

RHETORIC ON RHETORIC: CRITICISM OF ORATORY IN SENECA'S *TROADES*

TOBIAS DÄNZER

While statements criticizing contemporary rhetoric are considerably few in the prosaic work of the younger Seneca, there is clear evidence for harsh criticism in his tragedies. This paper draws attention to the word battle between Ulysses and Andromache in the *Troades* (vv. 522–814), where the protagonists appear to quarrel over the fate of little Astyanax, son of Andromache and Hector and potential avenger of Troy. The true matter of the rhetorically organised dispute, however, is rhetoric itself. Ulysses presents himself as a shrewd and ruthless advocate in a lawsuit, trying to reveal the boy's true whereabouts, in order to kill him. He accuses Andromache, who tries to save her child, of rhetorical tricks, grandiloquence and obstinacy. By embellishing his criticism with myth and poetry, Seneca has found a way to accuse contemporary rhetoric of political ineffectiveness, forensic uselessness, and moral turpitude.

The literature of the 1st century AD knew various interpretations concerned with the circumstances that caused the decline of contemporary rhetoric.¹ The elder Seneca, who was the first to advance arguments on the topic, saw the rhetoric of his age in decline for three main reasons. To him, the decline began soon after Cicero's time and was due either to the decadent lifestyle of his contemporaries, to the fading prospects of honour, or to the persistent and natural change of greatness and depravity.²

¹ Literature on the topic is abundant: HELDMANN (1982) dedicates a detailed study on the subject; good overviews are given by CAPLAN (1944), FANTHAM (1978), WILLIAMS (1978: 6–51), KENNEDY (1972: 446–464), FAIRWEATHER (1981: 132–148) and KENNEDY (1994: 159–200, esp. 186–192). The comprehensive bibliographic list at the end of *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* is a highly useful and up-to-date documentation of the status quo of research in the field of Roman rhetoric: DOMINIĆ-HALL (2007: 451–486).

² *Contr.* 1,6sq.: *quidquid Romanae facundiae habet, quod insolenti Graeciae aut opponat aut praeferat, circa Ciceronem effloruit; omnia ingenia, quae lucem studiis nostris attulerunt, tunc nata sunt. in deterius deinde cotidie data res est sive luxu temporum, nihil enim tam mortiferum ingenii quam luxuria est, sive, cum pretium pulcherrimae rei cecidisset, translatum est omne certamen ad turpia multa*

Certainly, the most prominent interpretation is the one Tacitus put forward in his *Dialogus de oratoribus*, where he saw the decline of rhetoric connected to the restraint of freedom. While the forensic and political speech developed freely and suffered no restrictions in the republic, it was deprived of its public powers and dispelled from the forum in the Principate and under the reign of the later Emperors. The orator, however great, had to become active in the centumviral court, dealing with minor issues, bereft of political impact and urged to withdraw from the political stage.³

While becoming more and more useless in the public sector, rhetoric began to flourish in schools and offices, where young orators were trained to become *Konzertredner*, whose main objective was not political activity or persuasion, but sensationalism and entertainment. The main contemporary criticism of the rhetoric schools, enthusiastically stated by the satirists, was directed against their practice of speech, the *declamationes*, which were criticized as extensively pompous and completely out of touch with reality.⁴

Particularly few, measured against the wealth of his prosaic work, are the younger Seneca's statements criticizing contemporary rhetoric. Manifestations are limited to a small number of shorter statements, for example in *Letter* 108 to Lucilius, where Seneca introduces the sort of student that attends lessons not for philosophical instruction, but for pleasure and entertainment. The perfect student would be the one that is attracted by "*rerum pulchritudo*", not by "*verborum inanium sonitus*".⁵

Seneca offers a more detailed description of the interdependence of rhetoric and morals in *Letter* 114, where he sees the decline of rhetoric rooted in the decay of manners. As prime example for the moral depravity of the later Roman Empire Seneca introduces Maecenas, whose faulty speech, according to Seneca, was closely linked to his effeminacy and

honore quaestuque vigentia, sive fato quodam, cuius maligna perpetuaque in rebus omnibus lex est, ut ad summum perducta rursus ad infimum velocius quidem quam ascenderant relabantur.

³ The recent edition of the *Dialogus* by FLACH is supported with a detailed bibliography: FLACH (2005: 107–113). See also KENNEDY (1994: 190sq).

⁴ A still very good overview on origin, development, critics and influence of the *declamationes* is provided by BONNER (1949). CAPLAN (1944) focuses on contemporary criticism and its use in theories of decline. For more recent literature on various aspects of declamatory theory and practice, see FAIRWEATHER (1984), SUSSMAN (1984), STROH (2003), and BLOOMER (2007: 306).

⁵ Sen. ep. 108,6.

Rhetoric on Rhetoric: Criticism of Oratory in Seneca's *Troades*

general immorality.⁶ Referring to a phrase of Solon, quoted in Diogenes Laertius, Seneca apodictically summarizes his position: *talis hominibus fuit oratio qualis vita*.⁷ While it becomes clear already from the beginning of the letter that Seneca strives to formulate a general theory of the reciprocal relationship between moral and rhetoric,⁸ we do not find a political interpretation of the declining rhetoric in the letter. Seneca's discourse on rhetoric amounts to nothing more than to examining questions of style and taste.⁹

In this paper I want to show that Seneca cuts through the remarkable prosaic silence on the topic by transferring criticism of contemporary rhetoric into his tragedies, foremost the *Troades*, embellishing it with myth and poetry, thereby accusing contemporary rhetoric of political ineffectiveness, forensic uselessness and moral turpitude. Tragedy offers an unsuspecting place for spreading critical statements under the disguise of mythical figures and actions.

It is well known, and easily intelligible from the tragedies, that Seneca was a brilliant orator being highly familiar with the *declamationes* of his time.¹⁰ We are informed about Seneca's public activity as Nero's ghost writer through an instructive passage in the *Annals*, where Tacitus gives a review of Nero's funeral eulogy for Claudius, written by Seneca. The remark on the oration's style being adapted to contemporary ears is particularly instructive as it shows that Seneca was easily capable of conforming to the prevailing taste of his age.¹¹

⁶ BYRNE (2006) provides an exhaustive overview on Seneca's depiction of Maecenas and its functions, and gives an equally exhaustive bibliographic list on the topic. For a recent reading of Maecenas, see STAR (2012: 173–183).

⁷ Sen. *ep.* 114,1. The Greek quotation, adopted from Diog. Laert. 1,58, runs as follows: Ἐλεγε [scil. Σόλων] δὲ τὸν μὲν λόγον εἰδῶλον εἶναι τῶν ἔργων.

⁸ Sen. *ep.* 114,1: *Quare quibusdam temporibus provenerit corrupti generis oratio quaeris et quomodo in quaedam vitia inclinatio ingeniorum facta sit, ut aliquando inflata explicatio vigeret, aliquando infracta et in morem cantici ducta.*

⁹ See, e.g., KENNEDY (1994: 176): “Much of what Seneca has to say relates to style”, with respective examples.

¹⁰ Though obvious and stated early (see, e.g., BONNER (1949: 160–167)), there is no independent study on the influence of *declamatio* on Seneca's prose or poetry; on the contrast between the declamatory style of the tragedies and the prosaic philosophical discourse, see WILSON (2007). The rhetorical elements in Seneca's tragedies, however, are well studied; see, e.g., the early study of CANTER (1925), and the more recent ones by TRAINA (1987) and BILLERBECK (1988); for literature on the topic BILLERBECK (1988: 101, note 1).

¹¹ Tac. *ann.* 13,3: ... *oratio a Seneca composita multum cultus praeferret, ut fuit illi viro ingenium amoenum et temporis eius auribus accommodatum.* See also the famous depiction of Seneca's style as role model for young men given by Quint.

Ulysses vs. Andromache (*Troades* 522-814)

The battle of words between Ulysses and Andromache in Seneca's *Troades* is too grotesque, both regarding content and dramaturgy, to be true. Ulysses, "weaving cunning tricks in his heart",¹² tells Andromache that he was sent as ambassador by the Greek commanders in order to pick up the son of Andromache and Hector, little Astyanax, and to kill him. The risk of leaving the potential avenger of Troy alive would simply be too great, and the Greeks would not set sail before his death. The scene adds in bizarreness through the fact that Ulysses is not satisfied with torture or blackmail, but tries to achieve his aim – getting the boy from a mother that has lost everything else – by means of artful rhetoric.

