vision of consumption satirized here is different from Archestratus' aristocratic pleasure seekers and from Ennius' geography of conquest and pacification. Juvenal's big-bellied courtier Montanus has the same kind of expertise that Archestratus specialized in, for he can recognize the distinctive tastes of oysters from various places (Juvenal 4.140–3):

> For he [Montanus] had the know-how to detect right from the first bite
> whether oysters came from Circeii or the rocks of the Lucrine Lake,
> or from a bed in Richborough harbor,
> and he used to say what shore a sea-urchin came from after just a glance.

But, crucially, unlike Archestratus and Ennius, Montanus does not himself go to those far-flung places to buy the oysters, they are brought to him via the imperial infrastructure. Consumption of this satiric seafood is centralized, just as power is centralized in the imperial household.

Rome's destiny is served up as dinner in each satiric scene of divine deliberations. No longer Ennius' idealizing representative of Roman excellence, Lucilius' satiric Romulus is a Roman peasant, hungry for turnips. The Ennian council at which the grave matter of Romulus' fate was decided by the gods is reworked by Lucilius as a meeting of the gods-as-senators to decide the fishy fate of greedy Lupus. As the title *Apocolocyntosis* ("Gourdification," known from Dio 60.35.2ff.) implies, empty-headed Claudius misses his chance for turnips with Romulus and himself becomes the dry rattling gourd.[49] And Juvenal makes Rome itself the meal gobbled by the insatiable emperor when the treatment of the Roman world under the control of Domitian is equated

[46] Eden (1984) 98. [47] Braund (1996b) 271.
[48] See Braund (1996b) for full details, and Anderson (1982) 237–44.
[49] Eden (1984) 1–4.

to the treatment of the big fish: *cum iam semianimum laceraret Flavius orbem | ultimus*, ("When the last Flavian was tearing the half-dead world to pieces," Juvenal 4.37–8).

Epic poetry explains how the world order came to be; satire gives a particular slice of the here and now. In epic, Rome is the sum total of its history; in satire, the decadent and decayed residue of it. Sharing the basic metrical structure of epic, the dactylic hexameter, satire can swallow epic elements whole and reconfigure epic's cosmos-ordering world views as glimpses of Rome's everyday chaos. Satirists claim social authority for themselves – and their audiences – in their mastery of the epic tradition, treasure house of Rome's ancestral values, the *mos maiorum*. But because epic poetry explains how the world came to be the way that it is, allusions to epic also have the potential to comment on the political situation of the satirist who makes them. Lucilius and Juvenal use allusions to epic like a trumpet to make their anger big and public. Horace and Persius use epic allusions to shape the private space in which they speak: Horace uses the epic voice in ironic self-deprecation to show how unimportant he is, how separate he can be from Octavian's new world; Persius uses it like an urgent whisper, just loud enough to tell what he cannot say in Nero's Rome. From Romulus' turnips to Domitian's turbot, allusions to epic help satire tell its versions of Rome's history.

Further reading

Many scholars have discussed satiric poets' parodic allusions to traditional myths and their uses of elements of epic poetry or high and lofty style more generally. Gratwick (1982) and Coffey (1989) offer useful overviews of Lucilius' satiric techniques. Rudd (1966) remarks on the interplay of high and low styles in Horace: see 54–85 (on *Sermones* 1.5 and 1.9) and 224–42 (on 2.5); Anderson (1956) analyzes the use of epic parody in Horace, *Sermones* 1.9; Henderson (1999) 202–27 considers the public dimensions of the poet's picture of his private life in 1.9. Playful allusion to epic had been a hallmark of Alexandrian poetry; Zetzel (2002) demonstrates Horace's engagement with this Alexandrian tradition in the first book of his satires; on allusions to various aspects of the Callimachean poetic program see also Clauss (1985) and Scodel (1987). In Italian, Cucchiarelli (2001) offers an excellent detailed reading of *Sermones* 1.5; he focuses especially on the ways in which Horace defines his literary, social, and political identity through contrasts with Lucilius, some of which involve depicting Lucilius as a kind of epic figure (who rides a horse) as opposed to "pedestrian" Horace. The commentary of Barr and Lee (1987) on Persius is attentive to Persius' use of phrases drawn from (or which can be paralleled in) epic. Sullivan (1985) 74–114 detects allusion to Nero's poetic treatments of exotic epic and mythological themes in Persius' critique of contemporary poetry in satire 1. Anderson (1957) addresses epic parody in a comprehensive discussion of Juvenal 1–5. Bramble (1974) 164–73 emphasizes contrasts between the expansive "grand style" of Juvenal

and what he calls "the self-consciously unpretentious form of Lucilius, Horace and Persius." Henderson (1995) makes the case for parody of Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* in Juvenal 1; on Juvenal 3 see Motto and Clark (1965), Staley (2000). Braund (1996b) includes comprehensive discussion of Juvenal's use of mock epic elements in satires 1–5.

Gowers (1993a), Davidson (1997), Olson and Sens (2000), and Wilkins (2000) each offer detailed – and entertaining – studies of the cultural significance of literary representations of food.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521803595

First published 2005

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
The Cambridge companion to Roman satire / edited by Kirk Freudenburg.
p. cm. – (Cambridge companions to literature)
Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.
ISBN 0-521-80359-4 – ISBN 0-521-00627-9 (pbk.)
1. Satire, Latin – History and criticism. 2. Rome – In literature. I. Freudenburg, Kirk, 1961– II. Series.
PA6095.C36 2005
877'.010932376 – dc22 2004057024

ISBN 13 978 0 521 80359 5 hardback
ISBN 10 0 521 80359 4 hardback
ISBN 13 978 0 521 00627 9 paperback
ISBN 10 0 521 00627 9 paperback

THE CAMBRIDGE
COMPANION TO

ROMAN SATIRE

EDITED BY

KIRK FREUDENBURG
Professor and Chair, Department of the Classics, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS