

The Exploitation of the Epic Realm by Roman Satirists

by

Stuart Curtis

PhD

**University of Glasgow
Department of Classics**

September 2002

The Exploitation of the Epic Realm by Roman Satirists

The main purpose of this thesis is to establish a level of connection between the epic and satiric genres. The popularity of the epic genre was not always matched by its authors' talents, and the exclusively Roman satiric genre seems to have been one of a handful of genres that rose up as an alternative to the perhaps trite and conventional epic format. It will be shown that one of the techniques by which the satirists sought to replace the pre-eminent literary genre on the populace's reading lists with their own allegedly 'lesser' satiric poetry, involved the exploitation of various aspects familiar from the epic genre, but in an original and often unexpected way.

This exploitation of epic material by the satirists can be seen in several different ways, and indeed many of these methods have been briefly pointed out by earlier commentators at specific points in the text, or have even been discussed in their totality with regard to certain individual satirists. The innovation of this thesis will be to show that these different techniques, gathered together under the umbrella heading of 'exploitation of the epic realm', actually existed, to a greater or lesser extent, in each of the satirists' works, and should therefore be understood as a recurring motif within the satiric genre. The various elements of the epic realm that are exploited by the satirists will be systematically explored: beginning with simple opinions regarding the epic genre; building up through the satirists' utilisation of various stylistic and linguistic devices, recurring themes and motifs, and historical and mythological characters, that were usually associated with epic; then covering the satirists' frequent references to specific moments in earlier epic works, either through quotation or scenic parody; before climaxing with those satires that seem to have a wider epic framework and a 'heroic' central figure. The different levels of exploitation will also be discussed in each case: this can range from a serious and sincere appeal to the past that the epic genre represents, through a comical presentation of a stock satiric subject in ironically exaggerated epic terms, to a totally subversive parody of the epic genre itself.

In conclusion, a handful of different suggestions will be posited as to the exact reason why this motif of epic exploitation was so apparent within the satiric genre (although not, of course, to the extent that it was actually the primary satiric motif), and how this then relates to their satiric intentions.

The Exploitation of the Epic Realm by Roman Satirists

Contents

	Page	1
Chapter 1 - Introduction and Definitions		
Satire and the Satirists		1
Epic and the Epicists		6
Exploitation		9
Exploitation of other genres		12
Chapter 2 - Epic Opinion		14
<i>Apologia</i> and <i>Recusatio</i>		14
Satire Versus Epic		19
‘Epic-bashing’		21
Good Epic Required		24
Name-dropping		26
Chapter 3 - Epic Style and Language		31
“The Grand Style”		31
Catalogues		37
Epic Periphrases		40
Similes and Metaphors		50
Inappropriate Military Language		56
Menippean Verse Passages		65
Chapter 4 - Epic Motifs		70
The Golden Age		70
Council of the Gods		73
The Underworld		75
The Trojan Horse		79
Prophecies I: Dreams		80
Prophecies II: Oracles		82
The Muses		83
‘The Epic Storm’		86

Chapter 5 - 'Epic' Characters	Page 89
'History's Heroes' (and Villains)	89
The Emperor	97
The Gods	104
Epic Heroines	111
Epic Creatures and Monsters	117
Mythological Miscellany	122
Chapter 6 - Epic (Mis)Quotations	135
Homer's <i>Iliad</i> and <i>Odyssey</i>	135
Ennius' <i>Annales</i>	139
Virgil's <i>Aeneid</i>	141
Ovid's <i>Metamorphoses</i>	148
Lucan's <i>Bellum Civile</i>	150
Lucretius' <i>De Rerum Natura</i>	151
Non-Epic Quotations	152
Chapter 7 - Epic Scenes	154
The <i>Iliad</i>	154
The <i>Odyssey</i>	156
The <i>Aeneid</i>	161
The <i>Metamorphoses</i>	169
Chapter 8 - 'Heroes'	171
The 'Heroic Satirist'	171
The 'Satiric Hero'	174
Chapter 9 - Conclusions	187
Bibliography	191

Chapter 1 - Introduction and Definitions

It seems appropriate to begin this thesis with a brief definition of each of the terms in my title, along with an overall explanation, since the specific words in this title are open to numerous interpretations. Hence, in this opening chapter, I will cover in turn exactly what I take to be the meaning of the words 'satirists' (including the satiric works that these authors wrote), 'epic' (including the various authors who wrote it), and finally 'exploitation' (including the various exploitative techniques that are used), which will therefore hopefully show what the bulk of my thesis is attempting to explain.

Satire and the Satirists

The Oxford English Dictionary defines a satire as "a poem, or in modern use sometimes a prose composition, in which prevailing vices or follies are held up to ridicule" - while the satiric format is more likely nowadays to be film, television or a radio programme, the initial definition here will suffice for the purposes of this thesis, and so a practitioner of satire ('satirist') will mean 'an author of poetic verse in satiric form'. Moreover, the nature of a satire is further defined as "the employment, in speaking or writing, of sarcasm, irony, ridicule, etc. in exposing, denouncing, deriding, or ridiculing vice, folly, indecorum, abuses, or evils of any kind" - this emphasises the ideas of criticism and vice that can be readily found in our featured satirists' works¹. A final clue as to what we should expect in a classical work of satire can be provided by the four alternative ancient etymologies of the word 'satire': a derivation from *satyr* (mythological hybrids of man and goat) hints at the debauched behaviour appropriate to these creatures that the satirists attack in contemporary society; whereas one of the three possible derivations from *satura* ("full"), referring either to a stuffed sausage (*satura*), a mixed dish (*lanx satura*), or a collection of miscellaneous legislation on one bill (*lex satura*)², would suggest the wide variety of topics and themes that are covered in a collection of satiric works³.

My clarification of the authors whose works are covered in this thesis as "Roman satirists" should also be briefly explained. Although my scope is indeed purely limited to satiric works written in Latin, there is a further implication here regarding Greek literature. The grammarian Quintilian opines that "satire is entirely ours"⁴ (*satura tota nostra est*,

¹ Hight (1962) 18 further clarifies these "typical weapons of satire" as "irony, paradox, antithesis, parody, colloquialism, anticlimax, topicality, obscenity, violence, vividness, [and] exaggeration".

² These etymologies are discussed in much greater detail by Van Rooy (1996) 1-18 and Petersman (1999) 289-90, as well as in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (1996) and the *Oxford English Dictionary* (1933).

³ Classen (1988) 114 even considers *varietas* to be the key characteristic of satire.

⁴ All translations in this thesis are my own, based on both my reading of the texts and translations by others.

X.1.93), a statement which could feasibly mean that Roman satire was far superior to Greek satire, but, since we possess no evidence of an exact equivalent genre being written by Greek authors (a remarkably unique occurrence in classical literature), is more likely to suggest that satire was a wholly Roman invention⁵. While we cannot discount the influence on satire by other Greek literary forms (elements of old comedy, diatribe, and philosophy, to name but a few, are all evident in the satires)⁶, the genre as we now know it was essentially created by two Roman authors, namely Ennius and Lucilius.

Although it was Ennius (239BC - 169BC) who first wrote a collection of 'satires', in the form of a series of verses in differing metres and on differing themes, he is better known as an epicist, as the writer of the *Annales*; moreover, there are also a series of tragedies and other unclassified poems attributed to Ennius, making him one of the more diverse Roman authors. Although these various unclassified poems (including the *Scipio*, the *Hedyphagetica*, the *Sota*, and the *Euhemerus*, among others) have sometimes been taken as part of Ennius' satires⁷, due to both the variety inherent in the satiric genre and the apparent influence of these works on later satirists⁸, I am inclined to follow Coffey's view that an individually named satiric poem would not then have just been cited as part of the satires as a whole⁹. Discounting these works, then, means that we are left with between twenty and thirty fragments that can definitely be considered as part of Ennius' satires.

Lucilius (180BC - 103BC) took the 'variety' aspect of satire that Ennius had employed, and increased the elements of irony and abuse in order to create something that a modern audience could recognise as 'satiric' from our earlier definition; his main innovation, however, was to eventually settle on just one poetic meter - the hexameter - rather than the several which had appeared in Ennius' work, a choice that would then be followed by all of the later satirists¹⁰. Like Ennius' works, Lucilius' satires are nowadays found only in fragments, although fortunately to a much larger extent (around 1300 lines have been attributed to Lucilius). Within these fragments, we find a handful of words referring to the work itself, which perhaps hints at what Lucilius considered himself to be writing. The most common word is *sermo* ("discussion"), with three appearances (1039W, 1039M, 1085W / 1015M, and 1086W / 1016M): the fact that the latter two of these

⁵ The detailed discussion by Van Rooy (1966) 117-122 makes this latter conclusion appear indisputable.

⁶ Both Witke (1970) 1-20 and Coffey (1976) 11-23 discuss the probable influences on the satiric genre.

⁷ Jocelyn (1972) 1023 mentions Mueller's early attempts at making this connection.

⁸ Duff (1937) 42 comments on similarities between the *Hedyphagetica* and Horace's *Satires* II.2 and II.4, as well as noting the frivolity towards gods and mythology in the *Euhemerus* that permeates later satiric works.

⁹ Coffey (1976) 31 is referring to two lines written by Ennius, cited as appearing in the *Satires* and the *Scipio* respectively, whose similarity had at least made the allocation of the *Scipio* to the *Satires* seem viable; it should also be noted that Varro's individually-titled satires (see p. 5 below) do not seem to have ever been cited under a collective 'Satires' heading, but retained their separate identities in grammatical citations.

¹⁰ Van Rooy (1966) 50ff. discusses the benefits of the hexameter for any poet.

references are attributed to the persona of an adversary, criticising Lucilius' libellous insults, perhaps hints at the slightly derogatory and pejorative sense intended in this word, as if a *sermo* was to be considered common or crude. The remaining appearance of the word *sermo* is in conjunction with the word *ludo* ("sport"), which increases the suggestion of low regard for satiric writing to include the image of fun and games, as if satire shouldn't be taken as seriously as other genres. Elsewhere, Lucilius' work is labelled as *schedium* (1131W / 1279M), which seems closely linked to *schedia* ("raft"), and hence carries the implication of something that was cobbled together in a ramshackle manner; however, the satires are also granted the higher label *poemata* ("poetry", 1091W / 1013M), as if to defensively remind the audience that this 'lowly game' is still in verse form.

Although the works of these two innovators of the satiric genre are now preserved only in fragments, those of their generic successors are mainly intact: in fact, we possess a total of eighteen satiric poems written by Horace (65BC - 8BC). Like Lucilius, Horace also regularly uses the word *sermo* to refer to this work (i.IV.42, i.IV.48 and ii.III.4, as well as at *Epistles* i.IV.1, ii.I.4, ii.I.250, and ii.II.60)¹¹; he is also apparently the first satirist to describe his writings as *satira* (ii.I.1 and ii.VI.17). Horace follows the satiric characteristic of variety in the themes and moods of the ten poems that comprise his first book: there are moralistic lectures about the need in life for general moderation (i.III), and how this can be specifically applied to counter the sins of greed (i.I) or lust (i.II); constructive criticisms on the writing of satire (i.IV and i.X); narrative tales of some of Horace's adventures (i.V and i.IX); an amusing anecdote (i.VII); an appeal to the two 'father-figures' (Horace's actual father, and his literary patron Maecenas) who have allowed our satirist to live a pleasant life (i.VI); and even a 'ghost story' narrated by a scarecrow (i.VIII). The thematic variety of the second book, however, has been slightly diminished, as four of the eight poems feature a recurring motif of luxury, especially regarding food (ii.II, ii.IV, ii.VI and ii.VIII); elsewhere, Horace also manages to discuss the satiric themes of madness (ii.III), legacy-hunting (ii.V), and the division between the classes (ii.VII), as well as taking time to defend his choice of composing satire (ii.I). Horace's narrative technique is also noticeably different in his second book, where six of the eight satires appear in the form of a dialogue (usually between Horace and a friend / slave / critic, but also, in ii.V, between two fictional characters), while the remaining two satires feature reported speeches. Horace's manner in this second book is slightly less moralising (in fact, most of the moralising that does occur

¹¹ Although Horace is evidently also referring to his *Epistles* by the word *sermo*, I have chosen not to include these works in my thesis – while the *Epistles* share the hexameter, and occasional stylistic, thematic, and tonal parallels with Horace's *Satires*, they also lack the *persona*, critical attacks, and moralisation that typify the satiric genre, even if these differences do boil down to simply "a matter of degree" (Macleod (1986) xvii).

is noticeably placed in the voice of Horace's opponents) and somewhat more philosophical and thoughtful than in his first book, a change in mood undoubtedly attributable to his growing up during the several years that separated the composition of his two books¹².

There is a period of around eighty or so years before we find any further satiric work, by a young Stoic poet named Persius (34AD - 62AD): Persius himself admits in his first satire that poetry as a whole had fallen into some disrepute, which perhaps explains why no satire survives from that period (if, indeed, it existed at all). The main factor behind the survival of Persius' six satires (along with an accompanying prologue) is probably the complexity of his language and expression, which led to his continued presence in ancient scholiasts' grammatical texts; we should also consider his aptness for satiric moralising, given his Stoicism¹³. Persius' satires include a discussion of his opinions on the need for some kind of moral writing within a debauched society (Prologue and I); philosophical debates on the nature of the gods (II), the need for philosophy itself (III), and the lessons that can be learnt from the disparate teachings of Alcibiades and Socrates (IV); and more traditional satiric attacks against the vices of luxury (V) and greed (VI).

According to Juvenal (55AD - 127AD), the disrepute of writing that Persius described earlier had spread out into the world as a whole in the following forty years, meaning that society's sins were essentially crying out for a new indignant moralist to condemn them in satire, a role which Juvenal himself found difficult not to adopt (*difficile est saturam non scribere*, I.30). The variety of subjects in Juvenal's sixteen satires was extremely broad: he attacked certain types of people, including effeminate hypocrites (II and IX), women (VI), the military (XVI), and even the corrupt Emperor (IV); he criticised the universal vices of snobbery (V), luxury (XI), crime (XIII), and their overwhelming presence in Rome (III), as well as more specific sins, such as legacy-hunting (XII) and cannibalism (XV); he also composed philosophical debates concerning the state of literature (I and VII), the conflict between the past and the present (VIII and XIV), and the general "Vanity of Human Wishes" (X)¹⁴. Juvenal's satires were, like Horace's, composed over several years, and so we can notice a change in the satirist's mood as the poems progress, particularly regarding his indignation and wrath¹⁵: it should be briefly noted that this element of decreasing anger will help to explain Juvenal's apparently differing attitudes towards the epic realm across different satires.

¹² Muecke (1993) 1 describes the Horace of *Satires* ii as "a more confident, but more isolated figure".

¹³ Rudd (1986) 26 also points out that Persius was the first satirist to truly open up the distance between his own very high morals, and the much lesser morality of his satiric targets (Horace, for example, eschewed the idea of his moral superiority, preferring to see himself as merely an educated member of the common crowd).

¹⁴ The title is from Samuel Johnson's poem, "an avowed imitation" (Blakeney (1925) 55) of Juvenal *Sat.* X.

¹⁵ Braund (1988) has written the definitive account of Juvenal's gradually abating anger.

Although the preceding five authors account for the basic totality of the classical satiric genre over some three centuries (with only very brief fragments and references to other satirists during this time), we should also consider the related form of Menippean satire, which then allows the inclusion in my thesis of two very relevant works by two different authors. The general differences that allow a work to be qualified as ‘Menippean satire’ rather than simply ‘verse satire’ are minor, with one obvious exception: Menippean satire is written in *prosimetrum*, a generally prosaic form with occasional verse interludes¹⁶. The variety of meters that are used in these interludes, alongside the prosaic form, harks back to Ennius’ original compilation of satiric medleys, although it is the Greek work of Menippus (from the early third century BC) that is more influential here, as the name suggests¹⁷. Otherwise, the differences are slight, and the main characteristics attributed to Menippean satire can be seen also to exist, to a greater or lesser extent, in the satires of Juvenal, Horace, *et aliorum*: everyday speech and colloquialisms, proverbial examples, grand literary parody, and irony regarding ancient mythology¹⁸ do occur in both forms, but it is the latter pair which are most relevant to this thesis. Nowadays, there are three Latin authors whose works are considered to be Menippean satires - however, the satiric work of Varro (116-27BC) remains to us now only in around 600 fragments, which seem to have been preserved by grammarians purely for their author’s linguistic oddities, and so the extended context of any given fragment would be practically impossible to discuss properly¹⁹. More intact, though, are the other two works considered to be Menippean satires, namely Seneca’s *Apocolocyntosis* and Petronius’ *Satyricon*²⁰. Seneca (4BC - 65AD) is better known as a tragedian, but his *Apocolocyntosis*, a fictional account of the Emperor Claudius’ ascent to heaven, regularly displays his wicked sense of humour. The debate over the actual genre of the *Satyricon* of Petronius (? - 66AD) remains unsettled: proponents of both the Menippean satire and the ancient novel exist, although the most inviting (if perhaps slightly indecisive) option seems to be to allow both genres to

¹⁶ Relihan (1993) 17-8 mentions the “ironic overtones” that are involved in the interpolation of these verse fragments, inserting an “atmosphere of epic or tragedy into a much less elevated situation”.

¹⁷ Coffey (1976) 175 notes that the fragmentary nature of all the earliest and therefore probably most influential sources (namely, Menippus, Ennius and Lucilius) makes any definite association problematic.

¹⁸ These characteristics of Menippean satire are cited by Riikonen (1987) 12 (who follows Duff (1937) 104-5); Riikonen goes on to later mention (p. 23) a more noticeable difference between verse satire and Menippean satire, namely that “the comic element is usually increased in the Menippean satire” - essentially, a Menippean satirist will prioritise the ridicule of a sinner ahead of his moralisation about the sin.

¹⁹ It is clear from certain individual satire titles that Varro’s Menippean satires both exploited mythological characters (e.g. ‘Meleager’, ‘Tithonus’, etc.) and perhaps parodied their adventures (e.g. ‘False Aeneas’, ‘One-and-a-Half Ulysses’, etc.) - Cèbe (1972) discusses the possibilities of any further mythological parody.

²⁰ The definition of Menippean satire given by De Smet (1996) 70 as “fictional (mostly first-person) narratives in prose interspersed with verse ... aimed at mockery and ridicule and often moralising”, seems to presuppose that both of these works can be classified in this genre; similarly, Fredericks (1974a) 89 seems to presuppose in his discussion of the *Apocolocyntosis* that it is a Menippean satire.

have shared an equal influence on Petronius²¹. Nevertheless, the *Satyricon* does feature the aforementioned Menippean traits of colloquial speech, proverbs, literary parody, and mythological mockery, among others²², and, at the very least, its name seems to suggest a link with ‘satire’ (particularly with the possible derivation from *satyr*, given the characters’ sexual exploits), which is then heightened by the many moments of irony, parody and general satiric abuse within the work; however, it is the key aspects of literary parody and humour at the expense of mythology that explain the relevance of both the *Satyricon* and the *Apocolocyntosis* to this thesis, since these traits will be shown to permeate both works.

Epic and the Epicists

The Oxford English Dictionary has the following definition of epic: “that species of poetical composition, ... represented typically by the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, which celebrates in the form of a continuous narrative the achievements of one or more heroic personages of history or tradition”. This definition can be refined somewhat to show the essential traits that qualify a poem as ‘epic’: an epic poem is long (often covering several books), written in hexameters, with elevated style and language, and concerns an important event (such as a war or a journey) that is carried out by important people (mythological heroes, historical figures, or even the gods themselves)²³. The ‘typical’ epic works mentioned above are the Greek works by Homer, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, written around 3000 years ago, concerning, respectively, the destruction of Troy by the Greeks and the exploits of Odysseus / Ulysses on his way home from this battle: they are not only the earliest surviving epic works, but also perhaps the earliest surviving literary compositions (their nearest rival, the Sumerian tale of Gilgamesh from the same period, is also interestingly considered to be an epic work). The Roman epic tradition begins with the aforementioned *Annales* of Ennius, concerning the founding of the Roman Empire: this topic explicitly demonstrates the additional definition of ‘epic’ in the Oxford English Dictionary as “embodying a nation's conception of its own past history, or of the events in that history which it finds most

²¹ Key detractors from the connection with Menippean satire include Baldwin (1973) 296, Sandy (1974) 342 and Astbury (1977), while Van Rooy (1966) 155 and Fredericks (1974a) 104 are the main proponents of the link; Courtney (1962) seems wisest in his early suggestion that both Menippean satire and the novelistic genre should at least be considered as combined influences on the *Satyricon*, a multi-generic approach that Von Albrecht (1997) 1222 also supports since “Menippean satire is the right place for genres to meet”.

²² Further Menippean motifs in the *Satyricon* suggested by Fredericks (1974a) 104-5 include “a humorous approach to much of [its] satire”, and “the author [as] a sophisticated commentator”.

²³ Dominik (1993) 44 lists his own set of ‘epic rules’, based on the works of Homer and Ennius: these rules include “the conceit that the poet is the person through whom the Muse sings his lines” (see chapter four, pp. 83-6, for more on this motif in both epic and satire); the inclusion of “oracular and prophetic scenes [and] Olympian *concilia deorum*” (also approached at chapter four, pp. 82-3 and pp. 73-5 respectively); general “mythological apparatus”, including “the catalogue of troops [covered at chapter three, pp. 37-9], supernatural causation, [and] intervention in human affairs”; and various stylistic elements.

worthy of remembrance”²⁴. The fact that Ennius uses real historical figures, rather than the mythological characters found in Homer’s epics, is often cited as an example of Ennius’ redefinition of Homeric epic, which serves to make the history of Rome appear as important as the deeds of mythological heroes and gods²⁵. The *Aeneid* of Virgil (70BC - 19BC) enhances this connection between history and myth, as the defeated Trojan, Aeneas, sets in motion the events that will lead to the foundation of the Roman Empire, whereas Lucan (39AD - 65AD) hardly includes any mythological apparatus in his epic account of the Civil War (*Bellum Civile*) of 50BC - 47BC²⁶.