Ulysses introduces himself as skilful and learned orator right from the start, his first words being a veritable *captatio benevolentiae*:¹³

*Durae minister sortis hoc primum peto,
ut, ore quamvis verba dicantur meo,
non esse credas nostra: Graiorum omnium
procerumque vox est, petere quos seras domos
Hectorea suboles prohibet. Hanc fata expetunt.
Sollicita Danaos pacis incertae fides
Semper tenebit, semper a tergo timor
Respicere coget, arma nec poni sinet,
Dum Phrygibus animos natus eversis dabit,
Andromacha, vester.*

Ulysses presents himself as mouthpiece of powers lying beyond control, delivering a message that is not his own: the Greek military leaders sent him, while fate had prescribed the course of action. By mentioning the Greeks' fear for their lives Ulysses intends to evoke Andromache's pity. His tactics is as evident as absurd. Ulysses is depicted as genuine adept of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* who has learned in the classroom that emotion (πάθη) has to be evoked through character (ἦθος), and even more so, when the factual circumstances are unclear.¹⁴ As Ulysses can hardly hope to profit from the factual situation, he has to rely fully on the emotional devices of

inst. 10,1,125–131. WOODMAN (2010) provides an interesting account of the interdependence of voice, speech, and self in Seneca's orations in the *Annals*.

¹² *Tro.* 522sq.: *adest Ulixes, et quidem dubio gradu / vultuque: nectit pectore astus callidos*. These are Andromache's words as she catches sight of Ulysses, even before the dialogue has begun; the translation here is taken from FITCH (2002: 219).

¹³ *Tro.* 524–533.

¹⁴ See Aristotle's definition of the τρία εἶδη of πίστεις ἐντεχνοί in *Rhet.* 1,2,3–6.

Rhetoric on Rhetoric: Criticism of Oratory in Seneca's *Troades*

rhetoric.¹⁵ He seeks to win Andromache over by pretending to be a modest and highly sympathetic man who only fears for his comrades.

What does Ulysses expect from his address to Andromache? How likely is it that he will succeed in flatteringly demanding the very last from a mother that has nothing else to lose? Notwithstanding the limited prospects of success, Ulysses carries on with his rhetorical exercises, and renews his scholastic approach by seeking to arouse compassion with his fellow countrymen. They had become old during an exhausting and long lasting war, wished for nothing more than to return home, and feared nothing more than being haunted by Astyanax. He appeals to Andromache's sympathy, crying: *Libera Graios metu!* Not uttering a word of fear for his own life, Ulysses begs Andromache not to consider him, emissary of the gods, cruel. If he had had the choice, he certainly would not have sacrificed Astyanax, but Orestes.¹⁶

Yet Andromache easily measures up to the rhetorical skills of Ulysses, and is by no means inferior to her interlocutor in regard to oratorical virtuosity. She gives a mendacious speech overloaded with bombast and grandiloquence:¹⁷

*Utinam quidem esses, nate, materna in manu,
Nossemque quis te casus ereptum mihi
teneret, aut quae regio! non hostilibus
confossa telis pectus ac vinclis manus
sectantibus praestricta, non acri latus
utrumque flamma cincta maternam fidem
umquam exuissem. nate, quis te nunc locus,
fortuna quae possedit? errore avio
vagus arva lustras? vastus an patriae vapor
corripuit artus? Saevus an victor tuo
lusit cruore? Numquid immanis ferae
morsu peremptus pascis Idaeas aves?*

¹⁵ Arist. *Rhet.* 1,2,4: διὰ μὲν οὖν τοῦ ἡθους, ὅταν οὕτω λεχθῆ ὁ λόγος ὥστε ἀξιόπιστον ποιῆσαι τὸν λέγοντα· τοῖς γὰρ ἐπιεικέσι πιστεύομεν μᾶλλον καὶ θάττον, περὶ πάντων μὲν ἀπλῶς, ἐν οἷς δὲ τὸ ἀκριβὲς μὴ ἔστιν ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀμφιδοξεῖν, καὶ παντελῶς.

¹⁶ *Tro.* 553–555: ... *neve crudelem putes, / quod sorte iussus Hectoris natum petam: / petissem Oresten.*

¹⁷ *Tro.* 556–567. Whether it is true or not that Andromache “tries to act as though she had not heard Ulysses and were speaking her true thoughts in soliloquy” (FANTHAM 1982: 294), the very fact that Andromache gives a consistent, isolated, and pathetic speech here, relates her words to the contemporary declamatory style.

With Andromache's entry into the dialogue the subject of discussion changes from the original outset, that is Ulysses' wish to take hold of Astyanax, to a rhetorically polished discussion on rhetoric. Andromache gives a well-designed example of *simulatio*, a rhetorical device that means the misrepresentation of emotions.¹⁸ Yet Ulysses does not show himself too deeply impressed by the mother's lament, and detects her *simulatio*:¹⁹

*Simulata remove verba. Non facile est tibi
decipere Ulixem: vicimus matrum dolos
etiam dearum. cassa consilia amove.
Ubi natus est?*

Ulysses accuses Andromache of concealing the factual circumstances and tells her to give up the *cassa consilia*. The phrase *non facile est decipere Ulixem* should be translated as "it is not easy to fool a Ulysses". The speaker hints at his reputation as indisputable master of speech, whose oratorical powers have long become proverbial and who cannot be fooled by any rhetorical trick simply for the fact that he knows them all by heart. Ulysses continues his investigation, asking: *ubi natus est?*, whereupon Andromache answers in a highly forceful, staccato manner: *Ubi Hector? Ubi cuncti Phryges? / ubi Priamus? unum quaeris: ego quaero omnia* (*Tro.* 571sq). This time, Ulysses seems to be struck by the rhetorical ability of his counterpart, and resorts to nothing better than threatening her with punishment and torture. Yet Andromache sees her chance, and continues her hammering staccato, piercingly fraught with plosives such as t, p, d, c: *Tuta est, perire quae potest, debet, cupit* (574). The forcefulness of the phrase is supported by the tricolon increasing from the mere possibility of dying to the desire of doing so.

The verse is a *sententia*, γνῶμη in Greek. The use of *sententiae* was discussed in detail by Quintilian in the *Institutio*,²⁰ and ridiculed by the satirists in their criticism of declamations' bombast.²¹ Especially the

¹⁸ See LAUSBERG (2008: 399). Quint. *Inst.* 9,2,26 stresses the importance of *simulatio* for the evocation of affects: *Quae vero sunt augendis adfectibus accommodatae figurae constant maxime simulatione. Namque et irasci nos et gaudere et timere et admirari et dolere et indignari et optare quaeque sunt similia his fingimus*. As a matter of fact, Andromache's speech complies perfectly with Quintilian's list of examples and means by which *simulatio* is achieved.

¹⁹ *Tro.* 568–571.

²⁰ Quint. *inst.* 8,5,1–34. For a systematic overview of the different types of *sententiae*, see LAUSBERG (2008: 431–434).

²¹ BONNER (1949: 149–167) sees the *sententia* alias "the heightened, pointed, apt 'comment' that might equally well be transplanted to the pages of the elder

Rhetoric on Rhetoric: Criticism of Oratory in Seneca's *Troades*

rhetorically polished punch line seeking maximum effect on the listener was a fundamental part of their criticism. In Petronius' *Satyricon*, for example, Eumolpus laments that today's orators were exceedingly indulging in magniloquence and empty *pathos* and thought it easier to write a poem than to compose schools exercise speeches adorned with dazzling aphorisms:²²

Multos, inquit Eumolpus, o iuvenes, carmen decepit. Nam ut quisque versum pedibus instruxit sensumque teneriorem verborum ambitu intexuit, putavit se continuo in Heliconem venisse. Sic forensibus ministeriis exercitati frequenter ad carminis tranquillitatem tanquam 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.