Brief mention should also be made of two other authors, whose work has been widely discussed with regard to whether or not it can be classified as ‘epic’. Ovid (43BC - 17BC) is well-known for his love poetry, but perhaps his most famous work is the *Metamorphoses*. The combination of several factors, including the poem’s scope (fifteen books of around 1000 lines each), the use of hexameter, and the recounting of mythological episodes, means that the work can very easily be classified as ‘epic’²⁷, although detractors of this theory would note that there is no single hero throughout the work (an important focus in other epic works), and that Ovid’s style is not consistent with other epic poems²⁸. The relevant references to the *Metamorphoses* within the satires are so few yet so blatant that I think it is important to mention them, regardless of whether the work is to be considered ‘epic’ or not, even if only as a way to show the wider degree of reference to earlier literary works that the satirists often employed. Similarly, the handful of probable allusions to the *De Rerum Natura*, a didactic²⁹ treatise on philosophy by Lucretius (99BC - 55BC) that has also occasionally been classified as ‘epic’ because of its huge scope and hexameter verses³⁰, will also be included if only because these allusions show that the satirists made their clever references based on a much larger library. This also seems the

²⁴ The further clarification in the Oxford English Dictionary that “the phrase ‘national epic’ has been applied to any imaginative work (whatever its form) which is considered to fulfil this function” concurs with Boyle’s (1993) 2 assessment of the epic genre as “large-scale, narrative, ‘heroic’ poetry, concerned with the deeds of heroes and/or the history of a nation”.

²⁵ Dominik (1993) 48 clarifies that the historical characters in the *Annales* are “depicted in heroic terms”, but nevertheless “are contemporary and real”.

²⁶ The continual development of epic by successive authors is discussed by Von Albrecht (1999) 3-9.

²⁷ While Solodow (1988) 18 takes “the hexameter verse and the primarily narrative character of the material alone” as “suffice to suggest” that “epic naturally predominates” in the *Metamorphoses*, Kenney (1986) xvii goes to the other extreme in saying that the *Metamorphoses*’ “conventional pattern of classical epic ... [i.e.] a long poem in hexameters of high literary pretensions ... is as far as conformity [to this epic pattern] extends”.

²⁸ Galinsky (1975) 3 grants Ovid’s poem an “epic length”, although “epic style ... is not sustained” (p. 12).

²⁹ Boyle (1993) 5 considers didactic hexameters to have been “regarded by the ancients as a form of *epos*”.

³⁰ Gale (1994) 99ff. has a wide discussion and bibliography on how ancient critics and poets (as well as Lucretius himself) would have viewed the relationship between epic and didactic; she concludes first that “Lucretius indicates that his poem should be considered against the background of mythological – historical encomiastic epic” (p. 127); and then that “Lucretius characterises his poem as the ultimate epic - a non-mythological epic, which tells the truth without the need for allegorical interpretations” (p. 128); De Quehen (1996) 8 also flippantly notes the “seventeenth-century sense of epic as an encyclopaedic account of things”.

appropriate juncture to explain my titular phrase 'epic realm': there are occasions where the satirists exploit a mythological character or episode that does not have a specific counterpoint in any of these epic works. My justification for including such references is that they remain relevant to the overall 'realm' of epic, as precisely the kind of material that could have been included in epic (and indeed may have been covered in some now lost epic work). Again, the inclusion of these references does at least show that there was a much wider range from which the satirists drew their influences and allusions.

The poetic climate in which the satirists wrote should be mentioned at this point, which will go some way to explaining their general attitude towards epic as shown throughout this thesis. Basically, epic seemed to be considered as the pinnacle of poetic composition - the composition of verse was more taxing, and so presumably more fulfilling to an artist, than prose, and within poetry itself, the hexameters, eloquent style, and higher language of epic would have been even more appealing to a writer. In addition, the Roman epic authors had added a large element of patriotism to their works (whether by directly recounting the tales of war-heroes as in Ennius' *Annales*, or by indirectly making sweeping allusions to these figures as in Virgil's *Aeneid*), which increased the genre's appeal not only to a patriotic Roman audience, but also to the upper-class members of society whose egos would be propped up by epic's treatment of their ancestors and relatives. Hence, the composition of epic became an economic decision, because an epic author could receive great support, both financially and politically, from massaging the correct egos³¹.

Epic's popularity thus clouded the poetic landscape: as far as the audience was concerned, poetry was epic, and all would-be poets should therefore become epicists. The satirists themselves discuss the fact that most epicists therefore became smug believers in their own press, erroneously equating their public popularity with artistic excellence, whether it existed or not. Horace imagines a backlash against epic in the fourth satire of his first book, claiming that epic's overexposure by these self-important and unrestrained poets will cause the public to fear poetry and hate poets (*omnes hi metuunt versus, odere poetas*, i.IV.33); undoubtedly, there is a hint of jealousy here that Horace's satires might not receive the appropriate attention, simply because they are not epic. This overexposure of epic is further suggested by Horace's claims that he will not allow his work to be displayed on the pillars at a book-shop (i.IV.71), and that he will limit his recitations to only his close circle of friends, rather than the baths or forum, and even then only grudgingly (i.IV.73-6); the standard audience for these common recitations is then mocked by their depiction as

³¹ Boyle (1993) 81 actually believes that "there was considerable pressure upon the poets at Rome" to compose poetry that was "Roman, historical, [and / or] panegyric" (i.e. epic), citing as evidence Propertius' preference at *Elegies* ii.I.17ff. of relating Caesar's deeds over mythological events (if he had composed epic).

senseless (*sine sensu*, i.IV.77) for condoning such ill-timed recitations. The overabundance of poets in Rome is finally suggested in the poem's conclusion (*nam multo plures sumus*, i.IV.142), although Horace here includes himself in their midst with obvious irony. Persius labels epic poets as self-important and arrogant in his Prologue, mentioning their statues, which are immodestly crowned with victorious ivy garlands by an appreciative rabble (*imagines lambunt | hederæ sequaces*, Prol. 5-6), while the poets themselves remain seemingly ignorant of their own mediocrity. Juvenal also follows Persius' mocking use of statues in his second satire; however, it is the ill-educated audience (*indocti*, II.4) that is mocked now, since they place the statues of worthy philosophers like Aristotle or Cleanthes alongside worthless modern poets³². These statues, and their crowns of ivy, reappear in the seventh satire (*venias hederis et imagine macra*, VII.29), signifying the fame and fortune that the authors of "lofty poems" (*sublimia carmina*, VII.28) consider more important than actually composing something worthy of success. Already, we can see the animosity that the satirists felt towards over-privileged and under-talented epicists, perhaps hinting at their subsequent treatment of the epic genre³³.

Exploitation

The Oxford English Dictionary defines the verb 'exploit' thus: "to utilize for one's own ends, treat selfishly as mere workable material (persons, etc.); to 'make capital out of'". Inserting this into my thesis' title produces the following explanation: "the utilisation of 'the epic realm' by Roman 'satirists' for their own profit" - essentially, I am looking at those specific moments in a certain literary genre (i.e. satire) where the authors have (presumably, intentionally) borrowed and adapted other elements that may be considered more suitable in a different literary genre (i.e. epic). This simplification naturally leads into the field of intertextuality; however, since I find the theories and terminology of intertextuality to tend towards the verbose and needlessly complex (an accusation that I do not intend to be levelled at this thesis), I will refer only to the most basic definitions from the literature of this area. Firstly, the theory of intertextuality essentially suggests that "the writer is a reader of texts ... before s/he is a creator of texts, and therefore the work of art is inevitably shot through with references, quotations, and influences of every kind"³⁴; moreover, in order for this intertextuality to work effectively, the subsequent reader of any work must also be acquainted with the same texts to which the writer has (whether

³² Rudd (1986) 187 notes that this clash of good author / poor author also works on a racial level ("genuine Greek / Roman impostor"), which is perhaps a telling comment on the state of Roman literature as a whole.

³³ It is also worth mentioning here Martial's epigrammatic point that the epic and tragic genres may have increased in quantity, but this is at the expense of their quality (viii.III.14ff.).

³⁴ Still & Worton (1990) 1.

consciously or subconsciously) referred³⁵. So, in relation to my thesis, I intend to show the various levels of intertextuality between the satiric and epic realms: that is, the great amount of “references, quotations, and influences” that the satirists have derived from their own reading of the popular epic genre, and which they hope will then register in their audience, who would presumably have a similarly literate and educated background.

The simplest, but perhaps most widespread, illustration of this exploitative relationship between the two genres is the hexameter verse form: the satirist (initially, Lucilius, although all later satirists follow his lead) took something appropriate to the epic genre (in this case, the very meter itself), but then used it in a completely different and often inappropriate way (basically, to write about lowly areas of contemporary Roman life, rather than grand moments of mythology or history)³⁶, with their ‘profit’ being that people actually enjoyed reading this alternative poetic genre. Beyond this, it is my intention in this thesis to catalogue the various other ways in which the epic realm was thus exploited in satire - by combining my own ideas with appropriate comments and suggestions made by earlier scholars, I hope to show that there are a variety of different elements within the satires that can then be collected under this umbrella heading of ‘exploitation of the epic realm’. My chapters will each cover a related selection of these elements, ordered to essentially ‘build up’ from the general through to the specific.

Chapter 2: the various comments made by the satirists on the state of the epic and satiric genres in their contemporary society will be discussed here, as possible justifications for the satirists’ later exploitation of the epic realm.

Chapter 3: I will cover here the various stylistic and linguistic devices appropriate to the epic genre that have been exploited and subverted in the satirists’ work.

Chapter 4: here, I will elaborate on certain stock motifs from the epic genre that have taken on a somewhat skewed or humorous appearance from their satiric appearances.

Chapter 5: this chapter will cover both the specifically epic and the more generally mythological characters whose satiric presence is usually diminished in some way.

Chapter 6: I will investigate in this chapter those occasions when the satirists actually quote (or occasionally misquote) a specific phrase from an earlier epic work.

Chapter 7: here, we will see how specific scenes from epic are both parodied in the satires, and actually appear to be re-enacted by inappropriate satiric characters.

³⁵ Riffaterre (1990) 56 thus defines intertextuality as “one or more texts which the reader must know in order to understand a work of literature in terms of significance”.

³⁶ Henderson (1989) 97 discusses the “important question [of] how far the hexameters that Roman Satire is written in are made to depart from the message of epic”; Braund (1992) 3 even goes so far as to label satire’s exploitation of the hexameter as being “hijacked” from epic.

Chapter 8: there are a handful of satires (and particularly the two Menippean satires) that will be shown to possess an epic framework, including a central ‘satiric hero’.

Chapter 9: finally, I will conclude with a summation of my findings, as well as a brief discussion on why the satirists might have carried out this ‘epic exploitation’.

Throughout these chapters, certain generic tendencies will be seen to emerge: an element will first be shown to be generally used in a specific way within the epic genre, but then will typically be found occurring in a somewhat different way within the satiric genre. Naturally, there may be a few areas where the satirists follow the epic example to the letter, and furthermore, there may be occasions when the supposedly ‘non-epic’ method adopted by the satirists can actually also be seen to exist briefly within certain epic works; it is obvious that any author has sufficient licence to break the rules of their given genre, but these generic rules only exist because the majority of authors follow them. The running theme in this thesis is essentially juxtaposition - elements from the epic realm appearing alongside elements from the satiric realm - and so a somewhat monochromatic view of the epic genre, based on the rules followed by the majority of epicists, has been employed in order to highlight this contrast between epic’s way of doing something and satire’s way of doing it (and certainly this monochromatic view of the epic genre seems to be shared by the satirists themselves, as shown at pp. 8-9 above, and throughout chapter two).

The juxtaposition of epic and satiric elements has two fundamentally opposite effects, the first of which will be labelled as ‘inappropriate elevation’ throughout this thesis: the satiric elements - that is, the “vice, folly, indecorum, abuses, or evils” in Roman society - attract some of the reverence and grandeur of the juxtaposed epic elements, essentially lifting them up to a height where it is much easier for the satirists to set about “exposing, denouncing, deriding, or ridiculing” them. This accounts for the first ‘profit’ to the satirists in their exploitation of the epic realm:

they make their own satiric subject matter seem as important as any epic event³⁷.

There is, however, a secondary effect on the epic elements themselves, whose exploitation has now left them sitting uneasily against the depths of human behaviour that make up the subject matter of most of the satiric genre: these grand elements are debased, diminished, and mocked by their new contextual connection with reality³⁸, a technique which is labelled as ‘subversion’ in this thesis. Hence, the satirists gain a second, related ‘profit’ in their exploitation of the epic realm:

³⁷ Gowers (1993a) 188 hyperbolically explains that “only the grandest style is adequate for vice which exceeds even epic proportions”.

³⁸ Sullivan (1993) 152 marks the contrast that “epic themes are unreal”, whereas satire approaches “the everyday life of poverty, patronage and power”; Braund (1992) 43 also differentiates between “remote and irrelevant” epic and “real and immediate” satire.

they diminish the importance of epic, and so further increase satire's relevance³⁹.

We will regularly find both techniques occurring simultaneously, seemingly multiplying the importance of the satiric genre over the epic realm⁴⁰. This latter point, then, shows the likely, cumulative 'profit' that the satirists hope to gain in their exploitation of the epic realm, namely a wider readership for their non-epic work (some further possibilities will also be discussed in my conclusion at chapter nine, pp. 189-90). By combining these two opposite techniques of, firstly, elevating their satiric subject matter to a more important and more relevant level than epic's traditional themes, and, secondly, simultaneously diminishing the various aspects of the epic realm, the satirists were basically bringing the two genres to a greater degree of parity; their intention was therefore the popularisation of their own genre among a Roman readership who were apparently completely absorbed in the ubiquitous epic genre.

Exploitation in other areas

It should by now be apparent that this thesis will be establishing a level of connection between epic and satire; however, it must be clearly emphasised that this connection is not a unique generic occurrence, and indeed the theory of intertextuality suggests that exploitation of any one genre's elements may be found within almost any other genre. There are moments in many different genres where it is clear that there is an intertextual relationship with both the general epic realm, and more specific epic works. The tragic genre has an obvious and fundamental intertextual relationship with the epic genre, since many of the characters and stories of Greek and Roman mythology (particularly the varied events revolving around the fall of Troy) provide the plots for both tragic and epic works⁴¹. Tragedy was not the only dramatic genre that exploited material suitable for epic poetry: from as early as the 4th century BC, Greek comedy writers had been creating a "burlesque of mythology" and "mythological parodies"⁴², although the only such play that has survived is the Latin *Amphitruo*, Plautus' 2nd century BC bedroom farce based on the legend of Hercules' conception. Epic traditions were also exploited within the poetic genres: in the elegiac meter, Propertius utilises the dream motif in poem iv.VII, with

³⁹ Hight (1962) 103ff. labels these respective techniques as "mock-heroic" (elevating the non-heroic to inappropriately heroic levels) and "burlesque" (deflating the grand for comic effect); Braund (1988) 68 simply classifies both techniques as "tonal incongruities" (i.e. the surrounding tone is either too heroic for the lowly subject at hand, or, conversely, it is too lowly for the heroic subject at hand).

⁴⁰ Scott (1927) 47 considers the use of elevation immediately followed by diminution to be "one of Juvenal's favourite tricks of wit", although we will find it in other satirists' work too.

⁴¹ Indeed, "all but one of the plots of the surviving sample of [early Greek] tragedies are drawn from heroic myth, familiar to 5th-cent. audiences from epic poetry" (*Oxford Classical Dictionary* (1996) 1540); the one exception (Aeschylus' *Persians*) was based on recent historical conflicts.

⁴² Both quotes are from Duckworth (1952), pp. 13 and 15 respectively.

the ghost of his now-dead mistress Cynthia appearing to the poet in a repeat of Patroclus' appearance to Achilles in the *Iliad*⁴³; while in the lyric genre, Horace not only creates an invocation to Mercury as his poetic muse in *Odes* iii.XII⁴⁴, but also treats various mythological themes in a less than serious manner in *Odes* i.XV (the Trojan War) and iii.XXVII (Europa). The epistolary genre also addresses epic themes: Horace considers the various moral aspects of Homer's poetry in *Epistles* i.II⁴⁵, while Ovid's exile near the Black Sea at Tomis naturally leads to his creation of several epic-tinged storms in his *Tristia* (e.g. at I.42, IV.1 ff., and X.3 ff., amongst others). Finally, in the epigrammatic genre, whose pithy tone and subject matter is closely connected to the satiric genre, Martial's assorted epic allusions, such as the contemporary 'hero' who is likened to Achilles (ii.XIV.4), the goat likened to the Golden Fleece (viii.L.8), and the beautiful woman who is deemed worthy of Paris' judgement (x.LXXXIX.3), all possess an ironic undertone that is similar to the general epic exploitation practices of the satirists.

Similarly, the satirists did not confine their own literary references and allusions to just the epic genre, as various intertextual connections can also be found between the satiric genre and other literary areas. The stock characters of comedy, for example, are essentially the same lowlife cast of the satiric realm (for example, prostitutes appear at Horace i.II.58 ff. and Juvenal VI.118, as well as in most of Plautus' plays)⁴⁶; satire's key aspect of social commentary is shared by both the epistolary and epigrammatic genres⁴⁷, although the approach of each genre is fundamentally different; and the satirists' occasional descent into smuttiness and innuendo might suggest a connection with both the usually chaste elegiac genre and the more pornographic *Priapea* poems. Undoubtedly, the intertextual links between satire and non-epic genres could fill another thesis; this thesis will only cover those non-epic connections which occur alongside moments of epic exploitation, in order to emphasise the thematic shift that may partly account for any deflation of the epic element. Hopefully, my own bias towards the satiric connections to epic will reflect a similar bias on the part of the satirists themselves; and perhaps the main connection that the satiric genre will then be shown to have with other non-epic genres is precisely their non-epicness (indeed, satire may be the genre that most regularly tries to stress its own identity).

⁴³ Camps (1965) 115 actually notes several more specific allusions to *Iliad* XIII in Propertius' poem.

⁴⁴ Lee (1998) 247 considers this invocation to be "grandiose" rather than subversive or ironic.

⁴⁵ Mayer (1994) 41 further notes that "the practical moral guidance to be extracted from his [i.e. Homer's] text is found also at [*Epistles*, Book i] 7.40-4".

⁴⁶ Ramage (1974a) further notes that several of the initial satiric meters used by Ennius, such as the trochaic septenarii and the iambic senarii, were essentially comic meters (pp. 14-5); Barr (1987) 152 also identifies a specific allusion to Menander's version of *Eunuchus* (rather than Terence's version) at Persius V.161 ff.

⁴⁷ Fredericks (1974b) 138 compiles a list of further connections between satire and epigram, including "dramatic elements, dialogue, commentary on contemporary people and affairs, mordant wit, [and] irony".

Chapter 2 - Epic Opinion

Having just considered that the satirists were basically trying to set themselves apart from the more prevalent epic genre, I shall now attempt in this chapter to cover the various opinions that the satirists seem to express regarding their main generic competitor, as well as its practitioners and its relationship to satire. One caveat that should be briefly mentioned is the issue of the satiric persona, and how this might impact on some of these opinions¹. At any given moment in a work of satire, the narrator might be identified with the author himself, or this narrator might more obviously be seen as a separate character or persona: hence, any opinion expressed in a satire does not *necessarily* express the author's own sentiments. By and large, however, the comments that I shall be discussing here do seem to be made in the relevant satirist's own voice, or at least in the voice of an exaggerated 'poet-persona' that can be identified with the satirist. Regardless of whether the author himself holds any given opinion, or alternatively is simply repeating a common complaint or criticism held by others in the voice of this persona, the comments that are made in the satires regarding the state of literature could nevertheless sway the audience's views into agreement: hence, the belittlement of epic in this way (alongside the elevation of satire) could only help the satirists' cause for their own works' popularity.

Apologia and Recusatio

I have already mentioned the ubiquity of the epic genre among Roman poets, with ample evidence from the satirists themselves: it therefore seemed obligatory for authors in other genres to include either an *apologia* or a *recusatio*. In the first place, a poet might have to admit that he was not up to the task of composing the complicated, patriotic, and inspiring hexameters that were required for epic, and hence would offer apologies (*apologia*) for this supposed inadequacy; whereas in the second place, a non-epic poet would simply offer an explanation of his rejection (*recusatio*) of the standard path of epic composition in favour of his chosen genre instead, with no apparent need for apologies². Examples of both differing types of justification for the non-epic approach exist in all of

¹ Anderson (1982) 3-10 discusses the various problems that the question of the satiric persona can raise regarding the identification of narrator, while Braund (1992) 2 discusses satiric persona more generally.

² Edwards (1992) 87 defines both terms respectively: "a Roman author who cultivates some other form than epic will either excuse himself from the higher calling with the claim that his powers are inadequate [he cites Virgil *Eclogues* VI.6-7 here as an example of an *apologia*] or deny after all that epic is entitled to a monopoly of praise [Virgil *Georgics* III.1-9, Propertius *Elegies* i.IX.11 and, crucially, Juvenal I.1-2 are all cited here as examples of the *recusatio*"]; Boyle (1993) 4-5 further explains that most genres were essentially defined by their differences to epic (as, say, 'lighter fare', or 'more comical'). It should also be noted that such claims of inadequacy may contain a degree of false modesty – for example, Post (1908) 315 considers that Martial's *apologia* at xii.XCIV.1-2 "is not to be taken too seriously".

the satirists' works, further evidence that satire was one of the literary genres that viewed itself in direct competition with the epic genre.

Ennius is first to include a self-deprecating comment about a lack of skills in the poetic realm: *non est meum ac si me canis memorderit* ("it's not my way, as if a dog had bitten me", 22W). The indifference expressed in this fragment may be attributed to Ennius himself regarding the epic genre, if we supplement our search for comments appropriate to a *recusatio* or *apologia* with the possibility that the dog (*canis*) which has bitten Ennius may be a metaphor for the satiric genre itself³. Of course, given Ennius' more prominent role as an epic author, we must consider the possibility that he is combining irony with the expected self-deprecating defence of a non-epicist. The preceding fragment also deals with an opinion on poeticism: *numquam poetor nisi si podager* ("I never write poetry unless I have the gout", 21W). Poetry is shown here to require the attention to detail that an extended period of bed-rest due to illness might provide: if Ennius himself can be assumed to be the speaker here, we can see a combination of a sly joke at the expense of epic works (possibly even his own *Annales*, depending on the chronology of Ennius' composition) in connection with an illness, and the suggestion that satire is not to be considered as poetry.

Lucilius does not seem to include an explicit *recusatio* or *apologia* in his poetry; of course, the fragmentary nature of his work today suggests that any relevant section simply has not survived. Although the author does not set out an overt scheme regarding either his feelings about epic or about his preferred genre, there do exist several connected references to a 'higher' form of writing, and to the authors who compose it, from which Lucilius' feelings about epic may be extrapolated. These fragments evidently formed part of a satire on the proliferation of more serious genres by such aspiring authors as the friend whom Lucilius addresses therein. Lucilius (given the almost epistolary format of these fragments, I take Lucilius himself to be the speaker here) begins by claiming to be inadequate to a certain task at hand (*ego si, qui sum et quo folliculo nunc sum indutus, non queo*, 691W / 622M) – although the line is incomplete, this task will become evident by the end of the related fragments. He continues with an address to a friend who has succumbed to the writing of serious poetry, specifically ancient history (*veterem historiam*, 700W / 612M), a subject which violently displeases Lucilius (*mihi vehementer displicet*, 701W / 629M). Lucilius would rather be different (*ego contra ut dissimilis siem*, 703W / 630M), and so he shuns his friend's preferred course of action (*ut ego effugiam quod te in primis cupere apisci intellego*, 702W / 628M). Already, we see the satirist's desire not to follow a common herd in taking the 'epic' route, although the friend's decision to take it is

³ Warmington (1938) 3 explains *canes* as "the snarl of satire" at Lucilius 4W / 2M.

seemingly not criticised explicitly. In fact, Lucilius actually offers the advice that the goal of an author should be praise and profit (*laudem* and *fructum*, 713W / 620M), implying the laudable and rewarding realms of epic; he also recommends that something else ought to be shunned and avoided (*cavendum* and *vitandum*, 712W / 609M) - possibly this ‘lesser’ satiric genre that Lucilius has adopted, that would not prove profitable and praiseworthy for his friend? Perhaps Lucilius’ displeasure towards the epic genre stems in part from an inability to practice it himself, and this is the task at 691W / 622M in which he claims an inability to partake⁴? Even if this latter example of an *apologia* did not exist in the original text, the other fragments form a *recusatio* of sorts, although Lucilius’ scorn for epic in favour of satire seems to be secondary to his advice for his poet friend.

Surprisingly, Horace does not open his first book of satires with an *apologia*, especially considering that he lived during a very prolific period for epic-writing - perhaps Horace felt that, in not justifying his alternative genre, he was allowing the strength of his work to speak for itself. Regardless, it is perhaps quite bold for the author to launch straight into his topic without a formal introduction, especially since around a hundred years had seemingly passed satire-free since Lucilius’ time. The opening satire’s theme is why people aren’t happy with their lives, but instead “praise the followers of different routes” (*laudet diversa sequentis*, i.I.3) - is it possible to read this comment on deeper levels? Superficially, the topic points to the differences between such professions as merchandising and the military, and the prejudices that each career’s practitioners hold for each other; the subtext, however, could ironically apply to the art of writing satire too. When Horace speaks of either *ratio* (“reason”, i.I.2) or *fors* (“luck”, i.I.2) as having assigned people with their lots in life, his own lot would seem to be the composition of hexameter poetry; of course, he himself is then half-guilty of not being content with his destiny, since his hexameter compositions will not be epic, but rather satire – the further implication would be that his own unhappiness with his lot leads him into praising those people who follow a different path within poetry (e.g. Lucilius), and actually going so far as to follow their example by adopting satire himself. It is not until the fourth satire that we discover a more explicit *apologia* regarding Horace’s poetic abilities: he claims that he does not even think of himself as a poet (*primum ego me illorum, dederim quibus esse poetis, | excerpam numero*, i.IV.39-40). Granted, he writes in hexameters, but his choice of language and word order seems (at least to Horace’s mind, anyway) more prosaic or similar to everyday speech (*sermoni propiora*, i.IV.42); ironically, though, Horace later counts himself among the poets (*nam multo plures sumus*, i.IV.142 - see chapter one, p. 9).

⁴ Both Marx (1905) 230 and Warmington (1938) 222 make the same assumption.

Horace does finally see fit to follow the schemes of *apologia* and *recusatio* in the opening poem of his second book of satires: it is almost as if Horace was not somehow aware that his work in the first book would be looked down upon, and he is only now explaining his actions. Having been reminded of the benefits of choosing an epic style (ii.I.10-12), Horace comes up with the first excuse that his desire to produce grander works than these satires is not matched by his ability to carry it out (*cupidum ... vires | deficiunt*, ii.I.12-13), a typical *apologia* of self-deprecation similar to his earlier comment at i.IV.39-40. His second line of reasoning, an extension of the first excuse, is that not just anybody can compose epic (ii.I.13-14): humorously, Horace immediately subverts his declarations of poetic impotence by skilfully composing a couple of lines of epic-flavoured verse (see chapter three, p. 34, for more on these lines). Horace implicitly justifies his omission of any *apologia* from his first book with these few lines: his skills are perfectly up to the tricky task of elevated composition, despite his traditionally modest claims otherwise, and so he doesn't feel the need to further justify either himself or his satires.

The next satiric practitioner, Persius, precedes his work with a brief Prologue that acts as a typical *recusatio* by suitably mocking the genre that he is rejecting. The most interesting aspect of the Prologue is its meter, choliambics: in the main six satires, Persius does follow the tradition that Lucilius had originated, and Horace had perpetuated, of composing satire in the epic hexameter. However, this fourteen line Prologue of choliambics is composed in a meter more commonly associated with Greek tragedy, and often called 'limping iambics' - Barr notes that this meter had been used by Hipponax to criticise his enemies in the sixth century BC, and by Cercidas to attack luxury in the third century BC, thus hinting at its relevance here⁵. I would further add that Persius is also subtly showing a minor debt to the first satirist Ennius (whose epic *Annales* is mocked in the Prologue), regarding his utilisation of several different meters in his satiric work (although their fragmentary nature makes it difficult to know whether Ennius did in fact specifically ever use choliambics). The Prologue opens as Persius points out the traditional sources of epic inspiration, and explains that none of them apply to him: the Hippocrene spring (1), inspirational dreams (2-3), and even the Muses themselves (4) are not within Persius' experience, although he does still refer to his work as an elevated *carmen* ("song", Prol. 7) which was composed according to the *sacra vatam* ("rites of the bards", Prol. 7). This dissociation from the epic realm continues on a slightly different track as Persius dismisses other poets as untalented hacks (see chapter three, p. 54, on the manner of this attack): although Persius utilises the *recusatio* to dissociate himself from epic poetry, it is

⁵ Barr (1987) 64.

with a wicked stab at its typical practitioners, as if to actually claim superiority over them. Persius, then, seems unapologetic here, and appears glad in his supposed *apologia* that he doesn't have to mix with epic poets due to his 'flaws'.

Juvenal's programmatic first satire immediately sets up the angry tone which he will apply to his satiric targets: in this case, his indignation is being utilised in his *recusatio*, aimed at the epic genre which he criticises openly to explain his alternative writing path. It soon becomes clear that he is attacking epic's "trite mythological content"⁶, which we will later regularly find to be the most apparent target of Juvenal's subversive exploitation of the epic genre; we shall also see in chapter three that Juvenal regularly and skilfully exploits the style and language of epic in his satires (perhaps more so than any other satirist), and so he has no need for a self-deprecating *apologia*. A rhetorical question opens the first poem (and, in fact, the entire work as a whole): *semper ego auditor tantum?* ("Must I always be just the listener?", I.1). Within just four words, Juvenal manages to establish both his background as a pupil of rhetoric and oratory, as well as the irate tone of his subsequent satiric persona⁷ - the use of the word *tantum* announces to the reader Juvenal's contrary, forthcoming role as a speaker rather than a listener, which Braund rightly views as a kind of revenge against the forced attendance at recitals of the low quality works such as he is about to criticise⁸. It should be noted that, while the epic genre is undoubtedly the main target of Juvenal's criticism in the rest of this satire (and elsewhere), his indignation at this point also extends to other genres: comedy (*togatas*, I.3), elegy (*elegos*, I.4) and tragedy (represented by the hackneyed subjects of Telephus (I.5) and Orestes (I.6)) are also brought in as genres whose recitals have become viewed as crimes which go unpunished (*inpune*, I.3)⁹. The essential basis of Juvenal's attack here seems to be a combination of regularly excessive length and an over-familiar lack of originality, thereby justifying his preference for satire's snappy, almost epigrammatic immediacy and novelty. Juvenal later adds a further *recusatio*, suggesting that nature seems to have denied him any ability in composing epic (*natura negat*, I.79)¹⁰; however, nature has seen fit to instead furnish him with a great and vitriolic anger (*indignatio*, I.79), which Juvenal evidently sees as a fair swap, since it essentially allows his entry into the satiric realm.

⁶ Winkler (1989) 425.

⁷ Courtney (1980) 83 and Braund (1996) 75 both view the omission of a verb (either *ero* or *sim* would fit) as a sign of indignation, as if Juvenal is tripping over his angry words.

⁸ Braund (1996) 75; this view is then backed up by *reponam* (I.1), as Juvenal explains his response.

⁹ Henderson (1995) 102 notes that Juvenal has, in just six lines, attacked "at least the entire scene of poetic productivity in his Rome."

¹⁰ Scott (1927) 4 sees this conventional self-deprecation as being made "probably quite ironically", since, as will become clear in chapter three, Juvenal is actually quite capable of exploiting the grand style.

Satire Versus Epic

Of all the Roman satirists, Ennius is potentially the most interesting to analyse with regard to his view on the relationship between the satiric and epic genres: as the initial composer of poems labelled *saturae*, and more widely recognised as a pioneer in the epic genre for his *Annales*, Ennius' position as a practitioner of both genres is unique. The former point is clouded by the nature of 'satire' in Ennius' day: the collection of poems on various themes which comprise our remnants of Ennius' satires lacks the elements of abuse, moralising, and wit which Lucilius would later use to change the genre into its more recognisable form. Although we cannot be certain in which genre Ennius indulged first, the latter point still remains relevant: the prospect of an epicist going on to compose satires immediately suggests that some crossover may occur, in that Ennius might include epic references or stylistic devices in a somewhat less serious and reverential tone or context than would have been required in the composition of the *Annales*; and if his satires preceded his epic work, then any subversive epic moments in his satires would at least show Ennius' eventual maturing attitude towards the epic genre¹¹. The fragmentary nature of all of Ennius' work may also create some biases, since the satires are said to have consisted of four books¹², yet we possess less than thirty lines: however, a fair proportion of these satiric lines, along with other evidence for the books' contents, *does* hint at a degree of elevated epic style and language (although in a variety of meters beyond just the hexameter), possibly indicating its more general presence throughout all four satiric books.

Only once in Ennius' satires do we perceive a direct comment on the connection between the two genres, in an interesting address to Ennius' poeticism, which actually exploits epic imagery on several levels: *Enni poeta salve qui mortalibus | versus propinas flammeos medullitus* ("hail, o poet Ennius, who passes on to mortals the flaming verses that were drawn from your own heart", 6-7W). Apart from the mythological and military imagery within this remark¹³ (discussed at chapters five, p. 105, and eight, pp. 171-2, respectively), Ennius names himself (or rather the persona addresses Ennius, but the self-realisation nevertheless remains) as being apart from mortal men, and our satirist is thus raised to a godlike level: this arrogance may have been appropriate in epic, where the important events and characters, coupled with the genre's universal appeal, could withstand and justify an author's self-opinions (or the outside praise from others) of grandeur and longevity, but its application to satire seems ironically deluded¹⁴. Ennius' "flaming verses"

¹¹ As Duff (1937) 39 points out, the "light manner" of Ennius' satires is very different to "the elevation of the author's tragic and epic style".

¹² I accept the view by Warmington (1935) 382 that Donatus' claim of six books seems unlikely.

¹³ According to Petersmann (1999) 294, *medullitus* would also suggest comedic imagery.

¹⁴ Rudd (1986) 87 is uncertain whether the elevation of the lines is serious or mocking; I prefer the latter.

of satire are hence being viewed as just as grandly important as epic verses, which does perhaps seem the obvious outcome from a writer in both genres.

Horace, on the other hand, is not shy about admitting the flaws of the satiric genre in contrast to higher realms: in the fourth satire, he even momentarily casts doubt on “whether this type of writing [i.e. satire] can be called poetry” (*iustum sit necne poema*, i.IV.63)¹⁵. In both this satire and the tenth, he also utilises criticism of Lucilius to show that he is not blind to the perceived public view of satire as an unworthy genre. Horace states that Lucilius’ verse was made up of *incomposito ... pede* (“disarrayed feet”, i.X.1), but that his predecessor’s wit should be praised at the same time. He continues by juxtaposing the good characteristics of satiric ambition that Lucilius displayed, as well as the skills he lacked, climaxing in the key feature that Horace hopes to mimic, that is “to be at once the orator and the poet” (*defendente vicem modo rhetoris atque poetae*, i.X.12). The emphasis on these two elevated aspects of ‘good satire’ might perhaps show that Horace fully intends his satiric works to be favourably compared with higher genres in terms both of content and style. However, Horace actually refutes this while discussing Lucilius’ penchant for the inclusion of Greek words in his satiric works (i.X.20ff.): this could be seen as an attempt by Lucilius to raise his poems to a higher level, but Horace feels that it is inappropriate for Lucilius to wish that his satires be regarded on a par with epic or tragedy, since there is a time and place for Greek poetry, which is neither oratory nor satire. It is clear that Horace wanted a degree of “Latinity” to exist in his work, as opposed to any “foreign importations”¹⁶ (since it was, after all, Roman vice that he was satirising); his disaffection with Greek poetry, which he states that he had written in his youth (i.X.31), helps to show that he was keen to respect the satiric genre as a unique entity from higher genres, yet still sought some level of recognition for it.

After opining that Lucilius would have been a more accomplished poet if he had been born a century later, living in Horace’s own era (i.X.67ff.), Horace makes his two main points of advice for aspiring poets: first, to constantly rewrite in a bid for perfection (*saepe stilum vertas*, i.X.72); and second, not to seek to be admired by the crowd (*neque te ut miretur turba labores*, i.X.73). This is in total contrast to the typical authors of sloppy epic, who desire fame and adulation: Horace claims to ignore the derision of the masses, preferring instead the acceptance of Maecenas’ circle of literary friends (and other renowned authors) for his well-polished poetry (i.X.81). Horace’s final line of the satire (and the whole book) perhaps shows the satirist’s ego as possessing some of this critical

¹⁵ As Krenkel (1972) 7 points out on this poem, “Horace, in 38BC, when he was 27 years old and wrote satire i.IV, had already a relatively clear conception of *satura*, as he saw it”.

¹⁶ Both terms are Brown’s (1993), pp. 85 and 186 respectively.

disdain: *i, puer, atque meo citus haec subscribe libello* (“go, boy, and swiftly attach this to my little book”, i.X.92). Horace’s use of the word *citus* possibly gives away his eagerness for the completion of his book; he is thus tarring himself with the same brush as the ambitious young writers of epic whom he has denounced in the above lines, proving that artistic ambition is a common poetic flaw to both epicists and satirists.

Juvenal’s need to write is partly inspired by the prevalent needs of the ‘bards’ to fill up reams of paper with their musings - Juvenal’s use in his first satire of the aggrandising word *vatibus* (I.18 - equivalent to the similarly aggrandised English word ‘bards’) is undoubtedly ironic in the surrounding context of untalented hack poets¹⁷, and he concedes that he will not be adding himself to *their* ranks, but rather will follow his satiric predecessors. More specifically, Juvenal’s need to write satire simply comes from all of the despicable and degraded sights that he has seen, leading up to the realisation then that “it is hard *not* to write satire” (*difficile est saturam non scribere*, I.30). Juvenal sees the need for both satire and higher literary forms, but is unashamed to choose the former over the latter, given its more immediate relevance to the present’s lack of morality; his rejection of the epic genre is not entire, though, as we will regularly find its lofty style being adopted within his satires (covered throughout chapter three).

‘Epic-bashing’

In addition to the general, generic comments discussed above, the satirists often attacked specific areas associated with the epic genre, which is directly linked to the *recusatio* as a means of belittling the usual genre of choice and thereby making satire look more appealing. Lucilius is the first to carry out a specific act of ‘epic-bashing’, as he discusses the need for a philosophical way of thinking, so that superstition can be overcome by a rational, scientific approach. He comments on the fact that many people believe in witches (*Lamias*, 524W / 484M), living statues (526-8W / 486-8M), and all sorts of other omens (*portenta*, 520W / 480M) and monsters (*monstra*, 521W / 481M), but the most terrifying of all of these creatures is the Cyclops Polyphemus, whose immense size means that he must use a ship’s mast as a walking stick (*bacillum*, 522W / 482M). It is exactly this kind of charming and realistic attention to detail, perpetrated by all epicists in their treatments of myths and legends, which causes such superstitious terror in mankind. Lucilius attempts to mock this irrational fear by ensuring that such terrifying monsters are clearly labelled as having been drawn from a work of fiction (*ficta*, 529W / 489M), and are simply the product of “an artist’s gallery” (*pergula pictorum*, 529W / *pergula fictorum*,

¹⁷ Scott (1927) 67 goes as far as saying that it is a “travesty of the high meaning of the word”.

489M)¹⁸: *ficta* diminishes the epic works of Homer and others as mere flights of fancy, and not the authoritative historical documents of legendary deeds that some naïve readers might take as fact (the diminishing effect on Polyphemus himself will be touched on briefly at chapter five, pp. 117-8). This belittlement of the very essence of the epic realm recurs when Lucilius later claims to have become hateful (*contemnificus*, 666W / 654M) towards Agamemnon - the character stands as representative of all mythological writing (and particularly the epic and tragic genres), and is intended to symbolise the repetitiveness and lack of originality that has now crept into these genres, thus incurring Lucilius' wrath.

This contempt for the epic genre's characters has been transformed and transferred onto its authors as well by Persius' time: he characterises poor epic poets in his generally subversive Prologue as parrots and magpies (*psittaco ... | picamque*, Prolog. 8-9). This piece of animal imagery is doubly applicable: first, the parrot and magpie are both renowned for their abilities to imitate human speech¹⁹, implying that most epicists are simply regurgitating and copying their predecessors' works rather than themselves composing. Secondly, however, is the extended implication of reward: a pet parrot can be trained to recite on command by bribing it with food, and magpies are renowned for their love of shiny metal objects²⁰ – these poor epic poets, then, merely regurgitate their own diluted work in the hope of some reward, be it money or food²¹ (see chapter three, p. 54, for more on this bird imagery). Persius also mocks these worthless poets in his first satire, considering their poetry to be unworthy of the praise it receives, but rather more deserving of *scombros* and *tus* (“fish” and “incense”, I.43)²². A so-called “custom of the bards” (*vatibus hic mos est*, V.1 – again, the word *vatibus* is ironic) is criticised in Persius' fifth satire, namely the invocation of the Muses²³ (this motif will be discussed further at chapter four, pp. 83-5). This hackneyed demand for poetic inspiration is perpetrated by those poets who would gladly tackle the already over-favoured mythological tales of Procne or Thyestes - or rather, to use Persius' original expression, “would boil their cauldrons” (*si quibus aut Procnes aut si quibus olla Tyestae | fervebit saepe*, V.7-9); Persius' reference to the mythological characters is certainly dismissive²⁴, but he has the more focused intention here of mocking and criticising such overblown and unoriginal poets.

¹⁸ While both choices of word here carry a sense of fabricated unreality in these creations, I prefer *pictorum*.

¹⁹ Austin (1961) 146 notes this “anthropomorphic” quality in parrots, while magpies are just “noisy” (p. 226).

²⁰ Austin (1961) 146 establishes “the ease with which they [i.e. parrots] are trained”, and considers magpies and other types of jay to be “notorious thieves” (p. 226).

²¹ Gowers (1993a) 8 paraphrases that “the stomach is the real muse of poetry”.

²² Barr (1991) 73 explains that badly-written poetry would have been used as wrapping paper for these items.

²³ Hinds (1998) 40 labels the custom as “a cliché, a dead horse being flogged at an exhausted Hippocrene”, evidently referring back to the deflation of the Muses' spring in Persius' Prologue.

²⁴ Gildersleeve (1979) 156 notes the “balance” between the two myths of cannibalism: “Procne served up her son, Thyestes made a meal of his”.

Juvenal's first satire makes several derogatory statements about the nature of epic poetry in Rome. He criticises the length and familiarity of the tragic and epic works that are being produced, but notes that such literary patrons as Fronto²⁵ still allow these uninspired poems to resound throughout their grounds, rather than anything more worthy: *Frontonis platani convolsaque marmora clamant | semper et adsiduo ruptae lectore columnae* ("Fronto's plane trees are always shouting, as are his marble columns, shaken and smashed by continuous readings", I.12-3). The clouding of these cacophonous recitals with *semper* and *adsiduo* allows Juvenal to reach the expected conclusion: "you get these same things from the best and worst poets" (*expectes eadem a summo minimoque poeta*, I.14), implying the extent of self-proclaimed 'poets' in Rome. Such poets are further attacked in the third satire, as Juvenal ranks "the recitations of poetry in the summer heat" (*Augusto recitantes mense poetas*, III.9) as being more prolific and unbearable than any threat of fire or ruin in the city. This statement foreshadows the third satire's main persona, Umbricius, when he lists his inability to appreciate bad poetry among his unsuitable qualities for life in the city at the present time (III.41 ff.). The extent of this bad poetry seems to have even afflicted the Emperor himself: Juvenal jokes in the eighth satire that Nero's crimes were worse than those similarly perpetrated by Orestes (a comparison that will be discussed further in chapter five, pp. 99-100), because Nero had also written an awful epic about Troy (*Troica*, VIII.221). Both figures' acts of murder are made to look frivolous here against the subsequent, most damning charges: that of all of the brutal legacies left over from Nero's tyrannical reign, it should be his artistic pretensions and foul composition (*foedo ... cantu*, VIII.225) that ought to be avenged (*ulcisci*, VIII.222).