It is by these vibrant sentences that Ulysses seems to be defeated on home ground by Andromache: He reiterates his menaces, and feels confident that she would desist of her cheap showmanship in the face of death. Blaming the mother of *magnificentia*, μεγαλοπρέπεια in Greek terms,²³ Ulysses aims to criticize the shallow *pathos* of the mother's speech. Andromache, at her best once more, answers with a strikingly impressive antithesis: *Si vis, Ulixee, cogere Andromacham metu, / vitam minare: nam mori votum est mihi* (576sq). Having rested from his interim feebleness Ulysses recovers his appetite for belligerent rhetoric, giving an illustrative portrayal of the interdependence between torture and truth. Yet Andromache is equally persistent in portraying her abilities to endure tortures of all kinds, and the word battle soon assumes the character of a fierce squabble among *declamatores*, who seek to outdo their rival in uttering phrases fraught with gaudiness and, at times, platitude.²⁴

After a while of quarrelling Ulysses notices that he cannot make any progress on the path he has chosen, and changes tactics. He accuses Andromache of insisting too obstinately or stubbornly (*contumax*) on her motherly affection (v. 589) – a particularly grotesque reproach that cannot be understood but on the meta-level of the dialogue. *Contumacia* is a term

Seneca" (ibid. 151) as the main hallmark of declamatory influence on the literature of the early Empire.

²² Petron. 118.

²³ On *magnificentia* as virtue of speech, see Quint. *Inst.* 4,2,61–64. The use of *magnificentia* in the law court, however, is harshly criticized.

²⁴ See v. 581: *necessitas plus posse quam pietas solet*; [v. 587] *stulta est fides celare quod prodas statim*; v. 588: *animosa nullos mater admittit metus*.

by which a judge or prosecutor describes the wilfully obstinate behaviour of the accused in the law court.²⁵ The accusation implies an obvious change of strategy. Ulysses takes on the persona of a judge or prosecutor who tries to discern the circumstances of a deed, and forces Andromache into the role of a culprit who conceals the truth. On Andromache's further attempts to declare her son dead, Ulysses, in his newly assumed role as chief prosecutor, demands a piece of evidence that would prove Andromache's statement. Andromache swears an oath, which at first seems to make deep impression on her interlocutor. Ulysses, however, who knows there is nothing left to lose for Andromache except her son, cannot be deceived anymore and sticks to his strategy. In an address to himself, he enters into an intertextual play with the literary figure of Ulysses, shaped through literature and tradition:²⁶

*nunc advoca astus, anime, nunc fraudes, dolos,
nunc totum Ulixem; veritas numquam perit.
scrutare matrem.*

“Calling forth, using the whole Ulysses”, that means calling forth his proverbial oratorical powers, stratagems, and cunning in order to excel the skilled orator Andromache, and to take her son away.

Proving again obedience to the laws of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, especially to the character studies in book 2, Ulysses connects the emotions he perceives in Andromache's words and actions with the type of mother.²⁷ Ulysses examines his counterpart with psychological scrutiny, thereby observing signs that reveal a mother fearing for her child. He perceives Andromache's mourning, the frightful going to and fro, and the careful listening for every single sound or word.²⁸ The skilled orator associates the symptoms of fear with the behavioural patterns of mothers, and concludes: *timor detexit matrem*, fear has revealed Andromache's motherhood.

Ulysses notices that Andromache shivers and is near to fainting, which confirms him in his course of action: *Intremuit: hac, hac parte quaerenda est mihi* (625). The prosecutor has found the weak point in the culprit's

²⁵ References are numerous, e.g.: CIL 10,7852,12; Iav. *dig.* 4,8,39; Plin. *ep.* 10,57 (65),2; Ulp. *dig.* 11,1,11,4; 12,13,1; 48,19,5; for more evidence, see ThLL 4 (1906–1909: 796sq., on *contumacia*, and 797sq., on *contumax*).

²⁶ *Tro.* 613sqq. For the reshaping of Ulysses in the literature of the Roman Empire see SCHMITZER (2005). For the portrayal of Ulysses in the *Troades*, see FANTHAM (1982: 290sq) and FÖLLINGER (2005).

²⁷ See Aristotle's detailed definition of φόβος: *Rhet.* 2,4,32–5,15.

²⁸ *Tro.* 615–618: ... *maeret, illacrimat, gemit; / sed huc et illuc anxios gressus refert / missasque voces aure sollicita excipit: / magis haec timet, quam maeret.*

plea. *Quaerere* is the technical term for the undertaking of a judicial inquiry, and means putting someone to the acid test.²⁹ Ulysses, the Greek star attorney, finally summons his outstanding abilities, getting ready for the final act: *ingenio est opus* (618).

The rest of the scene is mainly devoted to Ulysses' psychological torture methods. He instructs his henchmen to search the place and pretends to have found Astyanax, thereby increasing the pressure on Andromache. Ulysses finally seems to have found the right place – Hector's tomb – according to the principle of hit the pot, and threatens to raze it to the ground. Andromache sees her last resort in appealing to Ulysses' mercy, and hands over Astyanax.

The dramatic situation creates suspense à la Hitchcock by the edge in knowledge on part of the spectator or reader who knows from the outset that Astyanax is hidden in Hector's tomb. Suspense constantly increases as Ulysses' knowledge of the situation becomes more and more profound. The increase in knowledge is attained through the forensic investigations by which Ulysses tries to outwit Andromache, who is equally trained in rhetoric. He tries to achieve his goal by using accusations that do not contribute to the dramatic action or subject matter, but constitute a scholarly debate on rhetoric itself.

Ulysses' blaming is, from his point of view, just. Andromache conceals the whereabouts of her son, claiming that he would be far away or even dead. Ulysses could answer: "You are a liar!" But he does not blame her for distortion of facts, but for distortion of words. He says: "You resort to rhetorical dodges" (*simulatio*), "your speech is pompous and grandiloquent" (*magnificentia*), "you are not cooperative" (*contumacia*). To find out the truth, that is to break Andromache's resistance, Ulysses calls for appropriate help that consists of rhetorical talent (*ingenium*), cunning (*astus*), and treachery (*dolus*).

The objectives Seneca pursues with this scholarly and rhetorically organised debate on rhetoric are only intelligible against the background of the absurd dramatic situation, lacking any acceptable *raison d'être*, in which the dialogue is placed. Ulysses' ludicrous project of *talking* a mother into parting with her beloved son and lone survivor of her family, the absurdity of accusing a mother that seeks to protect her child by all means, of sophism and erratic behaviour, yet also the rhetorical versatility of a mother in need and anguish are, in my opinion, expressions of a multifaceted criticism of contemporary rhetoric. The dialogue between

²⁹ See, e.g. OLD (2007: 1533): "to hold a judicial inquiry into, investigate by process of law", "to examine (a person) by questioning, interrogate", with a list of references.

Ulysses and Andromache appears to be highly indebted to the exercise speeches, the *declamationes*, of the coeval rhetoric schools, and introduces a gravely distorted rhetoric, ruthlessly striving for the outmost. Ulysses finally achieves his goal by improper measures, physical and mental torture, which rounds out the picture. This may be the most obvious critical reference to the politics of his time. Episodes like *De ira* 2,33,3–5 may give an impression of the superiority of deed over word that prevailed in the later Roman Empire.³⁰

Rhetoric, as it is depicted by Seneca in the *Troades*, is boastful, morally corrupt, and politically ineffective.

Veritas and ἀλήθεια

Finally, we need to consider an important question whose examination will contribute highly to the understanding of the dialogue. The question is concerned with the definition of truth that underlies Ulysses' claim for *veritas*. Ulysses justifies his intimidating rhetoric against Andromache by introducing the judicial creed, or battle cry, *veritas numquam perit*. Yet, what kind of *truth* is it Ulysses strives for?

In Euripides' *Phoenissae* we encounter a very similar quarrel to the one in the *Troades*. The two feuding brothers Eteocles and Polynices are fighting a fierce battle for the crown of Thebes, presently doing so with words. While Polynices, due to a preceding agreement, is entitled to the crown, Eteocles holds it, not bothering to hand it over. The subject-matter of the dispute fought out by the two princes is to a much lesser extent the crown itself, but the proper and improper use of rhetoric. The brothers present their points of view by mutually making refined and rhetorically accomplished pleas: Polynices acts as advocate of the "old" rhetoric that saw truth and speech, heart and tongue in perfect harmony, while Eteocles maintains the position of the sophists, thereby resorting especially to the theory of *dissoi logoi*.