Seneca makes two witty remarks about epic writing. Firstly, he ironically sets himself up as an historian (*historico*, I.1), suggesting that his authoritative account of fantastical and fictional events may be a parody of works of historic epic: his point is that it is ridiculous for the public to accept highly-praised fiction as the truth²⁶. Secondly, he mocks the grandeur which epic poets unnecessarily display by rephrasing several allusive hexameters to the time of year into a more direct expression of the date (*dies III idus Octobris*, II.2 - i.e. October 13th), before labelling this latter exact statement as "too plain" (*nimis rustice*, II.3): Seneca ironically implies that the details of the time of day and year do in fact require this inflating hexameter, regardless of how uneconomical an expression they are (these hexameter lines will be themselves discussed at chapter three, pp. 67-8). Petronius tackles such implied rules of epic style with Eumolpus' ironic prelude (118) to

²⁵ The name apparently signifies a man who entertained many poetic recitals at his house - cf. Braund (1996) 77 ("not unlike Pliny himself") and Courtney (1980) 86.

²⁶ Duff (1937) 92 explains a further joke "that Claudius plumed himself on being a historian".

his own display of contemptible epic²⁷: the failure of Eumolpus' epic poem on the Civil War to back up these pompous claims by possessing the relevant poetic virtues just described shows that the ridiculous target of Petronius' satiric intentions here is neither Lucan, who had famously composed an epic on the same subject (see p. 29 below), nor Virgil, whose style and motifs seem to have been adapted in Eumolpus' poem (discussed at chapters three, p. 68, and four, p. 79, respectively), but is in fact Eumolpus himself, since he epitomises the ignorant and arrogant authors of poor epic.

Good Epic Required

In spite of these attacks on epic, there are occasionally good words to be spoken by the satirists about their generic 'opponent': it is not the entire epic genre that is criticised as being poor, but rather those blatantly poor epic works with inappropriate pretensions (which are, however, obviously implied as being in the majority). As mentioned above (pp. 15-6), Lucilius advises his would-be poet friend that an author's goal must ultimately be praise and profit (*laudem* and *fructum*, 713W / 620M), two rewards that a mere satirist would never be able to acquire; subsequently, Lucilius actually recommends the highly laudable and popular epic genre to his ambitious friend. His recommendation that his friend should "make noise of Popilius' battle, and sing of Cornelius' deeds" (*percrepa pugnam Popili, facta Corneli cane*, 714W / 621M) not only contains military events and verbal imperatives that are both appropriate to epic's subject matter and compositional tone respectively, but also possesses the clever clarification of suggesting not only historical epic in preference to mythological epic, but more specifically *modern* historical epic in preference to *ancient* historical epics²⁸. Lucilius justifies his advice by illustrating the difference between ancient and modern subjects in epic: the former rises "from troubled times" (*ex saevis ... tempestatibus*, 717W / 626M), the latter from a more peaceful era (*in tranquillum*, 717W / 626M). The explicit suggestion, then, is that the more recent events would be slightly easier subjects for research and composition; however, Lucilius also implicitly suggests two contrasting traits that modern historical epic possesses - it is both original, in comparison to other epicists' trite and unappealing topics, and it is more likely to gain financial reward, since its main characters are still alive. Lucilius' delegation of the task of revitalising the epic genre to his friend hence comes not only from his own supposed lack of compositional ability, but also from an apparent interest in epic.

²⁷ Luck (1972) 133 elaborates that "we might call it a piece of literary criticism in verse ... he supplements his objections with a piece of truly constructive criticism", an overly serious view of Eumolpus' 'talents'.

²⁸ Warmington (1938) 229 notes the respective dates of these commanders' clashes with the Numantines as 138BC and 133 BC, therefore contemporary with Lucilius' composition.

As Juvenal's anger gradually subsides over the course of his satires, so we find that his indignant attitude towards the practitioners of bad epic, as shown in his first satire, is replaced by sentiments essentially similar to Lucilius' earlier opinion. The seventh satire opens with a typical Roman epic flourish, namely the adulation of the Emperor: *et spes et ratio studiorum in Caesare tantum* ("writing's hope and reason lie entirely in Caesar's hands", VII.1). Juvenal explains the Emperor's role as 'poetic last resort' by pointing out his sole respect (*respexit*, VII.3) for the Muses (*Camenas*, VII.2): it hence seems clear that the satirist shall be directing his indignation at those people who do *not* respect the Muses (ironically, the satirists will themselves be shown at chapter four, pp. 83-6, to disrespectfully poke some fun at the Muses), in the sense of providing opportunity or patronage for upcoming writers at Rome. The fate of poets under this apparently restrictive system is Juvenal's initial angle, and he is keen to show the disparity of their fates, setting the poets up as famous and well-known (*celebres notique*, VII.3), before knocking them down as the owners of baths and ovens (*balneolum* and *furnos*, VII.4). But fame and fortune are available, says Juvenal, if one writes epic²⁹, loftily alluded to as "melodious music" (*canoris ... modis*, VII.18-9) and by the poetically inspiring activity of chewing laurel (VII.19). It is perhaps ironic that Juvenal now appears to be condoning the composition of epic, after decrying the vast quantity of dreary epic that was being written in his first satire. However, this may be connected with the weakening of Juvenal's indignation since the early satires³⁰, as he now at least recognises that there is a need for (well-written, *canoris modis*) epic. The satirist returns to a mention of the Emperor, or rather his indulgence personified (*ducis indulgentia*, VII.21), which is actively encouraging the pursuit of epic: at this point, Juvenal's praise for the Emperor from the first few lines may start to lose its sincerity slightly, since his respect for the *Camenas* (specifically, Muses of epic) appears exclusive, and writers of other genres may not thrive under the Emperor. I would argue, however, that Juvenal's apparent about-face regarding epic poetry is brought into perspective by his clarification that epic should now be composed in a much more disciplined and appropriate manner than it had been had been by the untalented epicists attacked in his earlier satires, and so his praise for the Emperor, who may be able to allow this to happen by his patronage, is sincerely intended: Juvenal feels that it is better that good epic poetry be written than no poetry at all (even to the extent that the non-epicist Telesinus (VII.25) is told to dispose of his current poems in favour of the epic genre).

²⁹ Hardie (1990) 149 points out that suggesting a genre to a writer was already a satiric theme (as found at Lucilius 714W / 621M above, and throughout Horace's *Satires* ii.I).

³⁰ Braund (1988) devotes much of her work to discussing the diminishing anger of Juvenal's satires as they progress; Anderson (1962) 153 also notices that "the tone of the introduction differs radically from that which the satirist used in his savage assaults on Domitian's memory in Book 1".

Name-dropping

It is one of the innate qualities of Roman satire that the satirists use specific names of people to put across their ideas: unfortunately, for a modern reader, the relevance of these names is lost if we do not have any other context in which to put them – all we can say is that, ultimately, the names must refer, whether directly or obliquely, to a specific person, living or dead (or even fictional!), in order to be relevant. When it comes to the naming of specific epicists and their works, however, we have the advantage of knowing most of these poets from the continued existence of their works today. And whether their inclusion is for the purpose of a criticism against their own particular brand of epic styling, or as an example of how good epic can and should be written, or even just an attempt at exploiting a ‘higher’ and more lauded poet by their association with the accompanying satiric text, all of the key epic writers feature to some extent throughout the satiric genre.

Homer: Homer was, of course, ranked as perhaps the greatest poet, and so it is no surprise that the satirists all have a close acquaintance with his works; what is perhaps surprising is their treatment of this literary legend. Lucilius brings Homer’s *Iliad* into a discussion (401-10W / 338-47M) on the difference between *poema* (a small poem of the kind Lucilius himself was writing) and *poesis* (a much longer verse work, such as an epic poem). He argues that Homer’s work is beyond criticism because of its length, and any blame should be merely levelled at “an individually faulty verse, word, phrase, or passage” (*versum unum, verbum, enthymema, locumve*, 410W / ... *entymema, locum unum*, 347M). This devotion to Homer’s style does nevertheless introduce a sense that the Greek poet was perhaps not perfect; when Horace reiterates in his tenth satire that Lucilius essentially ignored “great Homer’s” flaws (*tu nihil in magno doctus reprehendis Homero*, i.X.52), he implies that Homer’s work evidently *did* have faults. Persius also mentions Homer’s work³¹ with negative connotations in his first satire, diminishing the *Iliad* as less preferable to him than his own satires (*nulla tibi vendo | Iliade*, I.122-3): the epic work evidently stands for the entire genre here in a clear attempt to elevate satire’s standing.

Juvenal usually brings in Homer’s name for the sake of a joke, whether it is at the expense of the author himself or someone else. In his sixth satire, Juvenal notes how the ‘blue-stocking’ women dare to voice their literary opinions at dinner-parties, including their comparison of the works of Homer (*Homerum*, VI.437) and Virgil (*Maronem*, VI.436); the stunned reaction of the men (VI.438-9) might suggest that such a comparison is actually flawed and embarrassing, but is admittedly more likely to indicate that the

³¹ Gildersleeve (1979) 101 actually takes the name *Iliad* here to refer to Labeo’s work of the same name (Labeo having already been mentioned at I.4 and I.50, as noted at p. 30 below); he considers that “Homer’s *Iliad* would be too extravagant” to cite in this context, although that is perhaps Persius’ point.

women have managed to intellectually outdo their male counterparts. In his seventh satire, Juvenal jokes that the stereotypical, worthless epicists arrogantly concede that Homer is the greatest poet only because his epics were composed “a thousand years ago” (*propter mille annos*, VII.39); the satirist ironically implies that these untalented poets are unaware of any other reasons beyond age for which to praise Homer’s poetry. Homer is himself mocked (alongside, essentially, the entirety of the epic genre) in Juvenal’s tenth satire, when, in a reference to King Nestor’s longevity, the satirist makes the aside that this is only according to ‘great’ Homer, “if you can believe anything he says” (*magno si quicquam credis Homero*, X.246)! The idea that epic’s fantastical myths may have been less than honest is obviously neither an original thought, nor one that an educated man would contest; Juvenal’s tongue-in-cheek comment extends his mockery of Homer to those who would praise the epicist to the extent of treating his words as sacrosanct. Homer’s name is also briefly mentioned in the *Satyricon*, as one of the sources for the epicist Eumolpus’ poetic inspiration (118.5 - alongside Virgil and Horace, the latter of whom is, of course, ironically not even an epic poet³²); typically, Petronius’ specific targets here are both Eumolpus himself, who is regularly shown to be utterly inept in his poeticism, as well as the more general poets who would dare to hold themselves against these better writers.

Ennius: The initial example of Roman epic was Ennius’ *Annales*, and the Roman satirists were likewise aware of this work too. Lucilius merely mentions the work during his philosophising about the nature of poetry at lines 406W / 343M (see p. 24 above), showing his familiarity with the poem. Persius, however, actually mocks a passage from the work, and equally ridicules the author for having written it so straight-faced. Having quoted a line from the *Annales* in his sixth satire (and thereby acknowledging that the work had some merit - see chapter six, pp. 140-1, for further comment on this quotation), Persius mockingly recalls that “Ennius had once dreamt that he was both Homer and a peacock from Samos” (*destertuit esse | Maeonides, Quintus pavone ex Pythagoreo*, VI.10-11). These two lines parody Ennius’ statements from the *Annales* about his inspirational yet deluded visions of having become first Homer (*visus Homerus adesse poeta*, Ann. 6S), and then a peacock (*memini me fieri pavom*, Ann. 15S), compounded by the comical imagery of his snoring (*destertuit*) - note that Persius had also already mocked this dream in his Prologue (as will be shown at chapter four, p. 81). The humour of these hallucinations undermines Ennius’ epic authority from Persius’ earlier quotation; this is a good example of a satirist exploiting an epicist’s name by simultaneously mocking and praising him.

³² Slater (1990) 118 explains Horace’s inclusion as a showy example of “a newly fashionable literary name”.

Virgil: Although Virgil's *Aeneid* had not been published before Horace composed his satires, the satirist does mention Virgil's name on a handful of occasions: there is possibly an element of diminishment in the fact that Virgil is therefore never mentioned for his eventual fame as the greatest Roman epicist, but appears instead as a mere friend to Horace (i.VI.55, i.X.81), a fellow unsuitable voyager to Brundisium (i.V.40, i.V.48), and a rural poet (i.X.45). Literary criticism of Virgil's epic work does not appear until Persius' first satire, where the tendencies in the *Aeneid* towards grandeur and bombast are viciously yet humorously attacked by Persius' alter-ego: '*Arma virum*', *nonne hoc spumosum et cortice pingui | ut ramale vetus vegrandi subere coctum?* ("Weapons and the Man', surely that's frothy and fat, like a withered old stick on a stunted cork-tree's bark", I.96-7). This attack against the *Aeneid* (alluded to by its first two words³³) brings the grandest example of Roman poetry down into the same ranks as the tasteless modern-day works of so-called epicists: Persius' imagery is, of course, not very flattering, and surely somewhat inappropriate too, denouncing the florid style of one of the great works of Roman literature as so much excess weight and deadwood.

One of Juvenal's more amusing jokes regarding epic, and specifically Virgil, comes in his seventh satire, where he mocks the needs of poets to have financial backing by showing the effects of poverty and hunger on the poems themselves. Having first mocked Horace for supposedly only composing his *Odes* on a full stomach (*satur*, VII.62 - note the probable pun on 'satire' here)³⁴, Juvenal goes on to suggest that the epic sights³⁵ of chariots, horses, and gods (*currus et equos faciesque deorum*, VII.67) can only be fully expressed when one has no need to find a blanket (*opus nec de lodice paranda*, VII.66), his list of epic images culminating with the Virgilian reference to "the Fury bewildering the Rutulian" (*Rutulium confundat Erinys*, VII.68)³⁶. The poet's name is then explicitly mentioned in the following line, as Juvenal subversively jokes that, had Virgil been lacking the creature comforts of a slave or adequate housing (*si Vergilio puer et tolerabile desset | hospitium*, VII.69-70), his epic would have fallen flat, metaphorically represented by the ridiculous sights of the Fury losing her hair/snakes (*caderent omnes a crinibus hydri*, VII.70), and her trumpet-call to war (*bucina*, VII.71)³⁷ being muted (*surda*, VII.71). The

³³ Both Harvey (1981) 45 and Barr (1991) 80 note that Ovid refers to the *Aeneid* with the quoted words "*Arma virum*" at *Tristia* II.534, as does Martial at VIII.56.19 and XIV.185.2; Gildersleeve (1979) 95-6 also suggests that both the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* were known by their own respective opening words.

³⁴ Braund (1982) 165 clarifies the difference between Horace's genre here and the subsequent allusion to Virgil's work: "it is important for Juvenal's argument that he evoke Horace at the height of his *lyric* powers, just as he proceeds to evoke Virgil at the height of his *epic* powers".

³⁵ Wilson (1903) 70 explains that "epic poetry is suggested" by these motifs.

³⁶ *Aen.* 445ff. (as identified by Duff (1970) 268, Ferguson (1979) 221 and Braund (1988) 41, among others).

³⁷ *Aen.* 511ff.; Braund (1988) 59 believes that Juvenal is "detracting from the force of [his] point by ironic mockery" here, although I would argue that this sense of humour can only help his cause.

joke is extended to include a poor tragedian, Rubrenus Lappa, turning his character Atreus³⁸ into an auctioneer, selling off his crockery (*alveolos*, VII.73) and cloak (*laenam*, VII.73), a deflating juxtaposition of the literary character with the real (or at least satiric) world. Juvenal finally reverses the joke so that the authors suffer their works' fate: the poems' over-exposure to the lanterns' fumes causes Horace himself to become discoloured (*totus decolor esset* | *Flaccus*, VII.226-7), and Virgil to acquire a layer of black soot (*haereret nigro fuligo Maroni*, VII.227)³⁹. This comical exploitation of Virgil (and Horace) acts as a further subliminal deflation of the seriousness of other authors and their works, hence serving to further elevate the satiric genre by comparison.

Lucan: Lucan only briefly enters into the later satires; the first such occasion comes in a discussion on the respective success or failure of various epicists in Juvenal's seventh satire. Lucan is said to be "lying happy with his fame in his marble gardens" (*contentus fama iaceat Lucanus in hortis* | *marmoreis*, VII.79-80), an indication of his success that also subliminally suggests, rather unfairly, that Lucan may only have been an epicist for the profit implied by *marmoreis*. While not explicitly mentioned, Lucan also appears to be a target of criticism in the *Satyricon*, during Eumolpus' discussion on the 'rules of epic' (118). The specific details of Eumolpus' rules, combined with his own subsequent epic account of the *Bellum Civile* (119ff.), seem to suggest that Lucan's version is coming under oblique attack, since it did not follow Eumolpus' rules of divine intervention, mythological allusions, and willingness to replace historical accuracy with learned profundity⁴⁰. In fact, while Lucan is clearly being implicitly brought to the readers' attention in this list of rules, Eumolpus' account does not then actually go on to parody Lucan's *Bellum Civile* itself⁴¹; Petronius' point is instead that Eumolpus, who represents all similarly untalented poets, arrogantly claims superiority over truly decent poets like Lucan, but is completely ignorant of both Lucan's actual superiority and his own fundamental flaws.

Other Epic Authors: It is not just these renowned epic authors who are mentioned, both implicitly and explicitly, in the satires: other epicists are mentioned with varying levels of praise and disdain. Horace mentions an epicist called Furius in the fifth satire of his second book: *seu rubra Canicula findet* | *infantis statuas seu pinqui tentus omaso* | *Furius hibernas cana nive conspuet Alpīs* ("whether the red Dog star splits silent statues or

³⁸ Both Duff (1970) 269 and Ferguson (1979) 221 discuss whether Atreus (Agamemnon's father, and murderer of Thyestes' children) was an exclusively tragic character, or if he was also an epic figure.

³⁹ Braund (1988) 66 notes that both Horace and Virgil have experienced a distinct downfall from their heights at VII.62ff. (cf. footnote 34 above).

⁴⁰ Luck (1972) 135-6 discusses the traits of Lucan appropriate to Petronius' anonymous poet described here.

⁴¹ George (1974) 119, Coffey (1976) 193 and Slater (1990) 246 all agree that any moments of epic parody that do appear in this poem are aimed at Eumolpus' abilities, not Lucan's; Sullivan (1993) 156 admits that, even if there is a parodic side to Eumolpus' *Bellum Civile*, it is "not what could be called good parody".

whether Furius, bulging with fat tripe, sprays the wintry Alps with white snow”, ii.V.39-41). It has been suggested that this parodic, over-the-top epic metaphor for the weather (other examples will be discussed at chapter three, pp. 40-2) may have been adapted from Furius’ epic poetry⁴², suggesting his ranking as a poor epicist; it is also ironic that the prophet Teiresias has foretold Furius’ poetic ineptitude. The epicist Attius Labeo⁴³ comes in for criticism twice in Persius’ first satire, initially by being Persius’ literary opponent (I.4), before his *Iliad* is insulted as being “drunk with hellebore” (*non hic est Ilias Atti | ebria ueratro?*, I.50-1)⁴⁴. Juvenal’s first satire also takes a poor epicist to task, as Cordus’ work, the *Theseid*, is considered hoarse (*rauci*, I.2) and lengthy (*totiens*, I.2), a combination that thoroughly irritates our satirist’s sensibilities (*vexatus*, I.2). Juvenal’s literary criticism seems more measured in his seventh satire: the epicists Saleius and Serranus (VII.80)⁴⁵ are contrasted with their better-known contemporary Lucan (VII.79 – see p. 29 above), since, while the literary talents of all three poets have apparently been well-praised, it is only Lucan who has also received the more important (and more justified?) financial support. Statius (VII.83) is another epic poet whose work, the *Thebaid*, has attracted much praise, in this case the attention of the entire city (*laetam ... urbem*, VII.83), but few monetary rewards, causing him to sell his other work, the *Agave* (VII.87), to fend off starvation⁴⁶. Juvenal’s tenth satire also briefly mentions the historical epicist Sostratus, who is said to “compose with dripping wings” (*madidis cantat quae Sostratus alis*, X.178), an apparent insult however the phrase is interpreted⁴⁷. One final satiric joke at the expense of an epicist comes in the *Apocolocyntosis*, when the god Diespiter mockingly suggests that Claudius’ deification be included as a further chapter in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (IX.5)⁴⁸. Seneca’s allusion to the deification of both Romulus and Julius Caesar in *Metamorphoses* XIV-XV ironically elevates Ovid’s work as an authoritative historical tome, even in heaven; this joke typifies the satirists’ irreverence towards both the good and bad perpetrators of the epic genre, in an intentional attempt to raise their own genre’s profile by comparison.

⁴² Muecke (1993) 185 also discusses the various attempts at identifying Furius from this line.

⁴³ Harvey (1981) 15 mentions an Attius Labeo whose name was “preserved in inscriptions”; Gildersleeve (1979) 78 labels this epicist as “an unfortunate translator of Homer”.

⁴⁴ Barr (1991) 74 notes that hellebore was taken as “a stimulant for the intellect”, which Harvey (1981) 31 claims would hence cause “erratic and undisciplined composition” (perhaps Eumolpus was a partaker of the drug when composing his verses in the *Satyricon!*).

⁴⁵ Duff (1970) 269 and Ferguson (1979) 222 both provide brief synopses of these authors and their works.

⁴⁶ Jones (1982) 478-9 comments on the inappropriate surroundings of Statius’ appearance here, with both sexual language and an apparent pantomimic atmosphere.

⁴⁷ Scott (1927) 55 notes that the phrase *madidis ... alis* comes from *Met.* I.264, describing the wind Notus’ literally wet wings; Courtney (1980) 472 sensibly thinks that Juvenal is simply implying sweaty armpits from a heated recital, although the suggestion by Ferguson (1979) 266 that Juvenal is making an allusion to Icarus, whose attempts at (literally) flying high led to disaster, is attractive given Sostratus’ apparent epic failure.

⁴⁸ Eden (1984) 114 explains further that *Metamorphoses* here comes as “an unexpectedly comic substitution for the aridly official *fasti*, where such an event would have been recorded at Rome”.