Polynices blames his brother for using sparkling phrases instead of relying on the simple word of truth:³¹

³⁰ The episode of Caligula's insane behaviour against the Roman *eques* C. Pastor is certainly not devoid of polemic, yet draws light on the course of action the emperors resorted to.

³¹ Eur. *Phoen.* 469–472. Polynices' speech, as a matter of fact, is by no means devoid of ποικιλία and μεγαλοπρέπεια, and shows the influence of contemporary sophism. On the speech and its influences, see MASTRONARDE (1994: 280). On structure and function of the ἀγών presided by Iocaste, see MUELLER-GOLDINGEN (1985: 92–115).

Rhetoric on Rhetoric: Criticism of Oratory in Seneca's *Troades*

ἀπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος τῆς ἀληθείας ἔφυ,
κοῦ ποικίλων δεῖ τάνδιχ' ἐρμηνευμάτων
ἔχει γὰρ αὐτὰ καιρόν· ὁ δ' ἄδικος λόγος
νοσῶν ἐν αὐτῶι φαρμάκων δεῖται σοφῶν.

Polynices' reproach of ποικιλία is consistent with Ulysses' accusation of *magnificentia* in the *Troades*. Both Polynices and Ulysses want to push their interlocutors to speak out the “simple” truth, and to refrain from telling witty lies. Yet, who is the Euripidean speaker? Polynices formulates a concept of truth that is based on sincerity both in word and deed, and is sharply separated from lie and fraud. He maintains a “pre-sophistic” position that is committed to a concept of philosophical and ethical truth that has not yet been affected by any sort of *discidium* between heart and tongue.

After Eteocles' rhetorically polished and pathetic commitment to an uncompromising and unrestrained master morality, the chorus, representing the people of Thebes, takes the side of Polynices:³²

οὐκ εὖ λέγειν χρῆ μὴ 'πι τοῖς ἔργοις καλοῖς·
οὐ γὰρ καλὸν τοῦτ' ἀλλὰ τῆι δίκῃ πικρόν.

The choral comment addresses the interdependence of truth and justice: The word of truth needs no embroidery, but serves justice through itself. From Ulysses' point of view in the *Troades*, Andromache disguises δίκη with unnecessarily wordy and grandiloquent speech. The main difference, however, is that Ulysses' seeking of truth has nothing in common with moral beauty, καλόν, but is Machiavellian in style, progress, and result. Ulysses acts as prosecutor in search of a judicial truth that disregards, and even violates, all senses of humanity.

In *Letter* 40, Seneca discusses the proper style of philosophical discourse. Without going in greater detail here, we cite a passage from the letter, where Seneca touches on the link between philosophical truth and speech:³³

Adice nunc quod quae veritati operam dat oratio incompressa esse debet et simplex: haec popularis nihil habet veri. Movere vult turbam et inconsultas aures impetu rapere, tractandam se non praebet, aufertur: quomodo autem regere potest quae regi non potest? ... Multum praeterea habet inanitatis et vani, plus sonat quam valet.

³² Eur. *Phoen.* 526sq.

³³ Sen. *ep.* 40,4sq.

Veritas here, as philosophical instruction, is conveyed through plain and simple speech. Radiant language is for the masses that are desirous of *impetus* and *sonitus*. Seneca's account of truth here is similar to Polynices' claim for sincerity, and significantly counteracts his protagonist's concept in the *Troades*. The truth Ulysses is seeking is fundamentally different from the ἀλήθεια Polynices advocates. Ulysses finds his match in Eteocles who is the reckless protectionist of a rhetoric that tries to achieve any goal, with no method, however cruel, fraudulent or inhumane, out of reach. In the *Troades*, the concept of truth is perverted through the one who articulates it. Ulysses, the scholarly trained, boastful and deceiving messenger of the Gods, accuses a mother that protects her only son from being killed, of fraud and lie. The rhetorical and philosophical truth, the unity of word, thought and deed that is outlined by the Euripidean Polynices, is reinterpreted as abominable battle cry of lynch law, where truth, as the equivalent to murder, has completely lost touch with reason and humanity.

References

- BILLERBECK 1988 = M. BILLERBECK: *Senecas Tragödien. Sprachliche und stilistische Untersuchungen*, Leiden et al. 1988.
- BLOOMER 2007 = W. M. BLOOMER: *Roman Declamation: The Elder Seneca and Quintilian*. In: W. Dominik – J. Hall (eds.): *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*. Malden, MA 2007, 297–306.
- BONNER 1949 = S. F. BONNER: *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire*. Liverpool 1949.
- BYRNE 2006 = S. N. BYRNE: *Petronius and Maecenas: Seneca's Calculated Criticism*. In: S. N. Byrne – E. P. Cueva – J. Alvares – (eds.): *Authors, Authority, and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel: Essays in Honor of Gareth L. Schmeling*. Groningen 2006, 83–111.
- CANTER 1925 = H. V. CANTER: *Rhetorical elements in the tragedies of Seneca*. Urbana 1925.
- CAPLAN 1944 = H. CAPLAN: *The Decay of Eloquence at Rome in the First Century*. In: H.A. Wichelns et al. (eds.): *Studies in Speech and Drama: In Honor of Alexander M. Drummond*. Ithaca 1944, 295–325.
- DOMINIK–HALL 2007 = W. DOMINIK – J. HALL (eds.): *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*. Malden, MA 2007.
- FAIRWEATHER 1981 = J. FAIRWEATHER: *Seneca the Elder*. Cambridge 1981.
- . 1984 = J. FAIRWEATHER: *The elder Seneca and declamation*. ANRW 2,32,1 (1984) 514–556.

Rhetoric on Rhetoric: Criticism of Oratory in Seneca's *Troades*

- FANTHAM 1978 = E. FANTHAM: *Imitation and Decline: Rhetorical Theory and Practice in the First Century after Christ*. CPh 73 (1978) 102–116.
- . 1982 = E. FANTHAM: *Seneca's Troades. A Literary Introduction with Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Princeton 1982.
- FITCH 2002 = J. G. FITCH: *Seneca: Hercules, Trojan Women, Phoenician Women, Medea, Phaedra*. Cambridge – London 2002.
- FLACH 2005 = D. FLACH (ed.): *Cornelius Tacitus: Dialogus de oratoribus. Streitgespräch über die Redner*. Stuttgart 2005.
- FÖLLINGER 2005 = S. FÖLLINGER: *Die Gestalt des Odysseus in Senecas Troades*. In: T. Baier – G. Manuwald – B. Zimmermann (Hrsgg.): *Seneca: philosophus et magister*. Freiburg/Br. – Berlin, 105–115.
- HELDMANN 1982 = K. HELDMANN: *Antike Theorien über Entwicklung und Verfall der Redekunst*. München 1982.
- KENNEDY 1972 = G. A. KENNEDY: *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*. Princeton 1972.
- . 1994 = G. A. KENNEDY: *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton 1994.
- LAUSBERG 2008 = H. LAUSBERG: *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*. Stuttgart 2008⁴ (München 1960).
- MASTRONARDE 1994 = D. J. MASTRONARDE: *Euripides, Phoenissae*. Cambridge 1994.
- MUELLER-GOLDINGEN 1985 = C. MUELLER-GOLDINGEN: *Untersuchungen zu den Phönissen des Euripides*. Stuttgart 1985.
- SCHMITZER 2005 = U. SCHMITZER: *Odysseus – ein griechischer Held im kaiserzeitlichen Rom*. In: A. Luther (Hrsg.): *Odysee-Rezeptionen*, Frankfurt/M. 2005, 33–53.
- STAR 2012 = C. STAR: *The Empire of the Self. Self-Command and Political Speech in Seneca and Petronius*. Baltimore 2012
- STROH 2003 = W. STROH: *Declamatio*. B.-J. Schröder – J. P. Schröder: *Studium declamatorium. Untersuchungen zu Schulübungen und Prunkreden von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit*, München – Leipzig 2003, 5–34.
- SUSSMAN 1984 = L. A. SUSSMAN 1984: *The Elder Seneca and Declamation since 1900. A Bibliography*. ANRW 2,32,1 (1984) 557–577.
- TRAINA 1987 = A. TRAINA: *Lo stile "drammatico" del filosofo Seneca*. Bologna 1978.
- WILLIAMS 1978 = G. WILLIAMS: *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire*. Berkeley 1978.
- WILSON 2007 = M. WILSON: *Rhetoric and the Younger Seneca*. In: W. Dominik – J. Hall (eds.): *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*. Malden, MA 2007, 425–438.