Chapter 3 – Epic Style and Language

The aim of this chapter is to uncover the various instances in the extant satires where the language used, or the stylistic convention utilised, is intentionally borrowed or copied by the satirists from the general style and conventions of epic. A general point that carries throughout the passages discussed in this chapter is the existence of “the mock-heroic parodist”¹: that is, the satirists usually parody the ‘high’ style or language of epic by using it in relation to the typically ‘low’ content of satire, and often to an exaggerated extent. In my other chapters, we will generally find that it is the subject matter of the epic realm that is either being related in a base or crude manner, or is inappropriately juxtaposed with the lower figures and practices common to the satiric realm; in this chapter, however, these latter debauched activities or stock satiric lowlives are shown to be juxtaposed with the somewhat higher style that is being used to describe them². This technique will not only be shown to elevate the satiric material to a grander level of importance, but will also be seen to detract from the usual grandeur of the language or stylistic devices through parody and exaggeration; the result is that satire and epic are therefore brought closer together.

“The Grand Style”

Scott uses the above phrase in the title to her work on Juvenal’s satires: it allows her to approach the subject in a somewhat more general manner than simply labelling the technique as ‘epic style’, including Juvenal’s regular rhetorical motifs and his occasional allusions to tragedy. My own use of the phrase for the title of this first subsection has been similarly generalised to include such features as alliteration, archaisms³, asyndeton⁴, hyperbole, and didactic language, among others: essentially, these features momentarily convey a somewhat more elevated mood than might be expected given the satiric subject matter (but they are not as easily categorised as, say, similes or militaristic language). Although I am certainly indebted to Scott’s book in many ways, my own wider focus on this practice by other satirists as well as Juvenal not only sets my work apart from Scott’s, but also allows me a minor degree of brevity when discussing any Juvenalian passages that

¹ This phrase was coined by Hight (1962) 103: “a mock-heroic parodist pretends to be serious”.

² Troost (1995) 194 notes this general satiric motif of “comic incongruity by describing the commonplace in language normally applying to the magnificent and noble”; while Muecke (1995) 212 is generally correct that the difference between epic and satire is that “epic is written about heroes in the grand style, satire about scoundrels in the low style”, this thesis will show that there is often a lot of crossover in the satirists’ styles.

³ Von Albrecht (1997) 83 considers that “in the saturnian, apart from the rhythm, alliteration was an important feature of style”; he also notes that “epic preserved its privilege of using archaic ornament”.

⁴ D’Alton (1931) 112 explains the grandeur of asyndeton thus: “natural to an orator labouring under violent emotion, and seeking to give speedy release to thoughts straining at the leash”.

Scott has already discussed in greater detail. One misconception that might arise from Scott's title shall be addressed here: Juvenal should not be considered a "consistent practitioner of the high or grand style"⁵, since he actually uses it as just another weapon in his satiric arsenal; similarly, Juvenal does not have the satiric monopoly on "the grand style", as all the other satirists also regularly exploit a higher level of style and language.

We know from Ennius' *Annales* that he was capable of grand composition and stylistic elevation: their presence in his satiric work, of course, is not always as appropriate as in his epic material. The satirist's first fragment concerns a stock satiric character, the glutton: *malo hercle magno suo convivat sine modo!* ("by the gods, may he dine to excess, without limit, for the worse!", 1W) - this type of extremist character is elevated by the alliteration of the *m*'s, grandly conveying the sound of his consumption in a flowing line. A more obviously epic-influenced line appears to approach the didactic subjects of cosmology and creation: *contemplor | inde loci liquidas pilatasque aetheris oras* ("from that place, I watched the flowing and sturdy regions of ether", 3-4W). Since the didactic genre was identified with the epic genre (see chapter one, p. 7), the adoption of such an elevated topic in a satire is somewhat unexpected and incongruous⁶; in addition, the grandly archaic word *aetheris* suggests that Ennius was consciously subverting the high style of his *Annales* by utilising it in these supposedly 'lighter' poems⁷.

Of course, the combined problems of the fragmentary nature of Ennius' work, and his position as both satirist and epicist, mean that any lines with a higher level of style could simply be taken from the *Annales*, an issue that has divided commentators on at least one occasion. A fragment generally assigned to Ennius' satires can be seen to possess the general linguistic and stylistic feel of his epic (aided by its composition in hexameters)⁸: *testes sunt | lati campi quos gerit Africa terra politos* ("the wide fields which the African land brings to fruition are witnesses", 10-11W). This fragment has also on occasion been assigned either to the *Annales*, precisely because of this grander style, or instead to the *Scipio*, because of its similarity to a further fragment from this work by Ennius (*testes sunt campi magni, Scipio* 14W); a final confusion that shows the difficulties of fragmentary texts is that the above similarity of lines has even seen the *Scipio* misinterpreted as part of

⁵ Powell (1999) 312; he further clarifies that it is Juvenal's constant "mismatch of register" (p. 326) between the grandeur appropriate to epic and the lowliness of the satiric realm that should be noted, rather than just an emphasis on the higher style - Gifford (1992) vii defines satire's linguistic variety as veering "from the extravagances of mock-epic grandeur through the everyday discourse of polite gentlemen to explicit crudity".

⁶ Rudd (1986) 86 simply cites these as an example of "some elevated lines" in Ennius' satires.

⁷ Jocelyn (1972) 1026 also generally suggests that "Ennius parodied the metre and language of his own epic"; Petersmann (1999) 294 reaches "a similar conclusion".

⁸ Petersmann (1999) 293 compares the "elevated style" of this fragment with similar fragments of the *Annales* (e.g. 309S: *Africa terribili tremit horrida terra tumultu*).

Ennius' satires (as noted at chapter one, p. 2). My brief mention of this fragment here does at least show that, if these lines can ultimately be shown to be satiric, then my argument that even Ennius exploited the grand style in his satires would be strengthened.

Lucilius' satires may also be fragmentary, but at least we are not aware of any epic endeavours on his part: hence, whenever we come across a line attributed to Lucilius which seems to possess an elevated language and style inappropriate to his satires (outside of the more specific moments of epic parody discussed elsewhere), we can be more confident that they are an example of the satirist's intentional subversion of the grand style. The majority of Lucilius' lines show his lowly satiric context; his very first line, however, displays his occasional grandeur. The phrase *aetheris et terrae genitabile quaerere tempus* ("to search for the time which created heavens and earth", 1W / 1M) seems to suggest a grander programmatic statement than might be expected for a satirist, more appropriate in fact to a didactic account of creation. This establishment of a wider intention and scope is then reinforced and refocused in the following line, as Lucilius rhetorically blames the world around him, and society's emptiness, as the cause of his writing satirical poetry (*o curas hominum! O quantum est in rebus inane*, 2W / 9M). Two further Lucilian fragments feature elevated language and an abundance of style while covering the lowly topic of prostitution. In the first fragment, Lucilius appears to be making a grand statement about prayer: "wipe off your tears, and, having admitted our plans, let us pray with incense to the gods whether you shall be allowed, unpunished, to go whoring" (*absterge lacrimas et divos ture precemur | consilium fassi, placeatne impune luperis*, 249-50W / ... *placent tu ne impune luperis*, 206-7M). The sudden anticlimax of *luperis* ("whoring") turns the elevation of this solemn prayer to the gods on its head by descending into prostitution. The second fragment discusses the efforts of the courtesan Phryne to retain her beauty as she herself mentions that she is "shaved, under-plucked, peeled, scraped, preened, polished and painted" (*radior subvellor desquamor pumicor ornor | expolior pingor*, 296-7W / ... *expilior expingor*, 264-5M). The rushed asyndeton of these seven, generally obscene verbs is an intentional exploitation of a grand grammatical construction that is inappropriate for such language or indeed for such a lowly speaker⁹.

The first example of Horace's occasional exploitation of an elevated style comes in the opening line of his second satire: *ambubaiarum collegia, pharmacopolae* ("the guilds of Syrian flute-girls, the quack-doctors", i.II.1). Horace has cleverly filled the hexameter line with just three polysyllabic words, although the lowly figures described therein

⁹ Marx (1904) vol. II 100 discusses other appearances of these verbs, adding that their effect is "veluti Phrynen nobilem illam apparet".

(especially the Greek-derived *pharmacopolae*) serve to diminish this grand flourish¹⁰. In his fourth satire, Horace defends the satiric genre against accusations of simple maliciousness with a rhetorical series of ascending clauses (*qui* is repeated five times in i.IV.81-5), describing the kind of villain who does thrive on pain; his satiric indignation is then heightened by the subsequent “epic or oracular touch”¹¹ of the archaic imperative in *hunc tu, Romane, caveto* (“you ought to beware him, true Roman”, i.IV.85). The sixth satire has a more appropriate subject for these kind of stylistic touches, namely Maecenas’ grandfathers (*avus*, i.VI.3): their depiction alongside great legions (*magnis legionibus*, i.VI.4), compounded by the five-syllable, epic-style ending of *imperitarent* (i.VI.4)¹², is a suitably laudatory introduction for the grand family against whom Horace’s lower class will then be contrasted. Such grandeur is not just used as praise: in Horace’s eighth satire, the narrator Priapus-scarecrow tries to make the unreal witchcraft scene seem more vivid and realistic by using the mock-heroic emphasis of *vidi egomet* (“I’ve seen it myself”, i.VIII.23) to attest to its veracity¹³.

Horace’s exploitation of elevated style continues in his second book of satires. The elevated admonition in the first satire, *ter uncti | transnanto Tiberim somno quibus est opus alto | irriguumque mero sub noctem corpus habento* (“may those who need deep sleep rub themselves with oil, swim three times across the Tiber, and then cover their body with pure wine before nightfall”, ii.I.7-9), features such typical stylistic elevations as the repetition of an action three times, the heavy style of the alliterative *t*’s, and the internal assonance of *transnanto*; these combine with the battlefield image of an oiled-up torso to sit in humorous contrast against the contextual weakness of Horace’s insomnia¹⁴. Horace’s subsequent attempts at a *recusatio* in this satire (see chapter two, p. 17) are immediately subverted by the juxtaposition of these claims at epic incompetence with three lines of fairly impressive epic-style verse: *neque enim quivis horrentia pilis | agmina nec fracta pereuntis cuspide Gallos | aut labentis equo describit vulnera Parthi* (“for not just anyone can describe armies bristling with spears and Gauls perishing with broken blade or a Parthian’s injuries as he falls from his steed”, ii.I.13-5). Horace’s exploitation here of the typical style, imagery, and diction of epic is clearly at odds with the supposedly untalented satirist who has just composed them¹⁵. In his second satire, Horace suddenly juxtaposes the

¹⁰ Brown (1993) 101 labels this line as “a mock-heroic opening, ... undermined by the sleazy nature of its constituents”, and Fraenkel (1957) 76 suggests that the lines “give the impression of pomposity”.

¹¹ Brown (1993) 134.

¹² The metrically similar word *imperitarunt* can be found at the end of *DRN* III.1028.

¹³ Brown (1993) 172 notes an instance of this “mock-heroic touch” at *Aen.* III.623.

¹⁴ Muecke (1993) 102 considers the language to be appropriate for “legal advice or a medical prescription”.

¹⁵ Muecke (1993) 103 considers this line to be “reminiscent of archaic epic”, noting Ennius’ similar phrases *densantur campis horrentia tela virorum* (267S), and *horrescit telis exercitus asper utrimque* (384S).

general frivolity of a friendly banquet with Ofellus' *quasi*-invocation to Fortune: *saeviat atque novos moveat Fortuna tumultus* ("let Fortune rage and incite new disruptions", ii.II.126). This grand phrase seems to mimic an epic hero's typical resilience to an adverse god's will¹⁶; while the high style of the line does slightly jar with the preceding six lines of descriptive feasting, the farmer Ofellus sincerely fears that spiteful Fortune might seek to deprive him of his meagre property, and so this 'heroic' role of standing against any disasters thrown in his way has been forced upon him. The sixth satire also features a handful of grand stylistic elements during Horace's fable of the Town Mouse and the Country Mouse (ii.VI.79ff.). These include the repetitious phrases *murem mus* (ii.VI.80) and *veterem vetus* (ii.VI.81), the archaic word *leti* ("death", ii.VI.95), and the periphrastic expression *haec ubi dicta* ("when these things had been said", ii.VI.97)¹⁷. The tale of the contrasted Mice is therefore incongruously elevated to a grand level: but the mock-heroic Mice are made even more unsuitable for this accolade (beyond their mere animal status) by their respective satiric pursuits of lowly and extravagant feasts¹⁸.

Persius' style has been discussed in greater detail elsewhere¹⁹, although there remain a handful of relevant points to be discussed here. The very first line of his programmatic first satire, in fact, which is a quotation of the Lucilian line *o curas hominum! o quantum est in rebus inane!* (I.1 - see chapter six, p. 152), acts not only as an appeal to his satiric predecessor, but also exploits the aforementioned grandeur of that specific line (see p. 33 above) to apparently foreshadow Persius' further exploitation of the "grand style" in his work. This line is itself actually deflated when a second speaker²⁰ interrupts Persius, incredulously asking who would want to read such material (*quis leget haec*, I.2); Persius' response of *vel duo vel nemo* ("only a couple, or nobody at all", I.3) is an ironic comment on both the satiric genre and the pomposity of such an overblown programmatic statement. The constant jibes in this satire at the expense of stale epic and tragedy are afforded their own mocking grandeur: his sarcastic comment on the approval of the masses for such cheap entertainment is an epic cliché, *adsensere viri* ("the men

¹⁶ Muecke (1993) 129 simply notes here that "the tone rises to epic grandeur".

¹⁷ Muecke (1993) 208-211 notes at various points that: the repeated words are an example of "poetic sophistication producing a mock-heroic tone"; *letum* can be found in epic at *Ann.* 398S, *DRN* III.472, and *Aen.* II.134; and that Virgil utilises the phrase *haec ubi dicta* on several occasions (e.g. *Aen.* I.81).

¹⁸ Hudson (1993) 76 considers that "the satirist improves on Aesop's version by concentrating on the anthropomorphic joke in the idea of mice holding dinner-parties"; and Griffin (1993) 12 marks the incongruous juxtaposition of the lofty and lowly realms in this "fable presented in terms of good eating".

¹⁹ A useful overview is provided by Ramage (1974b) 127-133, who summarises various earlier comments on Persius' style as "harsh, angular, disconnected, grotesque, condensed, allusive, and crabbed" (p. 127).

²⁰ Coffey (1976) 101 notes the difficulties in assigning specific lines to the interlocutor, separate from the author's central satiric persona; Hendrickson's reported remedy of counting the first satire as a monologue is somewhat unsatisfactory, leaving the most appealing solution as considering the exchange as an 'inner dialogue' between the side of Persius that wants to write satire, and his more practical and realistic side.

approved”, I.36), which is then echoed by *laudant convivae* (“the guests shouted their approval”, I.38); the two phrases paint the ignorant audience as epic warriors cheering the speaker at a banquet²¹. Persius also uses grand expressions for authoritative emphasis, just as Horace had done before him: for example, when the satirist lets his readers in on the secret that he has found out (namely, that everyone has donkey-ears), he exploits the emphatic and repetitive cliché *vidi, vidi ipse* (“I saw it, I saw it myself”, I.120)²².

Juvenal’s exploitation of the “grand style” usually serves to elevate the satiric figures described therein to inappropriately heroic levels; in the fourth satire, for example, Juvenal’s high tone helps to turn both Domitian (whose role will be discussed further at chapter five, pp. 100-1) and the big fish (likewise, at chapter eight, pp. 181-2) into mock-heroes. The presence of the archaic word *induperatorem* (IV.29)²³ is an early hint at the poem’s more pervasive use of certain grand features once Domitian becomes the poem’s central figure; however, in keeping with Juvenal’s overall mockery of Domitian, this grand word is debased alongside the lowly word *gluttisse* (“guzzled”, IV.28)²⁴, illustrating one of Juvenal’s most common subversive tricks in his satires, namely the juxtaposition of high-flown phrases with common or street language²⁵. Juvenal also uses an overly-grand device to describe Domitian’s ridiculous “Mini-Me” figure, Crispinus (see chapter five, p. 101), creating the ‘golden’ chiasmic line with plodding meter, *et matutino sudans Crispinus amomo* (“Crispinus, sweating under his morning lotion”, IV.108)²⁶.

Juvenal actually contemplates the nature of his occasional exploitation of the “grand style” in the conclusion to his sixth satire. The satirist considers whether his various connections between contemporary female sinners and literary heroines and villainesses (Juvenal’s actual myths and characters will be discussed at chapter five, p. 115) could cause his criticisms of women to be seen as not being based on reality, but rather as entering into the lofty (*altum*, VI.634 / *grande*, VI.636) realms of epic and tragedy; Juvenal follows Persius’ lead here (Persius V.1-21), as he “considers, only to reject ... that the high style may have intruded into his satire”²⁷, since it is supposedly the high characters themselves who are intruding into the real world (VI.638ff.). Elsewhere, however, the

²¹ Harvey (1981) 28 cites the examples of *Aen.* II.130 (*adsensere omnes*) and *Met.* IX.259 (*adsensere dei*), as does Gildersleeve (1979) 85, observing “the Epic vein”.

²² Harvey (1981) 51 suggests that this phrase was also typical in the legal realm.

²³ Braund (1996) 242 calls *induperator* “a dignified word, rendered incongruous by the context of gluttony” - its epic appearances include *Ann.* 83S, 326S, and 347S, as well as *DRN* IV.967 and V.1227; Powell (1999) 326 also notes the “mockery in Juvenal’s use of the archaic form” here.

²⁴ Courtney (1980) 206 clarifies that *gluttisse*, “even if not onomatopoeic in origin, is certainly undignified and totally foreign to elevated style” - a comedic instance of the form *gluttias* is Plautus *Persa* 94.

²⁵ Braund (1996) 271 calls this technique “tonal alteration”.

²⁶ Ferguson (1979) 168 simply labels this phrase as “mock-epic”.

²⁷ Smith (1989a) 813.

“grand style” can be seen to fleetingly enter Juvenal’s satires, in order to elevate the mundane into epic levels. In the eleventh satire, for example, the most important affairs of society are said to be the results of the *Megalesiacae* (XI.193): this six-syllable coinage for a racing event honouring the goddess Cybele²⁸ nevertheless does simply describe a mere game, as shown by the belittling juxtaposition of a napkin (*mappae*, XI.193 - i.e. the starting flag). The presiding magistrate of the games, the *praetor* (XI.195), is also subversively elevated and then deflated, as his mock-triumphant posing (*similisque triumpho*, XI.194) cannot hide his own deflating love of the races (*praeda caballorum*, XI.195). In the fourteenth satire, the influence of the evil parents over their innocent children must be appropriately aggrandised: hence, Juvenal places a hyperbolic thousand teachers (*mille ... magistros*, XIV.12) at each of the children’s ears (although even these grand levels of collected teachers are unable to avert the innocents from their downfalls). Finally, in the fifteenth satire, Juvenal elevates the feud between the two Egyptian towns, Ombi and Tentyra (XV.35), with the grand phrase *inmortale odium* (“undying hatred”, XV.34), an elevated juxtaposition for their subsequent lowly acts of cannibalism²⁹.

Catalogues

A common stylistic device within the epic genre is the catalogue: while epic catalogues vary greatly in terms of size, content and format, their general form is a list, comprising of several names, places, or items with a common feature or trait, that is built up in order to convey their importance. It is worth noting here some of the most important catalogues to be found in the epic genre, so that we can then see how the satirists subsequently exploited the device in comparison. Homer’s catalogue of ships and officers in the latter half of *Iliad* II is seen as the archetype for an epic catalogue, as the poet simply lists hundreds of soldiers’ names, surprisingly few of which actually occur in the later story; the countless men have sailed from Boeotia, Aspledon, Locria, Argos, and numerous other places from around the known world, thus emphasising the extent of the war’s influence. Virgil’s catalogue of the assembled warriors at *Aen.* VII.640-817 is not as seemingly superfluous as Homer’s catalogue of ships in *Iliad* II, since many of the characters, such as Camilla and Mezentius, will play crucial roles in the war at Latium during the later books (at *Aen.* XI.539-828 and X.684-908 respectively), rather than being seemingly forgotten as soon as they are mentioned as in Homer’s catalogue. Lucan and

²⁸ Juvenal’s “mockingly lofty description” (Scott (1927) 68) of the event is probably his own invention, since it does not occur elsewhere.

²⁹ While Ferguson (1979) 318 merely considers that “the language is mock-epic”, Courtney (1980) 599 notes that Juvenal is probably quoting Statius’ use of the phrase in his epic *Thebaid* (at IV.609).

Ovid both feature catalogues of animals in their epic poems: Lucan's list of snakes at *BC* IX.604-937, although seemingly just a huge digression, is perhaps intended to ironically foreshadow Cleopatra's death by snakebite (which Lucan's work never actually reaches, however), while Ovid's catalogue of dogs at *Met.* III.206ff. is probably intended as a subtle parody of the catalogue device, since it ends with the phrase "and others too long to name" (*quosque referre mora est, Met.* III.225), effectively diminishing the previous list.

Satire's exploitation of catalogues tends to follow this playful example of Ovid, either by including somewhat inappropriate satiric characters instead of earlier epic's grand heroes (essentially, creating a "rogues' gallery", as it were), or by ridiculing the laborious cataloguing process itself. Juvenal appears to be the only satirist with obvious catalogues in his work, although Horace's grand introduction to the comical combatants Sarmentus and Messius at i.V.54ff. (see chapter eight, pp. 177-8) could be considered a catalogue (despite having only two entries), and the fragmentary nature of Lucilius' work, as well as the apparent loss of a middle section to Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, may hide a more traditional use of the catalogue for citing the members present at their respective councils of the Gods. Juvenal's subversive use of the technique, however, becomes apparent right from its first appearance in his first satire: this catalogue contains the stock characters of the satiric world, such as effeminate men, masculine women, and millionaire barbers (I.22-50), whose presence here practically demand that somebody writes a satire about them (I.30). Another rogues' gallery is used in the second satire, as hypocritical villains denounce their own crimes (II.24ff.): this irony is later enhanced by the juxtaposition within the satire of an appeal to heroic ideals. Juvenal composes a further catalogue later in the same satire, this time introducing several obscene characters with repetition of *ille* (II.93, II.95, and II.99) to differentiate their activities: one man paints his eyebrows in a feminine manner (II.93-5); a second character wears inappropriate clothing (II.96-7), taking his transvestism to extremes when "his slave swears on his master's Juno" (*per Iunonem domini iurante ministro, II.98*)³⁰; and the third man vainly admires himself in a mirror (II.99ff. - see chapter six, pp. 141-2, on the quotations used to further aggrandise this figure's mirror).