Tobias Dänzer

WOODMAN 2010 = A. J. WOODMAN: *Aliena facundia: Seneca in Tacitus*.
In: D.H. Berry – A. Erskine (eds.): *Form and Function in Roman
Oratory*. Cambridge 2010, 294–308.

ON THE SOURCES OF JUVENAL'S *SATIRE* 3

GERGŐ GELLÉRFI

Juvenal's *Satire* 3 is a peculiar poem in many aspects. The 322-line satire is much longer than was usual before Juvenal, and almost the entire poem consists of a speech of Umbricius, the longest continuous speech by an interlocutor in all extant Roman satires. I have analysed *Satire* 3 as part of my research, focusing on the mixture of genres that can be observed in Juvenal's satires. From this viewpoint, *Satire* 3 is the most interesting satire by Juvenal before one considers the crucial role epic and bucolic literature play interpreting the poem. Examining the interlocutor's character and his literary sources, we can conclude that he is the most complex figure in Juvenal. Although the assumption of Umbricius' historical background and possible connection with real persons had been criticized, we must consider the possibility that on the one hand, the figure of Umbricius can be traced back to a historical character, and on the other hand, the dramatic setting of the satire (a friend leaves Rome) can be based on a real event.

After a short introduction by the narrator, Juvenal's *Satire* 3 contains the 300-line speech of the *interlocutor*, Umbricius, explaining why he decided to move from Rome to Cumae. Umbricius is the most complex figure of the Juvenalian Satires in several aspects: his character is ambiguous, and he seems to be composed using multiple sources. In this paper, I hypothesize about Umbricius, using the results of the earlier analyses on this mysterious figure.¹

We should start our investigation from the article of Motto and Clark, who summarize the character as follows: "Umbricius is no historical figure contemporary to Juvenal, a neighbour or a friend, but the "immaterial presence" itself – that shade or *umbra* representative of the deceased Eternal City."² Their interpretation is problematic, since they treat

¹ The most important analyses of Umbricius: MOTTO–CLARK (1965: 267–276); ANDERSON (1970: 13–33); LAFLEUR (1976: 383–431); JENSEN (1986: 185–197); BRAUND (1990: 502–506); SARKISSIAN (1991: 247–258); STALEY (2000: 85–98). In this study, my purpose is not to re-examine all of the interpretations of Umbricius, as they often contradict each other, and I concentrate only on the relevant aspects of the character.

² MOTTO–CLARK (1965: 275).

Umbricius as a homogeneous character “in the sum of his virtues, most Roman: he *is* in essence Rome itself”,³ however, as I will show, his figure is not so consistent.⁴ From a certain viewpoint, we can see a man leaving his home because of its decay. He emphasizes traditional Roman values and looks back to the glorious past of the city.⁵ Umbricius longs for the possibility of earning an honest living with a decent job,⁶ and does not want to take part in criminal activity.⁷ He speaks for the poor,⁸ and recalls the good old times with bittersweet nostalgia, particularly when speaking about public safety at the end of his speech.⁹ However, he is also jealous of the success of others, and his thoughts lead him toward envy and xenophobia.¹⁰ His departure is motivated by his own inability to succeed as much as by Rome’s corruption. Talking about the traditional values and virtues, he is also corrupted by the city. This ambiguity determines Umbricius: his Romanness goes hand in hand with the negative characteristics of contemporary Rome.¹¹ Thus, one part of the

³ MOTTO–CLARK (1965: 269).

⁴ ANDERSON (1982: 223) sees Umbricius similarly, as a *vir bonus atque Romanus*, and states that Juvenal “created a completely sympathetic, because completely Roman, Umbricius, and he has made a completely unsympathetic, because totally un-Roman, city.” cf. BRAUND (1988: 202, note 32): “I dissent from the view taken by Anderson (1982) 223 that Umbricius is a ‘completely sympathetic’ figure; see Winkler (1983) 220–3 on the darker side of Umbricius.”

⁵ In his speech, expressions like *moribus* (140), *virtutibus* (164) and *vires* (180) frequently occur.

⁶ The monologue starts with the description of this problem: *quando artibus [...] honestis nullus in urbe locus*, Juv. 3,21–22.

⁷ Umbricius declares that later while talking about the lack of possibility of an honest living again: *me nemo ministro / fur erit*, Juv. 3,46–47.

⁸ Among others: *quod / pauperis hic meritum*, Juv. 3,126–127; *nil habet infelix paupertas durius in se*, Juv. 3,152; *quis pauper scribitur heres?* Juv. 3,161; *libertas pauperis haec est*, Juv. 3,299.

⁹ Juv. 3,312–314: *felices proavorum atavos, felicia dicas / saecula quae quondam sub regibus atque tribunis / viderunt uno contentam carcere Romam*.

¹⁰ Following the interpretation of WINKLER (1983: 220–223), BRAUND (1996: 233–234) exhibits the “dark side” of Umbricius. STALEY (2000: 87) also emphasizes this aspect of the character. HARDIE (1998: 248–249) points out that Umbricius is unaware of certain historical processes, which can be traced back to his xenophobia.

¹¹ The conclusion of the analysis of WEHRLE (1992: 70) is worth quoting here: “His self-defacing monologue provides as much satirical substance as do the various faults of Rome specified therein; these manifold and much exaggerated urban ills (which indeed are almost universal) are presented to the reader by a persona which is simultaneously satirized.”

On the Sources of Juvenal's *Satire* 3

interpretation of Motto and Clark is true, though not in the sense suggested by the authors—namely, that Umbricius represents Rome, indeed, including all of its aspects. His figure carries the essence of the Roman past and that of the decadent Rome as well.

The character's interpretation is not the only disputed aspect of Umbricius, as there are different views on the "literary building-blocks" of him, as well. Certain scholars state that we should not seek any historical or contemporary person in his sources.¹² Nevertheless, we should examine this possibility, since the following arguments suggest that we must account for historical and contemporary sources.

"Who is Umbricius?" is the first question. Scholars who deny the historical background state that he has nothing to do with any real person, and Juvenal names his *interlocutor* Umbricius only because this name was appropriate for his poetic purposes. On the meaning of the name however, different interpretations were proposed.¹³ Moreover, it seems certain to me that the name is not Juvenal's own creation, but the name of a real historical person. Nisbet brought up the idea again that the *interlocutor* is the same person as Umbricius Melior, the *haruspex* about whom Tacitus wrote in the *Histories*, and whom Pliny the Elder and Plutarch also mentioned.¹⁴ Braund examined this proposition in detail, focusing on a few lines of the speech of Umbricius.¹⁵

¹² MOTTO-CLARK (1965: 275) and STALEY (2000: 88) among others.

¹³ STALEY (2000: 87) connects the name with the expression *in urbe locus* in line 22 and states that Umbricius suggests with these words that his name means Mr. "Place in the City". WINKLER (1983: 222–223) suggests that the name alludes to the ending of *Satire* 2 where, among the shades of great Roman heroes, Juvenal mentions Fabricius. MOTTO and CLARK (1965: 275) deduce that the name might originate from *umbra* according to their interpretation that Umbricius is the "shade or *umbra* representative of the deceased Eternal City." LAFLEUR (1976: 390–391) rejects this interpretation and states that Umbricius got this name because of the "pastoral associations of *umbra*", as Umbricius leaves Rome for living "in the shade", while FERGUSON (1987: 235) writes that "Umbricius is a shadowy name for a shadowy person, and the fact that *umbra* means a shady retreat is hardly accidental."

¹⁴ For the appearances of the name Umbricius in the Roman literature, see NICE (2003: 401–402).

¹⁵ NISBET (1988: 92) briefly mentions this possibility, having been rejected by MAYOR and FERGUSON (1979: 136) earlier without any reason, as BRAUND (1990: 505) states in her article on the identity of Umbricius. According to HIGHET (1954: 253), this identification is impossible because of lines 42–45; however, we have to agree with BRAUND, who identifies Umbricius with the *haruspex* on the grounds of these very lines.

Following her interpretation, we can describe the character of the *haruspex*-Umbricius based on these lines:¹⁶ he is not a liar (like other diviners), which he proves with a general example; he does not know the movement of the stars (since he is a *haruspex* deprived of his privileged position by astrologers);¹⁷ he does not foretell the death of relatives (that is also illegal),¹⁸ and he does not sink to utilizing inappropriate animals—frogs, for instance—for divination. According to this interpretation, Umbricius is an old *haruspex* who no longer needed, one who cannot and does not want to adapt to the changing conditions of his age, choosing instead to leave Rome. Furthermore, in the *Histories*, Umbricius Melior foretells dark events, an act which perfectly corresponds to the mood of the monologue of *Satire* 3.¹⁹ Moreover, this interpretation dissolves the contradiction between Umbricius’ hatred of the Greeks and the fact that his destination, Cumae, is the oldest Greek colony.²⁰ He moves there because it is the seat of the greatest diviner, the Sibyl.

In my opinion, the arguments presented suggest that a 1st century *haruspex* might be in the background of the character of Umbricius. However, we should not rule out the possibility that the choice of the *interlocutor* was influenced by the name “Umbricius”,²¹ and in this manner, this name can carry a message as it was proposed earlier. If we want to define the role of the imperial *haruspex*, we can say that his name and identity are barely more than a mask given to his *interlocutor* by Juvenal. Thus, his audience could connect the narrator’s “old friend” with the familiar name of a known person who was successful and recognized

¹⁶ Juv. 3,41–45: *quid Romae faciam? mentiri nescio; librum, / si malus est, nequeo laudare et poscere; motus / astrorum ignoro; funus promittere patris / nec volo nec possum; ranarum viscera numquam / inspexi;*

¹⁷ Cf. NICE (2003: 405–406).

¹⁸ MACMULLEN (1967: 129–130).

¹⁹ Tac. *hist.* 1,27,1: *Octavo decimo kalendas Februarias sacrificanti proaede Apollinis Galbae haruspex Umbricius tristia exta et in stantis insidias ac domesticum hostem praedicit...* Umbricius is mentioned by Pliny the Elder as well: Plin. *Nat.* 10,19: *Umbricius, haruspicum in nostro aevo peritissimus, parere tradit ova XIII, uno ex his reliqua ova nidumque lustrare, mox abicere. triduo autem ante advolare eos, ubi cadavera futura sunt.*

²⁰ Juv. 3,60–61: *non possum ferre, Quirites, / Graecam urbem.* Cumae is a suitable destination for Umbricius from another point of view as well, see STALEY (2000: 88–90).

²¹ BALDWIN (1972: 101) also brings up this idea; however, he follows HIGHET’s views concerning the *haruspex*, and counts with the possibility that Juvenal actually had a friend called Umbricius.

On the Sources of Juvenal's *Satire* 3

in his own time.²² The effect of Umbricius' speech is made even stronger by the contrast between the esteemed imperial *haruspex* and the "covetous failure driven away by his lack of success"²³ that contributes to the negative portrayal of Rome.

While we cannot deny that Umbricius' departure from Rome had some historical background, Nice's suggestion that Umbricius was a *vetus amicus* of Juvenal seems improbable.²⁴ However, it should not be ruled out that the dramatic setting of *Satire* 3 was inspired by an actual event. Claiming that Umbricius is somehow connected with Martial, whose significant influence was subsequently proven in other Juvenalian Satires,²⁵ is a recurring idea in present scholarship. When examining the speech of Umbricius, we find so many textual and thematic parallels with Martial's *Epigrams* that we can rightly name him the most important inspiration for *Satire* 3.²⁶ At first, a few proper names occur in Umbricius' speech which also appear in the *Epigrams* in the same context, such as the examples of poor Cordus²⁷ or Chione the prostitute.²⁸ Of course, we cannot say that they are the same people, nor that Juvenal's Cordus and Chione are real figures. More likely, they are probably merely names with obvious meanings: Cordus is poor and Chione is a prostitute – just like in Martial's *Epigrams*.

The proper names, together with textual parallels, advise the reader on the relation between the texts. These parallels are sufficiently presented by

²² cf. NICE (2003: 404). Pliny names Umbricius *haruspicum in nostro aevo peritissimus*, Plin. Nat. 10,19.

²³ Quotation from BRAUND (1996: 235).

²⁴ NICE (2003: 402–403).

²⁵ For example MORFORD (1977: 219–245). On the relationship between the two authors, WILSON (1898: 193) is even more categorical in stating that "in all the field of Roman literature there are perhaps no two writers who are more closely related or throw more light each on the other than Juvenal and Martial."

²⁶ The parallels presented in the next section of my argument are detected by WILSON (1898: 198–209), HIGHT (1951: 370–387), COLTON (1966: 403–419), COURTNEY (1980: *ad loc.*), and BRAUND (1996: *ad loc.*), but in most cases they do not explain them in detail.

²⁷ Juv. 3,203–205: *lectus erat Cordo Procula minor, urceoli sex / ornamentum abaci, nec non et parvulus infra / cantharus et recubans sub eodem marmore Chiron*; Mart. 3,15: *Plus credit nemo tota quam Cordus in urbe. / 'Cum sit tam pauper, quomodo?' Caecus amat.*

²⁸ Juv. 3,135–136: *cum tibi vestiti facies scorti placet, haeres / et dubitas alta Chionen deducere sella*; Mart. 3,30,1–4: *Sportula nulla datur; gratis conviva recumbis: / Dic mihi, quid Romae, Gargiliane, facis? / Unde tibi togula est et fuscae pensio cellae? / Unde datur quadrans? unde vir es Chiones?* Both names occur more than once in Martial's *Epigrams*.

the commentaries and articles on the two authors,²⁹ but stronger connections can be detected concerning a number of passages, since Umbricius talks continuously about social phenomena and problems which have a central role in one or more epigrams of Martial.

In the first section of his speech, Umbricius complains that in Rome, it is impossible to earn an honest living by a decent job. Furthermore, he mentions low-born former horn-players who, once relegated to accompanying gladiatorial shows, have made such a large fortune from these degrading jobs that now they are rich enough to organise the games themselves:

*quis facile est aedem conducere, flumina, portus,
siccandam eluviem, portandum ad busta cadaver,
et praeberere caput domina venale sub hasta.
quondam hi cornicines et municipalis harenae
perpetui comites notaeque per oppida buccae
munera nunc edunt et, verso pollice vulgus
cum iubet, occidunt populariter; inde reversi
conducunt foricas, et cur non omnia? cum sint
quales ex humili magna ad fastigia rerum
extollit quotiens voluit Fortuna iocari.*
(Juv. 3,31–40)

This is a recurring topic of Martial's Book 3. He addresses *Epigram* 16 to the “prince of cobblers” giving gladiators,³⁰ a figure mentioned again in *Epigram* 59 in connection with gladiatorial games, together with the fuller from Mutina, and another low-class occupation, the *copo*.³¹ After these lines, Umbricius utters his aforementioned complaint of the lack of possibility of an honest life in Rome:

*quid Romae faciam? mentiri nescio; librum,
si malus est, nequeo laudare et poscere; motus
astrorum ignoro; funus promittere patris
nec volo nec possum; ranarum viscera numquam
inspexi; ferre ad nuptam quae mittit adulter,
quae mandat, norunt alii; me nemo ministro*

²⁹ see note 26.

³⁰ Mart. 3,16,1–2: *Das gladiatores, sutorum regule, Cerdo, / Quodque tibi tribuit subula, sica rapit.*

³¹ Mart. 3,59: *Sutor Cerdo dedit tibi, culta Bononia, munus, / Fullo dedit Mutinae: nunc ubi copo dabit?* He refers to this in *Epigram* 99, as well. Mart. 3,99: *Irasci nostro non debes, Cerdo, libello. / Ars tua, non vita est carmine laesa meo. / Innoctuos permittite sales. Cur ludere nobis / Non liceat, licuit si iugulare tibi?*

On the Sources of Juvenal's *Satire* 3

fur erit...

(Juv. 3,41–47)

The point of an epigram in Martial's Book 3 is that a good man cannot make a living in Rome, or he can do so only by chance. Furthermore, there is a textual parallel between the two passages:³²

'Quid faciam? suade: nam certum est vivere Romae.'

si bonus es, casu vivere, Sexte, potes.