Juvenal's most important catalogues occur in the fourth and sixth satires. The latter half of the fourth satire is concerned with the convening of Domitian's inner council, and their subsequent debate about the trivial issue of the big fish: although Juvenal's main intention in this scene is to parody the typical epic scene of a meeting of the gods (see chapter four, p. 74, on this motif), the manner in which each member of the council is

³⁰ Courtney (1980) 139 explains this subversive twist on the common practice of "an oath by the *genius* of men addressed, to which the *Iuno* of a woman corresponds".

sequentially introduced, and usually in a mock-heroic manner (see p. 46 below on epic periphrases), means that the scene could just as easily be viewed as a mock-epic catalogue of convening ‘warriors’³¹. Juvenal’s most elaborate and continual catalogue, however, comes in his sixth satire: the very length of this satire (661 lines, plus a further fragment of 34 lines) has invited comparisons with epic poetry, but the structuring of these lines into an overall catalogue of the various vices of Roman women (with each individual sin being occasionally split into a further mini-catalogue) compounds Juvenal’s intentions of mock-grandeur, as the device covers female sin rather than the usual masculine heroism³².

Juvenal’s tenth satire features a catalogue of assorted satiric characters whose various sins of adultery, murder, fraud, and rape (X.220-4) make them highly inappropriate for such a grand device: the catalogue’s ubiquitous sinners are diminished further by Juvenal’s context that they are still not as numerous as the diseases that can ravage the elderly (X.218-9). The catalogue’s purpose of emphasising the extent of its contents is cleverly exploited in the eleventh satire, highlighting the relative extravagance of a feast in comparison to the host’s usual repast: Scott notes that the food available at this banquet is not just given the usual grand history (despite its relative ordinariness), but that Juvenal actually elevates the menu in “a mock epic tone ... naming the articles of food as if he were introducing epic heroes”³³ in a catalogue of warriors. The first such item on the menu is a kid (*haedulus*, XI.66): Juvenal piles up the descriptive clauses of this kid in a ridiculous fashion, including its birthplace (*Tiburtino*, XI.65), its greater size (*pinguissimus*, XI.65), its tenderness (*mollior*, XI.66), and its dietary habits (XI.66-8); even the accompanying asparagus is elaborately described as having been “picked by the farmer’s wife after she had finished spinning” (*posito quos legit vilica fuso*, XI.69). Next are the eggs, loftily labelled as *grandia* (XI.70) and accompanied by their mothers (*cum matribus*, XI.71 - i.e. the hens were served alongside them³⁴); other simple delicacies include preserved grapes (*servatae* | ... *uvae*, XI.72), foreign pears (*pirum*, XI.73), and “apples as good as those from Picenum” (*aemula Picenis ... mala*, XI.74 - the fact that the apples are not actually from Picenum might come as a slight anticlimax to this catalogue). A final catalogue in Juvenal’s thirteenth satire actually contains an appropriately epic subject matter, namely heavenly weapons (XIII.78ff.), although the context is slightly deflated, as the weapons are

³¹ Braund (1992) 45 also mentions this “catalogue of the advisers summoned to Domitian’s *consilium*”.

³² Braund (1992) 44 considers that the poem’s length “fulfils the speaker’s claim in Book I that satire can replace epic”, which Gifford (1992) xiii reiterates (“the poem is on an epic scale and in this way also fulfils the claim in Book I that satire has replaced epic”); Coffey (1976) 129 actually suggests that the catalogue may have been “a traditional basis of ancient attacks on women”.

³³ Scott (1927) 67.

³⁴ Scott (1927) 36 explains the pun; Winkler (1990) 377 also points to the occurrence of the same idea (although with regard to lambs and ewes) at *Aen.* I.635.

only being considered for use against people who have broken an oath (XIII.71-7). Initially, these weapons are described in an elevated manner, with Apollo's arrows alluded to as "the Cirrhan seer's darts" (*Cirrhæi spicula vatis*, XIII.79), and his sister Diana's own arrows becoming "the bolts of the virgin huntress" (*calamos venatricis pharetramque puellae*, XIII.80)³⁵, although later entries simply consist of the weapon and the appropriate god's name (XIII.81-2); the last entry in Juvenal's list is then the derisive anticlimax *quidquid habent telorum armamentaria caeli* ("whatever weapons heaven's arsenal holds", XIII.83), which ironically negates the need for including any of the previous catalogue entries³⁶.

Epic Periphrases

The stylistic device of the periphrasis (or circumlocution) is essentially a way of using several words when one or two would suffice: this verbose technique (which can often render an otherwise straightforward sentence somewhat more complex) is so entrenched in the epic genre that it is often called 'epic periphrasis'. Although it may now be seen as a deliberate method of creating an elevated mood, it is probable that a lot of periphrases were initially used simply as a way to get around the limitations of the hexameter: since certain words were metrically impossible in this grand meter, points had to be made by using other, metrically allowable words, and sometimes more than one word would have to be piled together to identify the intended meaning. In essence, epicists did not 'call a spade "a spade"', to use a modern idiom, but rather would call it 'a long-handled digger of the earth'. The satirists play with the convention somewhat by applying a periphrasis to the mundane and ordinary, thereby granting it an ironic elevated status³⁷: in fact, my above example of a periphrasis for a spade is probably more appropriate for satire.

Climate: A common area of elevation by periphrasis in epic is the climate: weather conditions and even the time of day would often be expanded upon rather than simply stating 'it was raining' or 'the sun had set'. Ennius expands on the coming of night in his *Annales* with *nox quando mediis signis praecineta volabit* ("when night will fly, bound in the middle by the stars", *Ann.* 414S)³⁸, while Virgil's image of Dawn personified - *iamque rubescebat radiis mare et aethere ab alto | Aurora in roseis fulgebat lutea bigis* ("and now

³⁵ Scott (1927) 100 briefly mentions this periphrasis.

³⁶ Ferguson (1979) 298 labels the line as "an excellent satirical climax to this epic parody"; both Scott (1927) 52 and Duff (1937) 394 also suggest that Juvenal may have been directly parodying Lucan's list of godly weapons, assembled for the war with the Giants (*BC* VII.144-50).

³⁷ D'Alton (1931) 113 describes the epic periphrasis thus: "primarily designed to enhance the beauty of normal expression, especially in a writer who is labouring to set forth an elevated thought, but in an author who lacks the touch of genius, [a periphrasis] might easily degenerate into empty bombast".

³⁸ Skutsch (1985) 579 notes that *volabit* here could point to either the literal flight of the personified Night, or to the driving of her chariot (both images are apparently attested to in literature and art).

the sea blushed in the sunbeams, and yellow Dawn shone from high heaven in her rosy chariot”, *Aen.* VII.25-6) - is a similar elevated periphrasis for sunrise³⁹. When the satirists exploit this technique, it is not just for the sake of pomposity or decoration: the context is invariably inappropriate for this level of grandeur. Horace’s exploitation of such an elevated, ‘scene-setting’ periphrasis in the fifth satire of his first book - *iam nox inducere terris | umbras et caelo diffundere signa parabat* (“now night was preparing to cast shadows on the Earth, and to scatter the stars in the sky”, i.V.9-10) - actually has a further intention: he creates an expectation that the subsequent details of his journey will be on an epic level, but then immediately fails to deliver upon this expectation with the abusive dialogue between the boatmen⁴⁰ (i.V.11-13 - see chapter eight, pp. 175-8, for more on Horace’s mock-heroism). Similarly, in the sixth satire of his second book, Horace’s climatic periphrasis *sive Aquilo radit terras seu bruma nivalem | interiore diem gyro trahit* (“if the North wind scours the earth or winter drags a snowy day on a shorter course”, ii.VI.25-6) elevates “in parodic epic style”⁴¹ the toils of living in the city, although the actual details of Horace’s everyday life (ii.VI.27-39) are not particularly arduous. The same satire’s fable also contains a grand scene-setting periphrasis: *iamque tenebat | nox medium caeli spatium* (“and now night was holding the middle area of the sky”, ii.VI.100-1); the lowly subject of the mice is ironically juxtaposed with this elevated expression⁴².

Juvenal uses this technique in his fourth satire as one of several methods of turning the big fish into a *quasi*-hero (only a *quasi*-hero, obviously, because it was dead - see chapter eight, pp. 181-2), since its journey to Domitian’s palace is fraught with the usual mock-epic circumlocutions for adverse weather conditions: *iam letifero cedente pruinis | autumno, iam quartanam sperantibus aegris, | stridebat deformis hiems praedamque recentem | servabat; tamen hic properat, velut urgeat Auster* (“and now, with lethal autumn succumbing to frost, and with the feverish hoping that it will be short, unformed winter whistled and preserved the recent catch; yet the man rushed forth, as if the South Wind urged him on”, IV.56-9)⁴³. Juvenal’s fifth satire features three further periphrases of this type; the first establishes the time of day as “that time when the chilly cart of slow Bootes makes its orbit” (*illo tempore quo se | frigida circumagunt pigri serraca Bootae*, V.22-3)⁴⁴. This roundabout way of setting the hour by reference to a constellation anticipates the lofty

³⁹ Williams (1972) 168 mentions that Virgil’s words *lutea* and *rosea* would intentionally evoke similar images of dawn personified in Homer’s epic works.

⁴⁰ Fraenkel (1957) 111 calls the line “a flourish in the hackneyed manner of heroic epic”; Barnes (1988) 57 notes the subsequent anticlimax of the poem, “as if the events to follow were of epic importance”.

⁴¹ Muecke (1993) 200; Fraenkel (1957) 141 also mentions the “hackneyed phraseology of epic poetry” here.

⁴² Muecke (1993) 210: “the inverted temporal clause, a favourite epic construction”.

⁴³ Scott (1927) 80 simply notes that this passage “parodies the style of epic”.

⁴⁴ Scott (1927) 75 lists this line as an example of Juvenal’s “lofty style in his descriptions of nature”.

tone to which the satire's subsequent meal will aspire. During this meal, the host laments the hardships that he was forced to endure in order to reach his current position: his metaphorical rise to living on the rich Esquiline is comically elevated as a literal climb up a steep mountain (*per montem adversum*, V.77) during torrential rain (*multo ... nimbo*, V.79), which Jupiter himself was overseeing⁴⁵. Finally, a fish on the menu at this feast is elevated by a periphrasis for the time when it was caught: *dum se continet Auster, | dum sedet et siccat madidas in carcere pinnas* ("when the South Wind had retired, and sat drying his moist feathers in his cave", V.100-1)⁴⁶. The grander detail that the fish had been caught near to the infamous Charybdis whirlpool (V.102) is actually deflated by this periphrasis: the fisherman had only entered this dangerous area during a lull in its harsh conditions.

Places: A further common area in which periphrases are employed in epic is in reference to a specific area or place, either as an allusive circumlocution to identify a certain place without naming it, such as Ennius' reference to the Capitoline hill as *Saturnia terra* ("the Saturnine land", *Ann.* 21S), or in an extended, scene-setting description of an area after it has already been named, such as Virgil's digression on Hesperia at *Aen.* I.530ff. Again, the satirists' exploitation of this kind of periphrasis is an attempt to elevate an area that really doesn't deserve such an epic depiction; and again, Horace's journey to Brundisium in his fifth satire can be seen to exploit such a technique in order to emphasise the 'heroic' elements of the trip. One town is said to be "unable to be named in verse" (*quod versu dicere non est*, i.V.87); Horace identifies it to his contemporary audience by digressing on its practice of charging for water, and the exquisite bread that is baked there (i.V.88-90)⁴⁷. The next stop, Canusium, is grandly described as having been "founded by brave Diomedes" (*qui locus a forti Diomede est conditus olim*, i.V.92), although the town is possibly implied to be unworthy of such a founder, given the low quality of *its* bread and water (i.V.91). Finally, Gnatia is described as the town that was "despised by the angry water-nymphs" (*Lymphis | iratis exstructa*, i.V.97-8), apparently a mock-epic way of denoting the water problems of this area too. Horace's eighth satire holds a more detailed digression on an area, namely Maecenas' new garden (home of the satire's narrator, the Priapus-scarecrow), which helps to build up the grand mood of the piece before the final deflation (Horace's punch-line will be discussed at chapter five, p. 107). Horace depicts the surrounding area of the Esquiline as having once been a burial ground for the masses, a far

⁴⁵ Ferguson (1979) 178 notes that, even though "Trebius is talking to himself, ... the language is [still] mock-epic"; these lines also appear in the list of periphrases by Scott (1927) 75.

⁴⁶ Courtney (1980) 242 contrasts the "fine epic style" of this line with V.103-6; Ferguson (1979) 179 cites a passage of Ovid as a possible source for this image of a wind (*Met.* XI.432, referring to Aeolus).

⁴⁷ Brink (1995) 267-71 discusses many possibilities and commentators' suggestions before settling on Herdoniae as the likeliest candidate for this town's identity.

cry from the *novis ... hortis* (i.VIII.7) that had since been established there; the current healthiness (*salubribus*, i.VIII.14) and sunny aspect (*aprico*, i.VIII.15) of the land contrast further with the gloomy mood of all the dead bodies that once dwelt there (*albis informem ... ossibus*, i.VIII.16), thereby also serving to explain the witches' presence there.

Persius' one periphrasis for an area comes in his sixth satire: Bovillae is named as Virbius' hill (*clivumque ad Virbi*, VI.56), the heroic name becoming ironic given that the hill is now surrounded by beggars⁴⁸. Juvenal also uses a periphrasis for one of Rome's seven hills in his third satire, although the phrase *a vimine collem* ("the willow's hill", III.71) is probably only used for metrical reasons, rather than any deliberately grand or subversive effect⁴⁹. The fourth satire, however, displays Juvenal's more usual periphrastic technique of evoking a contrast between the grandly-evoked areas and their surrounding context: the 'heroic' fish's journey through Alba features passing allusions both to the area's foundation by Ascanius, son of Aeneas – referred to as *ignem Troianum* ("the Trojan flame", IV.61) - and to its association with the cult of Vesta - *Vestam minorem* ("the lesser temple of Vesta", IV.61)⁵⁰ – epic circumlocutions that are intended to add to the inappropriate grandeur of the mock-heroic journey of the big turbot. In Juvenal's sixth satire, Palestine is periphrastically alluded to by the Jewish traditions practised there: observation of the Sabbath (*sabbata*, VI.159 – probably quite a lowly word) and not eating the flesh of pigs (*vetus indulget senibus clementia porcis*, VI.160)⁵¹. The literal translation regarding the porcine meat ("long-seated kindness is good for old pigs") is a comical expression of the practice, but is perhaps ironic in the surrounding context of old women being scorned, whereas in Palestine old pigs are borne more readily. Juvenal also discusses the bizarre practices of female religious cults later in this satire, such as swimming over the icy Tiber to the field of Tarquinius: the epic periphrasis for this field as *superbi | ... regis agrum* ("the proud king's land", VI.524-5) mockingly elevates the action rather than deflating the field itself. Juvenal's allusion in his tenth satire to Babylon, however, *does* slightly mock the grand city by its deflating connection with menial workers in that it was "fortified by potters" (*a figulis munitam*, X.171)⁵².

Juvenal also uses several periphrases in an extended description of the area in his twelfth satire; as in the fourth satire, our 'hero' (in this case, the shipwrecked Catullus - see

⁴⁸ Harvey (1981) 198 cites the actual name of the hill as *Aricinus*, which becomes Virbius' hill since "the hero ... was worshipped in Aricia" (cf. Gildersleeve (1979) 202).

⁴⁹ Barr (1991) 155 notes that the hill's real name, the Viminal, was metrically impossible.

⁵⁰ Most commentators explain the exact nature of these allusions to Troy and Vesta (such as Ferguson (1979) 164, Duff (1970) 170, Pearson & Strong (1892) 71, and Braund (1996) 248-9).

⁵¹ Scott (1927) 101 mentions the latter periphrasis.

⁵² Scott (1927) 94 first connects this image with a description of Babylon at *Met.* XII.610ff., but later (p. 101) considers Juvenal's phrase to be "probably a reminiscence" of Babylon's appearance at *BC* VI.49.

chapter eight, pp. 182-3, on Catullus' 'heroic' role) comes to Alba, and the grand allusions are intended to highlight his mock-heroism. The unnamed area is first given two allusive epic circumlocutions, as the town which Ascanius loved (*gratus Iulo*, XII.70), and which was the successor to Lavinium (*praelata Lavino*, XII.71)⁵³. The etymology behind the town's name is then explained, from the 'white' sow (*candida ... | scrofa*, XII.72-3)⁵⁴ that acted as a portent for the Trojans, foretelling the future glory of their new home (see chapter five, p. 120, on the deflation of this mythological creature here). Even the details of the harbour at which Catullus arrived are expanded upon: "the piers are built in the enclosed sea" (*positas inclusa per aequora moles*, XII.75), which is then ironically rephrased in the following lines as "the long arms run out into the middle of the sea" (*porrectaque bracchia rursum | quae pelago occurrunt medio*, XII.76-7). A final periphrasis on a place comes in Juvenal's fourteenth satire, with a digression on the famous scene from the Argonaut myth where armed skeletons arise at Thebes: *in quorum sulcis legiones dentibus anguis | cum clipeis nascuntur et horrida bella capessunt | continuo, tamquam et tubicen surrexerit una* ("in whose trenches the legions, with their shields, grew from the dragon's teeth, and immediately engaged in a terrible battle, as if a trumpeter had arisen with them", XIV.241-3)⁵⁵. The satiric context for the mention of Thebes is the fact that the self-sacrificing patriot Menoecus (XIV.240) did not show as much love towards the city as the satire's corrupt parents now show towards money; this deflation of the legend of Menoecus is then compounded by the digression on the skeletal warriors, which is an example of Juvenal's mocking caveat that one shouldn't always trust Greek legends (*si Graecia vera*, XIV.240), whereas satire purports to be the truth.

People: Epic periphrases for people can simply exist as a couple of descriptive words, adding a minor degree of grandeur to the character, as in Ennius' description of Juno as *Saturnia sancta dearum* ("daughter of Saturn, holiest of the gods", *Ann.* 53S); or the figures can be elevated even further by a cumulative series of descriptive phrases and subordinate clauses, as when Virgil describes the warriors Pandarus and Bitias: *Idaeo Alcanore creti, | quos Iovis eduxit luco silvestris Iaera | abietibus iuvenes patriis in montibus aequos* ("born to Alcanor of Ida, the wood-nymph Hieria bore them in Jupiter's grove, youths as tall as the trees on their native mountain", *Aen.* IX.672-4). Although in each of the above cases, the periphrases seem unnecessary in terms of plot or story development, they are actually an essential part of the verbosity and grandeur inherent in

⁵³ Scott (1927) 72 notes that "the tone is that of exaggerated dignity" here.

⁵⁴ Courtney (1980) 525 considers *scrofa* to be a derogatory word, a subversion of the more usual *sus*.

⁵⁵ Hardy (1951) 300, Courtney (1980) 582 and Barr (1991) 226-7 all cite Ovid's version of this scene (*Met.* III.161ff.) here; see also Apollonius (*Argonautica* III.1331ff.) and Valerius Flaccus (*Argonautica* VII.607ff.).

the epic genre. The few examples of periphrases for people found in Horace and Persius do not initially seem to be employed for the explicit purpose of inappropriate elevation, but rather more directly as metrical side-steps for inadmissible names. In the first satire of Horace's second book, for example, the satirist brings in the recent war hero Scipio as an example of a subject of Lucilius' satire, but must resort to extended allusions in order to identify him: first, he is *qui | duxit ab oppressa meritum Carthagine nomen* ("the man who took his deserved name by conquering Carthage", ii.I.65-6), and then simply *virtus Scipiadae* ("the bravery of that member of the Scipio clan", ii.I.72), militaristic allusions that do nevertheless add a degree of grandeur to Scipio (and deservedly so). The metrical inability to include Socrates' name in hexameters must also be initially seen as the reason for the two periphrases for the Greek philosopher, although both examples also have slightly comical edges. In perhaps the only elevated moment in the fourth satire of his second book, Horace alludes to Socrates as *Anytique reum* ("the man accused by Anytus", ii.IV.3): ironically, Anytus' name is only really known from his role in the more famous Socrates' trial and subsequent suicide. Persius' allusive circumlocution for Socrates in his fourth satire is also slightly comical, as it seems to sum up the entire span of the man's life in just nine words: *barbatum haec ... magistrum | dicere sorbitio tollit quem dira cicutae* ("the bearded judge said this, whom a bitter dose of hemlock took away", IV.1-2).

Juvenal also uses periphrastic allusions for philosophers in his satires, although possibly with a more subversive intention than a mere metrical side-step. In his tenth satire, for example, Juvenal introduces two philosophers (*sapientibus*, X.28), one who is said to constantly laugh (*ridebat*, X.29), and his counterpart who constantly weeps (*flebat*, X.30). The later identification of the 'laugher' as Democritus (X.34) shows that his name was not metrically inadmissible (unlike the name Heraclitus, which was the most likely identity of the 'weeper'⁵⁶), and so Juvenal is probably playing a game by rendering his earlier allusion superfluous⁵⁷. The joke seems to be reversed later in the same satire, when the orator Demosthenes is named first (X.114), but is then allusively identified as "the man at whom Athens marvelled" (*quem mirabantur Athenae*, X.127)⁵⁸. Juvenal also alludes to Socrates, as an example of a philosopher who would not advocate revenge, in his thirteenth satire; he seems to follow Persius in his brief summation of Socrates' life, as the periphrasis *dulcique*

⁵⁶ Courtney (1980) 451 discusses the subsequent contrast between Epicureanism and Stoicism.

⁵⁷ Diggle (1974) 183-4 quotes Housman's explanation of this style of joke (although in reference to the similar joke on Achilles at VII.270 - see chapter five, p. 123): "to mention a person first by patronymic ... or some other periphrasis and then directly afterwards by his or her proper name ... is an artifice in which Latin poets take no less delight".

⁵⁸ Scott (1927) 101 briefly mentions this periphrasis.

senex vicinus Hymetto (“the old man who lived near sweet Hymettus”, XIII.185)⁵⁹ is soon followed by the method of his death (*cicutae*, XIII.186).