(Mart. 3,38,13–14)

In *Epigram* 5 of Book 4, Martial goes further: it is not worth it for a good man to go to Rome. After that, he deals with themes that are also found in this section of Umbricius' speech: dishonest jobs, fraudulence, mendacity, adulation, and the worthlessness of virtue.³³ Umbricius mentions the praise of bad literary works as an aspect of adulation, a topic which is also found in Martial.³⁴ Juvenal's *interlocutor* returns to the topic of adulation several times, and soon thereafter, attacks Greek flatterers who use Greek mythological comparison to heroise their unworthy patrons, an act which Martial also criticizes in Book 12:

et longum invalidi collum cervicibus aequat

Herculis Antaeum procul a tellure tenentis

(Juv. 3,88–89)

exiguos secto comentem dente capillos

dicet Achilleas disposuisse comas.

(Mart. 12,82,9–10)

The attacked flatterer is Greek in the works of both authors. However, Umbricius sometimes talks about Greeks in certain contexts where Martial does not, because of his contempt for Greek and Middle Eastern people. He summarizes the superiority of the Greeks in adulation: *non sumus ergo pares* (Juv. 3,104). These words recall *Epigram* 18 of Martial's Book 2,

³² see also Mart. 3,30 in note 28.

³³ Mart. 4,5: *Vir bonus et pauper linguaque et pectore verus, / Quid tibi vis, urbem qui, Fabiane, petis? / Qui nec leno potes nec comissator haberi, / Nec pavidos tristi voce citare reos, / Nec potes uxorem cari corrumpere amici, / Nec potes argentes arrigere ad vetulas, / Vendere nec vanos circa Palatia fumos, / Plaudere nec Cano, plaudere nec Glaphyro: / Unde miser vives? 'Homo certus, fidus amicus.' / Hoc nihil est: numquam sic Philomelus eris.*

³⁴ Mart. 12,40,1: *recitas mala carmina, laudo.* Horace also mentions this type of adulation: Hor. S. 2,5,74–75: *scribet mala carmina vecors / laudato.*

where he repeats the sentence *iam sumus ergo pares* three times. We can sum up Martial's epigram this way: although the narrator is subjected to the addressed Maximus, they are of the same status, since Maximus has the same relationship with another person. Instead of a simple allusion, Umbricius uses these words to express his hatred of the Greeks again, whose adulation cannot be matched. Thus, while a Roman can be equal to another Roman in this "system of flattery", it is impossible for a Greek. The theme of this epigram is recalled again when Umbricius mentions the morning salutations that everyone, even the praetor, uses:

*quod porro officium, ne nobis blandiar, aut quod
pauperis hic meritum, si curet nocte togatus
currere, cum praetor lictorem impellat et ire
praecipitem iubeat dudum vigilantibus orbis,
ne prior Albinam et Modiam collega salutet?*
(Juv. 3,126–130)

This *locus* also resembles *Epigram* 10 of Martial's Book 10, which deals with the difficulties of clients' being hurried greetings.³⁵ Besides the obvious thematic-motivic parallel, a textual allusion also connects this epigram with the speech of Umbricius, who rewrites line 5 of the epigram (*qui me respiciet, dominum regemque vocabo?*), discussing the salutation as well, (*quid das, ut Cossum aliquando salutes, / ut te respiciat clauso Veiiento labello?* Juv. 3,184–185), while lines 127–128 of the satire (*curet nocte togatus / currere*) also have a precedent in an epigram of Martial (*nocte togatus ero*, Mart. 10,82,2).

After that, Umbricius approaches the humiliation of poor men on the basis that their dirty and ragged clothes make them ridiculous:

*quid quod materiam praebet causasque iocorum
omnibus hic idem, si foeda et scissa lacerna,
si toga sordidula est et rupta calceus aliter
pelle patet, vel si consuto volnere crassum
atque recens linum ostendit non una cicatrix?*
(Juv. 3,147–151)

³⁵ Mart. 10,10: *Cum tu, laurigeris annum qui fascibus intras, / Mane saluator limina mille teras, / Hic ego quid faciam? quid nobis, Paule, relinquis, / Qui de plebe Numae densaque turba sumus? / Qui me respiciet, dominum regemque vocabo? / Hoc tu – sed quanto blandius! – ipse facis. / Lecticam sellamve sequar? nec ferre recusas, / Per medium pugnas et prior ire lutum. / Saepius adsurgam recitanti carmina? tu stas / Et pariter geminas tendis in ora manus. / Quid faciet pauper, cui non licet esse clienti? / Dimisit nostras purpura vestra togas.*

On the Sources of Juvenal's *Satire* 3

His words remind us of *Epigram* 103 of Martial's Book 1, whose third couplet reads like a dense antecedent of the Juvenalian description, as these two lines also contain the dirty toga, the cloak, the *calceus*, and the multiple tears in the clothes—that is, every important element of the words of Umbricius:

*Sordidior multo post hoc toga, paenula peior,
Calceus est sarta terque quaterque cute*
(Mart. 1,103,5–6)

The humiliation of the poor is still not over. In the next lines, Umbricius complains about the embarrassing treatment connected with the *census equestris* and *lex Roscia theatralis*. This census is often mentioned in Martial's Book 5,³⁶ and the first lines of *Epigram* 25 closely resemble the words of Umbricius, quoting the outrage against someone who is not wealthy enough to sit in the first fourteen rows:

*'exeat' inquit,
'si pudor est, et de pulvino surgat equestri,
cuius res legi non sufficit...'*
(Juv. 3,153–155)

*'Quadringenta tibi non sunt, Chaerestrata: surge,
Leitus ecce venit: sta, fuge, curre, late.'*
(Mart. 5,25,1–2)

We can also find elements for which Martial is a potential inspiration in the next section of the speech, one which demonstrates the dangers of the city. Describing a fire consuming houses in the city, the *interlocutor* presents an example of social injustice: if a poor person suffers losses, he becomes even poorer, but when a rich man is affected by the disaster, he becomes even richer due to the donations of his clients. This is exactly the same scenario which Martial mentions in *Epigram* 52 of his Book 3. In both cases, suspicion arises that the rich man set his own house on fire. This so-called insurance fraud is another crime committed by wealthy Romans:

*meliora ac plura reponit
Persicus orborum lautissimus et merito iam
suspectus tamquam ipse suas incenderit aedes.*
(Juv. 3,220–222)

³⁶ Mart. 5,23; 5,25; 5,38.

Gergő Gellérfi

*Empta domus fuerat tibi, Tongiliane, ducentis:
Abstulit hanc nimium casus in urbe frequens.
Conlatum est deciens. Rogo, non potes ipse videri
Incendisse tuam, Tongiliane, domum?*
(Mart. 3,52)

Umbricius then briefly returns to the advantages of rural life before comparing the situation of the lower and higher strata of Roman society with another viewpoint, one which also has an antecedent in Martial. This time, the rich/poor contrast is discussed by complaining about nighttime noises that make sleeping impossible for those who cannot afford to live in a quiet neighbourhood:

*plurimus hic aeger moritur vigilando [...]
nam quae meritoria somnum
admittunt? magnis opibus dormitur in urbe.*
(Juv. 3,232–235)

*nec cogitandi, Sparse, nec quiescendi
in urbe locus est pauperi. Negant vitam
ludi magistri mane, nocte pistores,
aerariorum marculi die toto;*
(Mart. 12,57,3–6)

Neither of the above parallels would be enough on its own to suppose a close connection with Martial, but together they prove that his *Epigrams* play key role in the whole of the *interlocutor's* speech. The most important evidence of this is the passage where Umbricius compares Rome and the rural countryside, stating that toga is seldom worn in the country. Martial mentions this in a few of his epigrams, one of which, *Epigram* 18 of his Book 12, is the key to revealing the connection between Umbricius and Martial, since the epigrammatist addressed this poem to Juvenal:

*pars magna Italiae est, si verum admittimus, in qua
nemo togam sumit nisi mortuus. [...]
aequales habitus illic similesque videbis
orchestram et populum; clari velamen honoris
sufficiunt tunicae summis aedilibus albae.*
(Juv. 3,171–179)

*Dum tu forsitan inquietus erras
Clamosa, Iuvenalis, in Subura,
Aut collem dominae teris Dianae;
Dum per limina te potentiorum
Sudatrix toga ventilat vagumque*