Juvenal’s exploitation of periphrasis elsewhere invariably seeks to elevate figures that are not suitable for such a level of grandeur, and nowhere more so than in his fourth satire. The ‘heroic’ fish is introduced in a simple market scene that is soon turned into a more suitably epic hurdle for this hero to overcome by the comical elevation of both “the master of boat and nets” (*cumbae linique magistri*, IV.45-6 - i.e. the fishermen who caught the fish) and “the inspectors of seaweed” (*algae | inquisitores*, IV.48-9 - a ridiculous phrase for over-zealous market officials)⁶⁰. Later, several of the members of Domitian’s inner clique are also ironically elevated by epic periphrases, perhaps in order to make them appear better suited to their god-like roles in a mock *concilium deorum*. Crispus is first introduced as “the pleasant old age of Crispus” (*Crispi iucunda senectus*, IV.81), the characteristic standing for the man himself⁶¹. Then, Acilius’ foreseen death will supposedly come as a result of his birthright and his age (*in nobilitate senectus*, IV.97), therefore making being a nobody seem preferable if a violent death can be avoided: this idea of ‘being a nobody’ is humorously conveyed in the phrase *fraterculus ... gigantis* (“a giant’s little brother”, IV.98), which is contrived as meaning ‘son of the earth’ (a Roman expression for a nobody), since the giants were literally born from the earth, a comic circumlocution in such a sombre passage⁶². And a characteristic again stands for the described character with Montanus, or rather “Montanus’ stomach” (*Montani ... venter*, IV.107), hinting at his immense girth⁶³: Juvenal later compounds this description with an extended periphrasis on Montanus’ wide knowledge of oysters (IV.140-2), ironically learned in place of any diplomatic skills while he was serving on Nero’s earlier council.

Juvenal occasionally uses epic periphrases in order to describe literary characters: although this might initially sound quite apt, typically the circumlocutions serve to mock the usual grandeur of these figures in some way. In the fifth satire, for example, Aeneas is alluded to as *zelotypo iuvenis praelatus Iarbae* (“the youth preferred over jealous Iarbas”, V.45) - Juvenal’s use of the word *zelotypo* seems to turn Dido’s epic rejection of Iarbas in favour of Aeneas (*Aen.* IV.36) into a more comical scene of a cuckolded husband rejected

⁵⁹ Scott (1927) 100 indecisively labels this periphrasis as “perhaps partially mocking”; Courtney (1980) 555-6 considers the juxtaposition of Socrates with Thales and Chrysippus to be randomly chosen by Juvenal.

⁶⁰ Scott (1927) 81 notes this periphrasis without mentioning the ridiculous idea that it expresses.

⁶¹ Scott (1927) 80 sees this epic circumlocution as a “peculiarly Homeric type”, while Ferguson (1979) 171 connects the phrase to Statius’ *Thebaid*, which commentators regularly bring up regarding the fourth satire.

⁶² Courtney (1980) 219 discusses “the use of the diminutive of the puny human contrasted with his brother giants”, which Barr (1991) 163 reiterates as “the contrast in ‘little brother’ [*fraterculus*] and ‘towering’ [*gigantis*]”; Braund (1996) 257 explains the Giants’ link to the Earth with the aid of Greek mythology (“the Giants of mythology were sons of Ge, the Greek goddess equivalent to *Terra*”).

⁶³ Scott (1927) 80 briefly points out this periphrasis.

by his adulterous wife⁶⁴. The sixth satire features a brief mention of Catullus' elegiac mistress Lesbia, who is used as a stereotype for contemporary women in apposition to the innocent females of the Golden Age; although Lesbia's name could easily fit into a hexameter, Juvenal instead uses the allusive periphrasis *turbavit nitidos extinctus passer ocellos* ("a dead sparrow disturbed her gleaming eyes", VI.8), an obvious reference made even more apparent by the subsequent naming of Propertius' elegiac mistress, Cynthia⁶⁵. Aeneas is again described in a periphrasis in the eleventh satire: however, his depiction as "the lesser guest" (*minor illo | hospes*, XI.61-2) of Evander, since Hercules had been a physically bigger guest before him, is a brief moment of deflation, only partially remedied by the two subsequent periphrases referring to Aeneas' eventual divinity - *contingens sanguine caelum* ("kin to the heavens", XI.62)⁶⁶, and *ad sidera missus* ("sent to the stars", XI.63). Three allusive periphrases for mythological characters in the twelfth satire each appear in a somewhat deflated context: the goddess Minerva is identified as "fighting using a Moorish Gorgon" (*pugnanti Gorgone Maura*, XII.4), the ablative of instrument humorously creating the image of the Gorgon as a weapon wielded by the goddess⁶⁷; the Greek king Pyrrhus is referred to as *regique Molosso* (XII.108) during the digression on elephants, which is part of a wider passage on the lowly practice of legacy-hunting⁶⁸; and Iphigenia, or rather "the slain girl from Mycenae" (*iugulata Mycenis*, XII.127), is jarringly brought into the legacy-hunting discussion as an example of an heir being killed. A final mythological periphrasis in the incomplete sixteenth satire finds Juno allusively referred to as "the mother who delights in sandy Samos" (*Samia genetrix quae delectatur harena*, XVI.6)⁶⁹: although Samos was an area dedicated to the goddess' worship, Juvenal's manner of expressing this connection seems to diminish Juno as a mere sunbather.

Inappropriate Objects: Perhaps the most widespread exploitation of periphrasis by the satirists is for objects (I also include in this category life-forms other than human), which can never be truly worthy of the grandeur that is applied to them. That is not to say that such periphrases were never employed by epicists: for example, Virgil writes *sacer Fauno foliis oleaster amaris* ("a bitter-leaved olive-tree, sacred to Faunus", *Aen.* XII.766), and Lucan mentions *scabros nigrae morsu rubiginis enses* ("swords made rough by the bite

⁶⁴ Both Wilson (1903) 57 and Braund (1996) 285 explain the *Aeneid* reference; Duckworth (1952) 115 mentions the common plot in the mime where the "fat and stupid husband" is cuckolded.

⁶⁵ Scott (1927) 101 considers this line to be "at least partially mocking".

⁶⁶ Scott (1927) 100 and Winkler (1990) 378 both note this periphrasis.

⁶⁷ Although the reference is probably to an ornate carving of the Gorgon on Minerva's shield (cf. Pollmann (1996) 483), Barr (1991) 216 suggests that the Gorgon's head itself may have actually been tied to the shield.

⁶⁸ Fredericks (1979) 189 mentions this periphrasis; Smith (1989b) 296 considers the contextual association of elephants-as-bribes and eminent elephant-owners to be an unflattering link for the latter.

⁶⁹ Scott (1927) 101 briefly mentions the periphrasis.

of black rust”, *BC*. I.243). However, the objects in each of these rare examples are at least worthy of some degree of elevation (as, respectively, sacred objects of a god, and weapons in a grand war): satiric objects raised in periphrases, such as cups or sheep, are totally inappropriate. The two examples of periphrasis in Ennius’ satires show how the grand tone thus established does not match the lowly topic. First, the sea is grandly elevated by a periphrastic phrase, although this is within the comical-sounding fairy-tale of a flute-player who could apparently charm the fish out of the water with his music: *subulo quondam marinas propter astabat plagas* (“once upon a time, a flautist was standing near the watery regions”, 20W)⁷⁰. A further scene is also afforded a mock-epic tone by Ennius’ elevated periphrasis for some sheep: *propter stagna ubi lanigerum genus piscibus pascit* (“near the swamps where the woolly tribe grazes on fish”, 24W)⁷¹.

Once again, it is Juvenal who mostly exploits the periphrasis for inappropriate objects. The third satire finds Umbricius referring to his Roman upbringing with the dual periphrases of *caelum | hausit Aventini baca nutrita Sabina* (“breathed the Aventine air and was nourished by the Sabine berry”, III.84-5), the elevations of air and fruit serving to add a degree of snobbish grandeur to Umbricius’ patriotic claims. In the fourth satire, the big fish is immediately raised into its position as *quasi*-hero by the periphrastic praise *Hadriaci spatium admirabile rhombi* (“an Adriatic turbot of amazing size”, IV.39): Ferguson singles this periphrasis out as “a splendid parody of high-flown epic writing”⁷², while Winkler praises it as an example of Juvenal’s “mastery in handling and simultaneously ridiculing epic conventions”⁷³, and Courtney merely labels it as “near-golden”⁷⁴. An even more inappropriate periphrasis comes in the ninth satire, when the favour of astrology and horoscopes is deemed more important to a gigolo than possessing a large penis: the fact that Juvenal raises this trait as “the unrecognised size of his lengthy member” (*longi mensura incognita nervi*, IX.34) is an amusing attempt to elevate the satire’s crude content⁷⁵. In fact, examples of periphrases for objects being used by Juvenal with no apparent ironic elevation are very rare: there is only the straight periphrasis for an antidote in the fourteenth satire, *quod Mithridates | composuit* (“what Mithridates concocted”, XIV.252-3), although in this case Juvenal is purposefully exploiting the ancient Greek king’s name and his connection with poison in order to make the act of poisoning appear more exclusive to this satire’s subject of rich and hence greedy parents.

⁷⁰ Duff (1937) 41 agrees that this is “one of [Ennius’] humorous pictures”.

⁷¹ Petersmann (1999) 294 notes that Ennius also uses similar descriptions of sheep at *Ann.* 8S and 76S.

⁷² Ferguson (1979) 162.

⁷³ Winkler (1989) 437.

⁷⁴ Courtney (1980) 208.

⁷⁵ Braund (1988) 151 remarks on the sly humour of the epic periphrasis in this description of a large penis.

The fifth satire features several inappropriate periphrases, as items of tableware are given extended histories, as if they were epic warriors, in order to elevate the host's pretensions. The cups are first said to be encrusted with amber (*Heliadum crustas*, V.38 - from the Ovidian legend of the Heliades' tears turning to amber⁷⁶); Scott notes that "the mythical names [are] used purely for ornamentation"⁷⁷, but the following 'ornamentation' of the host's goblet seems to suggest the further purpose of heightening the intentional disparity between the host's paraphernalia and that given to his lowly guests. His cup is supposedly encrusted with the very jewels of jasper (*iaspis*, V.42 / *gemmas*, V.43) that had previously adorned Aeneas' scabbard (*in vaginae fronte*, V.44) - this seems to be an ironic mistake, since jasper had actually only ever appeared on Aeneas' sword previously⁷⁸, which, combined with the "characteristically allusive periphrasis" for Aeneas at V.45 (see p. 46 above), seems to prove Ferguson's point that "epic parody is never far from Juvenal's intent"⁷⁹ (although it is the host whose pretensions are simultaneously elevated and mocked here). The disparity between host and guests is further shown by the periphrasis describing the four-nosed vessel with which the lowly guest Trebius has been provided: *Beneventani sutoris nomen habentem* ("it is named after a Beneventan cobbler", V.46); this association with a lowly craftsman is belittling alongside the mythological connections of the host's tableware. It is not just the tableware that is elevated periphrastically: the prettiness of the host's personal cup-bearer is shown by the metaphorical periphrasis "the flower of Asia" (*flos Asiae*, V.56)⁸⁰; and the food is also aggrandised, with a wild boar being worthy of "blond Meleager" (*flavi Meleagri*, V.115)⁸¹, and apples having been allegedly grown in the "eternal autumn" of Alcinous' orchards (*perpetuus Phaeacum autumnus*, V.151)⁸². A final Juvenalian periphrasis, in his seventh satire, also mocks an epic figure; while the metonymy of the god Vulcan for fire is quite common (in fact, Horace had already used this metonymy at i.V.74), Juvenal deflates him both by alluding to his identity through his marriage to Venus (*Veneris ... marito*, VII.25)⁸³, and through comically contrasting this elevated fire with a second, lowlier method of destroying worthless books, namely "burrowing worms" (*tinea pertunde*, VII.26).

⁷⁶ Both Duff (1970) 187 and Braund (1996) 284 point to the best depiction of this tale at *Met.* II.340ff.

⁷⁷ Scott (1927) 58.

⁷⁸ Hardy (1951) 173 cites the epic reference: *illi stellatus iaspide fulva ensis erat* (*Aen.* IV.260).

⁷⁹ Both quotations are from Ferguson (1979) 176.

⁸⁰ Scott (1927) 82 mentions both of these periphrases.

⁸¹ Pearson & Strong (1892) 94 label the animal slain by the Greek hero Meleager as "the wild boar of Calydon"; Braund (1996) 295, Scott (1927) 65 and Ferguson (1979) 181, among others, also note that Juvenal's choice of adjective *flavi* is actually a direct translation of Homer's epithet, ξανθός (e.g. *Il.* II.642).

⁸² Ferguson (1979) 183 suggests that, since "Homer says [in *Odyssey* VII] that the crops do not fail in summer or winter" in this orchard, *autumnus* is therefore contextually mocking.

⁸³ Scott (1927) 73, Braund (1988) 56 and Pollmann (1996) 483 all mention this instance of metonymy.

Similes and Metaphors

The use of similes and metaphors in epic can sometimes be quite extensive⁸⁴, so much so that the phrase ‘epic simile’ is regularly used to describe “an extended simile that is used typically in epic poetry to intensify the heroic stature of the subject”⁸⁵. Essentially, an ‘epic simile’ follows the normal simile pattern of describing something as, say, ‘as strong as an ox’, but then extends the phrase into, for example, ‘as strong as a hefty ox which tirelessly ploughs the cruel farmer’s fields’ – a specific epic example would be Virgil’s seven-line simile comparing the industriousness of the Carthaginians in building their city to bees making honey (*Aen.* I.430-6). When the satirists decide to employ such elaboration to their own similes and metaphors, it is often with subversive intent – basically, the subject of this descriptive technique does not possess any ‘heroic structure’ to be intensified, and so the phrase becomes a mock-epic simile (with both the subject and the device being ridiculed to some extent)⁸⁶. The fragmentary nature of Lucilius’ satires means that we cannot ascertain whether his early use of simile could be described as mock-epic, since only two of his six evident remaining similes actually contain both the object being described as well as the clause of comparison. Both of Lucilius’ intact similes refer to a volcano: first, the flying ash of the eruption is likened to “the kind of sparks that sometimes gather around the massed metal when the iron is still hot” (*crebrae ut scintillae, in stricturis quod genus olim | ferventi ferro*, 146-7W / 144-5M - this is an allusive way to say ‘in a forge’); secondly, the sight of the ash is compared to the lanterns which fill the Roman Forum during the time of the games (*Romanis ludis forus olim ornatus lucernis*, 148W / 146M)⁸⁷. Given the general assignment by commentators of these volcanic similes to Lucilius’ account of his journey to Sicily, it seems obvious that any mock-heroic subtext to this trip would have been enhanced by such elevated descriptions en route; alternatively, there may be a slightly incongruous contrast between the natural wonder and the two manmade areas that are used to describe it. Three of the remaining four incomplete similes, which have not been assigned to any specific satire, do not include the subject of the comparison (only the presence of the comparative conjunction *ut* indicates the presence of

⁸⁴ Von Albrecht (1999) 129-33 discusses the wide range of similes employed by Virgil in the *Aeneid*, for example; he also explains the general reason for any author’s utilisation of the device at p. 176: “similes are meant to produce *ἐνάργεια* (*evidentia*, graphic vividness)”.

⁸⁵ Entry in *Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary*; Von Albrecht (1997) 82 clarifies that the use of similes in epic poetry could “give dignity to the action”.

⁸⁶ Whereas, for example, “in Homer the simile is an indispensable tool of knowledge rather than an ornament” (Von Albrecht (1999) 174), and Virgil creates images that become “material for symbolic architecture” (Von Albrecht (1999) 176), generally the satirists simply have comic intentions in their similes.

⁸⁷ Clearly, *forus* here indicates that *forum* was originally considered a masculine noun; whether it still was at the time that Lucilius was writing, or is instead an intentional archaism on the satirist’s part, for the purpose of “linguistic mockery”, as Petersmann (1999) 305 puts it, is less certain.

a simile): ultimately, all that can be said here is that the belligerent image of skirmishers (*veles*, 1263W / 1349M) is quite elevating, whereas acrobats (*petauro*, 1264W / 1298M) and forging again (*fabrica*, 1265W / 1165M) are quite lowly comparisons (Lucilius' one remaining simile is covered in the section on animals below).

Horace's general exploitation of simile is a better example of the overall satiric practice, since the subject is typically, and often comically, unworthy of any stylistic level of grandeur. In the first satire of his first book, Horace compares a miser, in his need to possess more money than anybody else, to a charioteer (*auriga*, i.I.115) on the Circus Maximus: the extended imagery of the charioteer urging his own horses ahead of everyone else's, and not thinking about the chariots behind him (i.I.114-6), is *quasi*-militaristic (although the chariot races are inevitably a lower activity than the use of chariots in war), an epic simile applied to a base subject. Likewise in the seventh satire, the ceaseless chattering of the lowly litigant Persius is cut short by an epic simile to sum up his presentation: *ruebat | flumen ut hibernum fertur quo rara securis* ("he was rushing like a river where an axe is rarely brought", i.VII.27); the implication must be that the area surrounding the river's course was particularly dense with trees, and so the elevated rural image actually carries an insult against Persius' overly wordy oratorical skills.

Juvenal's similes are always intended to provide humour, regardless of any grandeur also connected to them. In the second satire, Creticus' effeminacy is metaphorically called a disease (*contagio*, II.78), with the following similes specifically mentioning scabies among pigs and mould on a grapevine (II.79-81): effeminacy is therefore humorously diminished by the comparison with coarser aspects of rural life. A somewhat grander image occurs in Juvenal's conclusion to his sixth satire, where he likens the justifiable torrent of an aggrieved woman's passion to a rock-slide: *feruntur | praecipites, ut saxa iugis abrupta, quibus mons | subtrahitur clivoque latus pendente recedit* ("they are borne headlong like rocks snatched from the ridge, from under which the mountain collapses and the cliff-face falls away from the hanging hilltop", VI.648-50). This extended simile may have been adapted from Virgil's epic simile at *Aen.* XII.684ff.⁸⁸ - if so, Juvenal's subtle alteration of the epic context of Turnus' homicidal rage to his satiric example of the maxim 'hell hath no fury like a woman scorned' would be an intentional act of comical, literary subversion. Juvenal's ninth satire features an inappropriately grand simile relating to the lowly protagonist, Naevolus the homosexual gigolo, likening his countenance to that of a thin old man who has been feverish for a long time (*quid macies aegri veteris, quem tempore longo | torret quarta dies olimque domestica febris*, IX.16-

⁸⁸ Both Courtney (1980) 347 and Scott (1927) 76 note the similarities between these epic and satiric similes.

7)⁸⁹; of course, the apparent dark humour of bringing a wasting disease into a discussion on a sex-worker is probably an anachronistic suggestion. More often, the humour provided in a simile comes from the fact that the satirist has intentionally chosen a grander object of comparison than his lowly satiric subject; the frivolity or baseness of the subject is hence incongruously juxtaposed with the object's usual grandeur, providing a degree of mockery towards both elements. Juvenal's militaristic simile on the popularity of the races in his eleventh satire is a good example of this: the satirist claims that the despair suffered by race-fans when their favourite loses would be akin to their reaction to Rome's defeat at Cannae (XI.195-201), a simile that simultaneously mocks both the grand military campaign (by its deflating context of racing) and the frivolous human pursuit (by its inappropriate elevation to a military level).

The satirists also occasionally produce extended metaphors in a similar manner to their exploitation of epic similes. In the fourth satire of his first book, for example, Horace uses well-developed imagery from the field of the blacksmith: the arrogant chatterbox Crispinus is likened to the wind which comes out of an ironmonger's bellows (i.IV.19), the image being grandly extended by the phrase *usque laborantis dum ferrum molliat ignis* ("toiling until the fire softens the iron", i.IV.20); this language is slightly grander than both the subject and the object of this metaphor might otherwise require. Horace's seventh satire features a metaphorical motif relating to the cosmos, as the lowly litigant Persius attempts to flatter the judge, Brutus, and his retinue (*cohortem*, i.VII.23) as the sun (*solem Asiae*, i.VII.24) and the stars (*stellasque salubris*, i.VII.24) respectively; this stellar metaphor is soon reduced to a mere joke, though, as Persius mocks his opponent, Rupilius, by likening him to the ill-omened Dog-star (*Canem*, i.VII.25). Juvenal also exploits an extended metaphor in his tenth satire, comparing the common wish for prestige (*honores*, X.104) and riches (*opes*, X.105) to the construction of a tall tower (*excelsae turris*, X.106)⁹⁰; the juxtaposition of the grandeur of this imagery with the baseness of the satiric reality continues through to the inevitable conclusion of this tower's eventual collapse from a much greater height (*altior*, X.106) causing great destruction (*ruinae*, X.107), an apt, if perhaps overly lofty, metaphor for mankind's greed⁹¹. A final extended metaphor comes in Juvenal's fourteenth satire, where certain poor parents are viewed as charioteers, giving total control (*totas effundit habenas*, XIV.230)⁹² to their 'chariot' (*curriculo*, XIV.231 - i.e.

⁸⁹ Ferguson (1979) 249 bluntly points out that "the style is mock-epic" here.

⁹⁰ Scott (1927) 32 briefly mentions this grand metaphor;

⁹¹ Courtney (1980) 465 suggests that the details of this metaphor may in fact have been adapted from Virgil's earlier description of a falling tower at *Aen.* II.460-7.

⁹² Scott (1927) 98, Ferguson (1979) 311, and Courtney (1980) 581 all further suggest that the phrase *effundit habenas* has been borrowed from *Aen.* V.818.

their children); however, the consequences of these children then being unwilling to stop (*subsistere nescit*, XIV.231) widely differ from a charioteer's similar loss of control, since his horses would simply avoid the turning post (*metisque relictis*, XIV.232), whereas the children are caught up in their shameful activities (XIV.229).