On the Sources of Juvenal's *Satire* 3

*Maior Caelius et minor fatigant:
Me multos repetita post Decembres
Accepit mea rusticumque fecit
Auro Bilbilis et superba ferro [...]
Ignota est toga, sed datur petenti
Rupta proxima vestis a cathedra.
(Mart. 12,18,1–18)*

The direction of communication is reversed. Juvenal, who “restlessly wanders in noisy Subura”, is addressed by Martial from idyllic Bilbilis, the countryside where Juvenal’s “friend” in *Satire* 3 desires to be and therefore leaves Rome.³⁷ In the narrator’s introduction however, Juvenal mentions Subura, seemingly as his dwelling-place, where Martial places him in the epigram: *ego vel Prochytae praepono Suburae* (Juv. 3,5). Together with the numerous parallels, this suggests that the satire’s basic situation can be inspired by an actual event: a friend leaves Rome, and his destination is the place where he belongs. Martial returns to his homeland, whereas Umbricius goes to Cumae, where a useless diviner still has his place.³⁸

The close relation between Umbricius and Martial was rejected on different grounds.³⁹ In his article, Anderson presents the differences between Martial and Juvenal.⁴⁰ Baldwin asserts that the main problem with this identification is the fact that Umbricius is xenophobic, whereas Martial came from Hispania.⁴¹ Concerning the latter argument, it should be noted that Umbricius attacks only Greeks and Middle Easterners in his speech, but it is even more important to make the relationship between the

³⁷ The friendship of the two authors is widely accepted, among others WILSON (1898: 197), HIGHET (1951: 386), and SYME (1989: 3) refer to them as friends, the latter stating that “no friend is both verifiable and tangible, except for Martial”.

³⁸ This idea is briefly mentioned by HIGHET (1951: 370–371), and COURTNEY (1980: 154) also refers to the same: “One wonders if Juvenal accompanied his friend to the gates of Rome when he retired to Spain about A.D. 98.” However, neither of them discusses this possibility in detail.

³⁹ ANDERSON (1970: 1–34), BALDWIN (1972: 101). Other interpretations, for instance, the article of MOTTO and CLARK cited before do not even mention this possibility. HIGHET (1951: 386) and WILSON (1898: 196–197) quote and reject FRIEDLAENDER’s opinion, denying any closer connection between Juvenal and Martial: „Ihre Uebereinstimmung in Worten und Wendungen ist grösstenteils zufällig und natürlich: eine absichtliche Beziehung möchte ich nur bei Juvenal 5, 147 auf Martial I, 20, 4 annehmen.“

⁴⁰ ANDERSON (1970: 1–34).

⁴¹ BALDWIN (1972: 101) does not enter into a detailed analysis, citing only one parallel (Mart. 12,18,17–18) between *Satire* 3 and the *Epigrams*.

interlocutor and the epigrammatist clear, as it can explain the differences discussed by Anderson as well.

As in the case of the imperial *haruspex*, we should not identify Umbricius with Martial. We cannot do this because certain features of his character do not correspond with the epigrammatist. The *interlocutor* is a complex figure—his various aspects and features can be traced back to different sources and inspirations. Now, we can draw up the building-blocks of Juvenal's Umbricius.

According to our hypothesis, the dramatic setting of the satire, the departure of Umbricius, was inspired by Martial's return to Bilbilis, thus *Satire 3* can be understood as an answer to Martial's last epigram to Juvenal, in which Martial addresses the satirist, who wanders to Subura from the countryside. Juvenal's friend leaves Rome, the reasons for which are the common themes of the speech of Umbricius and the epigrams of Martial. But the *interlocutor* is neither identical to Martial nor to the *haruspex* telling gloomy prophecies to Galba, who gave his name and a mask to the *interlocutor*. Furthermore, the character of the *interlocutor* gets some features from the poet who created him. Umbricius talks like a satirist: his language is varied, his speech is interrupted by rhetorical questions and exclamations, and he emphasizes the indignation and anger that carries him away, just like a satirist. Moreover, at one point he falls out of his role and breaks the fourth wall since in his speech addressed to the narrator he uses the vocative *Quirites*, thus turning to the audience of the satire: *non possum ferre, Quirites, / Graecam urbem...* (Juv. 3,60–61)

Besides that, Juvenal also gives negative characteristics to his figure: the speech of Umbricius does not only show the virtues and values he talks about but also xenophobia and envy. In this manner, Umbricius actually becomes the essence of Rome, whose figure represents the city that is based on traditional Roman values, but sunk into a state of moral decadence. Or, from another point of view, Umbricius gives the most complete picture of Rome, presenting some faults with his words and some with his character flaws – in the style of a satirist, with themes of Martial's *Epigrams*, bearing the name of an imperial *haruspex*.

References

- ANDERSON 1970 = W. S. ANDERSON: *Lascivia vs. ira: Martial and Juvenal*. California Studies in Classical Antiquity 3 (1970) 1–34.
—, 1982 = W. S. ANDERSON: *Studies in Book One of Juvenal*. In: *Essays on Roman Satire*. Princeton 1982, 197–254.
BALDWIN 1972 = B. BALDWIN: *Three Characters in Juvenal*. CW 66 (1972) 101–104.

On the Sources of Juvenal's *Satire 3*

- BRAUND 1990 = S. H. BRAUND: *Umbricius and the Frogs (Juvenal, Sat. 3.44-5)*. CQ 40 (1990) 502–506.
- , 1996 = S. M. BRAUND (ed.): *Juvenal: Satires, Book I*. Cambridge 1996.
- COLTON 1966 = R. E. COLTON: *Echoes of Martial in Juvenal's Third Satire*. *Traditio* 22 (1966) 403–419.
- COURTNEY 1980 = E. COURTNEY: *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*. London 1980.
- FERGUSON 1979 = J. FERGUSON (ed.): *Juvenal: The Satires*. New York 1979.
- , 1987 = J. FERGUSON: *A Prosopography to the Poems of Juvenal*. Bruxelles 1987.
- HARDIE 1998 = A. HARDIE: *Juvenal, the Phaedrus, and the Truth about Rome*. CQ 48 (1998) 234–251.
- HIGHET 1951 = G. HIGHET: *Juvenal's Bookcase*. AJPh 72 (1951) 369–394.
- 1954 = G. HIGHET: *Juvenal the Satirist*. Oxford 1954.
- JENSEN 1986 = B. F. JENSEN: *Martyred and Beleaguered Virtue: Juvenal's Portrait of Umbricius*. C&M 37 (1986) 185–197.
- LAFLEUR 1976 = R. A. LAFLEUR: *Umbricius and Juvenal Three*. ZAnt 26 (1976) 383–431.
- MACMULLEN 1967 = R. MACMULLEN: *Enemies of the Roman Order*. Cambridge 1967.
- MORFORD 1977 = M. MORFORD: *Juvenal's Fifth Satire*. AJPh 98 (1977) 219–245.
- MOTTO-CLARK 1965 = A. L. MOTTO – J. R. CLARK: *Per iter tenebricosum: The Mythos of Juvenal 3*. TAPhA 96 (1965) 267–276.
- NICE 2003 = A. NICE: *The Persona of Umbricius and Divination in Juvenal Satires Three and Six*. In: C. Deroux (ed.): *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XI*. Bruxelles 2003, 401–418.
- NISBET 1988 = R. G. M. NISBET: *Notes on the Text and Interpretation of Juvenal*. BICS 35 (1988) 86–110.
- SARKISSIAN 1991 = J. SARKISSIAN: *Appreciating Umbricius: The Prologue (1–20) of Juvenal's Third Satire*. C&M 42 (1991) 247–258.
- STALEY 2000 = G. A. STALEY: *Juvenal's Third Satire: Umbricius' Rome, Virgil's Troy*. MAAR 45 (2000) 85–98.
- SYME 1989 = R. SYME: *The Patria of Juvenal*. 74 (1989) 1–15.
- WEHRLE 1992 = W. T. WEHRLE: *The Satiric Voice: Program, Form and Meaning in Persius and Juvenal*. Hildesheim 1992.
- WILSON 1888 = H. R. WILSON: *The Literary Influence of Martial upon Juvenal*. AJPh 19 (1898) 193–209.
- WINKLER 1983 = M. M. WINKLER: *The Persona in Three Satires of Juvenal*. Hildesheim 1983.