Animals: Perhaps the commonest area in which epicists employed similes and metaphors was the animal kingdom: armies and heroes, both mythological and historical, are often compared to beasts and birds with regard to their ferocity, speed, anger, or other such trait. The noise of the amassed Trojan troops is likened to the sound of a flock of cranes in the sky at *Il.* III.2-7; Ennius turns the quarrelling Romans and Sabines into "stubborn boars" (*sues stolidi*, *Ann.* 96S); and Turnus' bloodthirsty rage on the battlefield sees him being compared to "a large tiger amidst a flock of still sheep" (*immanem veluti pecora inter inertia Tigrim*, *Aen.* IX.730). The satirists also exploit animal imagery in this way, but with the inevitable twist that the nature of the creatures chosen is often diminished (e.g. ants and donkeys instead of bees and stallions), and hence the basis of the comparison is some satirically comical shared trait rather than an heroically laudable similarity. Lucilius' one remaining incomplete simile actually seems to simultaneously elevate and mock the gladiator Pacideianus in his comparison with "an Ethiopian rhinoceros" (*rinocerus velut Aethiopus*, 184W / 159M): the creature was presumably chosen for its horn, analogous to the heroic 'goring' of the gladiator's opponent with his sword (as shown in Warmington's subsequent fragment, 185W), but the accompanying adjective might be intended to ridicule Pacideianus if he was also an Ethiopian slave.

Horace's exploitation of animal similes tends to rely on the extent to which it can be considered appropriate. In his first satire, for example, an extended, *quasi-epic* simile illustrates the actions of money-hoarding misers by comparing them to ants (*parvula*, i.I.33), because both 'creatures' continually replenish their 'funds' in preparation for the future (*non incauta futuri*, i.I.35); however, the similarity is lessened once the image is continued, since an ant will happily live on his 'fortunes' in the cold winter (i.I.36-8), whereas misers are mocked for never allowing themselves to be forced into taking anything away from their acquisitions (i.I.38-40). In the ninth satire, after the pest has finally overcome his victim, Horace's persona is likened to a "discontented donkey" (*ut iniquae mentis asellus*, i.IX.20), a comic description of an animal by the human trait of mental depression. The subsequent appropriateness of this donkey simile then works on two levels: physically, Horace's ears are said to have drooped in defeat (*demitto auriculas*, i.IX.20), a comical extension of the simile that serves to actually lengthen his ears to

donkey proportions⁹³; metaphorically, though, the reason that a donkey would droop its ears becomes the same as Horace's reason - "a heavy load on their backs" (*gravius dorso subiit onus*, i.IX.21). A further piece of animal imagery from the second satire of Horace's second book uses the elevated metaphor *latrantem stomachum* ("a barking stomach", ii.II.18)⁹⁴ to denote hunger; however, even this grandly-realised hunger can be quelled by the lowly sustenance of salt and bread (*cum sale panis*, ii.II.17), a preceding undercutting of the appropriateness for such a grand metaphor.

Persius exploits animal imagery only in his Prologue, when he compares the poor poets against whom he is railing (see chapter two, p. 22) with various birds. Initially, the satirist simply draws a parallel between the 'bards' discussed in his first few lines and parrots and magpies (*psittaco ... | picamque*, Prolog. 8-9): the dual points of comparison are that the poor poets and these specific birds are both imitators rather than originators, and they both have only their stomach (*venter*, Prolog. 11) as their ultimate inspiration to perform. Persius then makes this latter comparison explicit when he mentions the "poet-ravens and poetess-magpies" (*corvos poetas et poetridas picas*, Prolog. 13) whose work is ironically described as "nectar from the Hippocrene spring" (*Pegaseium nectar*, Prolog. 14): these poor writers have essentially transformed into the greedy birds, and are writing purely for the purpose of feeding themselves, with little artistic merit⁹⁵.

Juvenal regularly employs animal imagery in his satires, with a keen eye on the appropriate levels of connection between the satiric subject and the animal itself. In his first satire, for example, Juvenal compares the criminal activities of an informer (*delator*, I.33) with a vulture: the similarity is that both bird and criminal "prey on the already consumed" (*rapturus de nobilitate comesa*, I.34), with the word *nobilitate* showing that the informer's victims must always be aristocratic, whereas a real vulture would not be so picky about their prey. A second animal simile also relates to a satiric lowlife, namely a gigolo, who is said to "grow pale like a man who has trodden barefoot on a snake" (*palleat ut nudis pressit qui calcibus anguem*, I.43)⁹⁶: although the connection is specifically stated that both the gigolo and the snakebite victim have been drained of their blood (*sanguinis*, I.42), in

⁹³ *Demitto* can be used both of 'letting a body-part drop' (e.g. *Aen.* IX.436), and of 'letting a weapon drop' (e.g. Statius' *Thebaid* X.423); this latter sense (with Horace's ears ironically being turned into weapons) would tie in with the satire's pervasive military imagery (see pp. 58-9 below).

⁹⁴ Muecke (1993) 119 notes that "the metaphorical use of *latrare* ... has epic parallels", citing *Od.* XX.13. *Ann.* 481S and *DRN* II.17 as examples; compare also *iratum ventrem* at ii.VIII.5, which is possibly "more elevated than the 'barking stomach'" (Muecke (1993) 230).

⁹⁵ Austin (1961) 224 considers ravens to be "practically omnivorous", a trait that is obviously connected to the word 'ravenous'; Gildersleeve (1979) 75 also makes a connection here with Ovid's tale of the Pierides, turned into magpies after losing a recital contest against the Muses (*Met.* V.294ff.).

⁹⁶ Both Scott (1927) 49 and Witke (1970) 137 point to *Il.* III.33-5 and *Aen.* II.379-80 as potential epic sources for this snakebite imagery.

the case of the gigolo, Juvenal is euphemistically referring to a post-coital torpor, and hence his ‘blood’ should actually be realised as semen⁹⁷. Juvenal then appends a further simile for the gigolo’s pallor, likening his whiteness to that of a nervous man about to take the stage at a famed rhetorical contest (*Lugudunensem rhetor dicturus ad aram*, I.44): the crudeness of the sexual subject hence acts as a deflating juxtaposition to both the grand animal simile and this contemporary reference⁹⁸.

Bird imagery is brought into both the second and third satires for the purpose of mocking the satirical subjects of the comparison. In the second satire, Juvenal’s mouthpiece Laronia finishes her arguments on sexual equality with a bird metaphor concerning the legislature of the period: *dat veniam corvis, vexat censura columbas* (“the law condemns doves, but gives mercy to ravens”, II.63). The ‘doves’, ironically, are adulterous women (like Laronia herself⁹⁹), whom the *lex Iulia* (II.37) regularly punishes; the ‘ravens’, therefore, are her target, the hypocritical effeminates, who go unpunished for committing sodomy, since the Scantinian law (II.44) is rarely invoked by comparison¹⁰⁰. In the third satire, another of Juvenal’s mouthpieces, Umbricius, uses a bird simile in order to point out the ridiculous extent that a Greek’s flattery can reach: *miratur vocem angustam, qua deterius nec | ille sonat quo mordetur gallina marito* (“he admires a thin voice, which sounds no worse than a hen being pecked by her husband”, III.90-1). The simile heightens the feminine deformity of this voice, thereby further mocking the sycophantic Greeks¹⁰¹.

Two animal metaphors in the sixth satire aid the impression of misogyny that Juvenal creates elsewhere. While discussing the servitude of married men to their wives, the satirist mockingly turns these spineless husbands into cattle, as they bow down under the ploughman’s yoke (*ferre iugum*, VI.208); then, the argumentative nature of such a domineering wife is characterised by her metaphorical presentation as a tigress whose cubs have been taken from her (*orba tigride peior*, VI.270)¹⁰². The appropriateness of the animals’ actions and their human counterparts highlights the contempt that Juvenal holds for both the dominated men and the dominating women. The handful of animal metaphors in Juvenal’s tenth satire also belittle the human subjects because of their specific animal qualities. First, the effects of old age on someone’s physical appearance are mockingly

⁹⁷ Courtney (1980) 94 remarks that “semen is a kind of blood”, according to ancient medics.

⁹⁸ Barr (1991) 143 explains the point of the word *Lugudunensem*; Courtney (1980) 95 is not over-the-top in calling this double-simile “from the sublime to the ridiculous”.

⁹⁹ Braund (1995) 208 suggests that Laronia’s comment on the *lex Iulia* combines with her indignation at her effeminate targets to imply that she herself is an incriminated adulteress.

¹⁰⁰ Courtney (1980) 132 explains further that “*columbae* are chaste, ... whereas *corvi* ... prey on *columbae*”.

¹⁰¹ Scott (1927) 71 mentions this “intentionally ridiculous use of an epic device”.

¹⁰² Ferguson (1979) 215 considers these two animal metaphors to be “vital” to the mood here in the way that they “frame the whole passage”.

likened to a simian's face in an extended simile: *talis aspice rugas | quales, umbriferos ubi pandit Thabraca saltus, | in vetula scalpit iam mater simia bucca* ("see the kind of wrinkles which mark the aged cheeks of a mother ape, from the shady glades extending along Thabraca", X.193-5)¹⁰³. The elderly are similarly mocked for their frailty, and specifically their inability to feed themselves, in the epic simile of a chick being fed by its mother (*ceupullus hirundinis, ad quem | ore volat pleno mater ieiuna*, X.231-2)¹⁰⁴. Finally, the long-lived Trojan king, Priam, is mockingly likened to an aged bull (*ut vetulus bos*, X.268)¹⁰⁵ because of the sacrificial manner of his death next to an altar (see chapters five, p. 131, and seven, p. 164-5, on further mocking aspects of this scene). In the twelfth satire, Juvenal creates a subtle joke on human greediness by contrasting the shipwrecked captain of Catullus' boat with a beaver (*castora*, XII.34): while the beaver will happily chew off its own testicles (*testiculi*, XII.36) in order to escape a trap, the captain is reluctant to save himself by jettisoning his ship's precious cargo¹⁰⁶. A final example of contrasted animal imagery comes in Juvenal's fourteenth satire, where the extended references to the good parental skills of storks (*ciconia*, XIV.74), vultures (*voltur*, XIV.77) and eagles (grandly alluded to in a periphrasis as "Jupiter's noble servants" – *famulae Iovis et generosae*, XIV.81) sit in complete contrast with the satire's main targets of corrupt parents.

Inappropriate Military Language

One of the key plot components of the epic genre is war: the *Iliad*, the *Aeneid*, the *Annales*, and the *Bellum Civile* all revolve around various glorious mythological and historical conflicts. The use of military language by an epicist is therefore quite common, with epic battles ranging from short duels to prolonged legionary campaigns. When the satirists exploit military language in their own work, however, it is generally in a subversive manner: often, the 'battles' that play out in the satiric realm are far removed from their epic counterparts, either by having completely inappropriate 'warriors' (this ties in with chapter eight's 'satiric hero'), or by being nothing more than a simple argument; at other times, the military language is used in order to establish an unsuitable metaphor, based on either sex or some other lowly activity. In either case, the exploitation of military language lends an elevated tone to the satires that should never be taken too seriously.

¹⁰³ Scott (1927) 36 briefly mentions the grandness of the simile, while Courtney (1980) 473 even suggests that the lines may be a "parody of an unidentifiable source".

¹⁰⁴ Scott (1927) 48 initially labels the simile of a bird feeding its young as Homeric, later (p. 56) citing the reference as *Il.* IX.323-4 (as does Courtney (1980) 476).

¹⁰⁵ Pearson & Strong (1892) 205 and Scott (1927) 56 both consider the sudden impact of the monosyllabic *bos* as the line's ending to have been borrowed from *Aen.* V.481.

¹⁰⁶ Both Courtney (1980) 516-7 and Barr (1991) 217 also explain this joke.

Ennius' satires feature a handful of words with military associations, to differing effect. A fragment which is seemingly drawn from some kind of didactic discussion (see p. 32 above) on cosmological creation contains a military metaphor: *contemplor | inde loci liquidas pilatasque aetheris oras* ("from that place, I watched the flowing and sturdy regions of ether", 3-4W). The participle *pilatus* can literally mean 'armed with spears'¹⁰⁷; although it is being exploited here metaphorically, in order to convey an idea of sturdiness, there may be an intentional image of armoured particles that is somewhat surreal and incongruous. The following fragment is generally considered to have come from a satire on busybodies or parasites, although this is likely just a retrospective connection with Lucilius' and Horace's poems on a similar theme: *restitant occurrunt obstant obstringillant obagitant* ("they linger, ambush, obstruct, confine, and move against you", 5W). Ennius' choice of words here conveys an impression of ambush and assault, which would incongruously raise these pests as warriors¹⁰⁸ (see pp. 58-9 below on Horace's similar military elevation of a parasite): further mocking elevation comes from the anaphora or repetition of the prefix *ob*. A final piece of evidence for Ennius' exploitation of militaristic imagery comes from a comment by Quintilian that one of Ennius' satires featured a conflict between Life and Death (*Mortem et Vitam*, IX.2.36) as personified abstract concepts: this conflict may have been elevated into mock-epic levels, if we consider Quintilian's use of the military phrase *contendentes* ("battling") to be representative of Ennius' own content.

Horace brings military language into his first book on several occasions, and, although the phrases are sometimes just indicative of the military lifestyle, there is usually a contextual contrast that makes the elevated words subversive in some way. In his first satire, for example, Horace contrasts the jobs of soldier and trader, by putting an idealised view of the glory of battle into the mouth of a disillusioned merchant, who claims "*concurritur: horae | momento cita mors venit aut victoria laeta*" ("battle is joined: a quick death or a joyous victory comes in a brief hour", i.I.7-8); perhaps Horace's use of epic military language here¹⁰⁹ is intended to suggest that this merchant's fairly cut-and-dry opinion of warfare has only come from reading epic accounts. The outrageous singer Tigellius is described in the third satire with one brief military simile: *saepe velut qui | currebat fugiens hostem* ("often he ran like he was fleeing his enemy", i.III.9-10). The image of the cowardly military deserter, while debased in itself, is diminished further by

¹⁰⁷ *Pilatus* has this sense at both Virgil *Aen.* XII.121 and Martial X.48.2.

¹⁰⁸ Rudd (1986) 86 labels the line as a "comic jingle". Later military uses of four of these five words occur at: Livy VII.39.14, X.19.5 and XXX.31.8 (*restito*); *Aen.* XI.503 and *DRN* VI.32 (*occurro*); Livy X.36.7 and XXI.41.15 (*obsto*); and Seneca's *Epistles* 115.6 (*obstringillo*); Petersmann (1999) 296 finds it "remarkable that *obagito* cannot be found elsewhere in Latin literature".

¹⁰⁹ For example, similar military overtones for *concurro* occur at *Ann.* 154S and *Aen.* XII.724.

the surrounding description of Tigellius' inconsistent flamboyance. The military imagery of the seventh satire elevates the lawsuit between Persius and Rupilius to inappropriately epic levels: after two earlier comparisons with epic warriors (see chapters five, p. 123, and seven, p. 155), the third militaristic comparison of the litigants to the lowly gladiators Bacchius and Bithus (i.VII.20) comes as a slight anticlimax, which is then compounded by the image of the two men "joining battle" (*procurrunt*, i.VII.21) as they enter the court¹¹⁰.

Horace's most continual use of military language, however, comes in the ninth satire, where Horace's persona is harangued and harassed by a pest, who is desperate to be allowed into Maecenas' elite literary circle. The epic tone of the poem is aided by a potential allusion to Aeneas' tour of the future site of Rome (considered further at chapter seven, pp. 165-6), and the more obvious repetition of the punch-line from Lucilius' thematically similar satire, which was itself a quotation from the *Iliad* (see chapter six, pp. 135-6, on these quotations). The grandest epic touch, however, comes from the military language which accompanies the pest's tormenting of Horace's persona: the satirist therefore elevates the parasite's relentless pursuit to the status of an epic battle, pitching Horace as an unsuitable hero and the unnamed bore as his treacherous enemy, attempting to break down his victim's defences¹¹¹. The first instance of military language comes with the arrival of the pest: *accurrit* (i.IX.3) gives a sense of surprise, as the pest makes an ambush¹¹², and a successful one at that, given that his prey's hand is quickly seized (*arreptaque manu*, i.IX.4). Horace's initial reaction is evasive flight, but his enemy does not give up so easily, and instantly gives chase (*adsectaretur*, i.IX.6) to his helpless quarry; the unsuitability of Horace for any kind of military role is then compounded when his own sweat (*sudor*, i.IX.10) holds him back from making a more literal escape (*discedere*, i.IX.8)¹¹³. The manuscripts offer two variant readings of the pest's intentions at i.IX.16, each of which gives a different belligerent image: '*persequar*' ("I will chase you down") turns the pest into a hunter, and Horace into his prey; on the other hand, '*prosequar*' ("I will escort you") would make Horace an unwilling captive being attended by his guard (and so possibly offers the more appropriate military image)¹¹⁴.

¹¹⁰ This military sense of *procurro* can be seen in epic at *Aen.* XII.785, and elsewhere at Caesar's *de Bello Civili* I.43.3, and Livy VI.12.8 and XXVII.42.3.

¹¹¹ Braund (1992) 21 notes that "both the allusion to Homer and the military language throughout portray the incident as a battle"; Buchheit (1968) 547 similarly explains that "zunächst fällt, wie in Satire 9, auf, daß der Prozewettstreit wie ein Kampf aufgezo-gen ist"; Anderson (1982) 89-101 covers "Horace, the unwilling warrior" and the satire's military vocabulary at much greater length.

¹¹² *Accurro* can also be found with this sense at Tacitus *Agricola* 37.1, and in the two works on Caesar's triumphs (of unknown authorship), *de Bello Africo* 69.4 and *de Bello Hispaniensi* 37.3.

¹¹³ *Discedo* can have a military sense of either desertion (e.g. Livy XXV.20.4) or simply denoting the end of a battle (e.g. Livy II.40.14 and Tacitus *Annales* II.46).

¹¹⁴ *Persequor* is found at Livy XXII.11.7 and XXX.24.1; *prosequor* is found at Livy II.31.11 and XXV.13.5.

After the pest states his case for entry into Maecenas' literary circle, Horace again tries fruitlessly to shake off his pursuer: however, he is forced to accept the nuisance as his conqueror (*victore*, i.IX.43), and follows him along (*sequor*, i.IX.43) like a prisoner-of-war behind his victor's chariot. The parasite resumes his efforts to infiltrate Maecenas' circle, offering his services to Horace as a lieutenant (*adiutorem*, i.IX.46)¹¹⁵, so that the satirist might then usurp or banish (*summosset*, i.IX.48) the rest of the crowd: evidently, the pest himself sees events from a military perspective¹¹⁶. Horace takes this opportunity to instruct the pest with false military plans about Maecenas' vulnerability: after ironically praising the virtue (*virtus*, i.IX.54) of his opponent, he claims that the parasite will easily be able to conquer (*expugnabis*, i.IX.55) Maecenas, who realises that he can be overcome (*vinci*, i.IX.55) and therefore makes the initial onslaught (*aditus*, i.IX.56)¹¹⁷ the most difficult. The pest warms to this theme of laying siege to Maecenas, laying out his plans of assault: he will bribe the appropriate slaves (i.IX.57), remain persistently vigilant (i.IX.58), and finally make a well-timed ambush (*occurram*, i.IX.59), which will therefore result in Maecenas becoming the pest's latest prisoner, and being led along in his wake (*deducam*, i.IX.59)¹¹⁸. When Horace fails to convince his friend Fuscus to rescue him (*eriperet*, i.IX.65), he downheartedly submits to the final, fatal wound from his opponent's knife (*sub cultro*, i.IX.74). Fortunately, an eventual respite comes at the hands of the pest's arch-enemy (*adversarius*, i.IX.75), who drags the parasite off to court amid the final images of war, the surrounding uproar (*clamor utrimque*, i.IX.77) and the ubiquitous assaults (*undique concursus*, i.IX.78)¹¹⁹, before the final punch-line of the translated Homeric quotation.

In his second book, Horace's military images are less common, as his focus becomes more intent on extravagant feasts than on petty conflicts. The seventh satire features a sexual scene with possible military connotations: *agitavit equum lasciva supinum* ("she playfully drove me on like a horse, on my back", ii.VII.50). The vulgarity of Davus' frank description of his sex-life provides a deflating contrast to the image of a mounted cavalryman. This satire also uses a mock-heroic description of a gladiatorial painting, in order to elevate the lowly portrait into an epic reality: *velut si | re vera pugnent, feriant vitentque moventes | arma viri* ("as if those men truly were fighting, raging and dodging as they swung their weapons", ii.VII.98-100) - it should also be noted that one of

¹¹⁵ *Adiutor* has a military sense at Livy X.26.2 and Tacitus *Annales* IV.7.

¹¹⁶ Anderson (1982) 102 points out irony of the pest's "aggressive personality".

¹¹⁷ *Aditus* has this sense at *Aen.* XI.766 and *BC* X.489.

¹¹⁸ *Deduco* has this sense at Livy XXIII.23.8.

¹¹⁹ *Clamor* has the specific sense of a battle-cry at *Ann.* 428S and *Aen.* IX.38; Fraenkel (1957) 118 considers the word *conkursus* to be "wholly appropriate to the scene of the Forum, [but] we recognise at the same time a typical element of descriptions of battle-scenes" - it occurs with this militaristic sense at Livy IV.34.7 and V.32.3, and *Met.* XIV.544.

the three depicted gladiators, Pacideianus, shares his name with a figure from Lucilius' earlier satire about a contest between two gladiators (172W / 149M) (Lucilius' contest will be discussed further at chapter eight, p. 175). The feast of the eighth satire also contains brief military touches, the first of which comes as the assembled revellers chant '*nos nisi damnose bibimus, moriemur inulti*' ("unless we drink him to ruin, we shall die unavenged", ii.VIII.34): the partygoers humorously raise themselves as warriors being stirred into battle, their ironic enemy being the somewhat deflating contents of Nasidienus' wine-cellar¹²⁰. The comic scene of disaster that soon befalls this dinner-party is turned into a metaphorical epic battle: *interea suspensa gravis aulaea ruinas | in patinam fecere, trahentia pulveris atri | quantum non Aquilo Campanis excitat agris* ("meanwhile the tapestries had fallen from where they hung, bringing great disaster onto the dish, and dragging down more black dust than the North wind blows on the Campanian field", ii.VIII.54-6). The epic language of this comparison does not sustain an epic mood, since the truth of the fallen tapestries diminishes the scene; the grandly exaggerated expression for a simple cloud of dirt is also quite comical¹²¹. Finally, the earlier idea of vengeance from ii.VIII.34 recurs with the word *ulti* (ii.VIII.93): the drunken 'warriors' are again deflated by the means of their vengeance against their host, this time by simply refusing to eat any of Nasidienus' luxurious offerings (ii.VIII.94).

Juvenal's exploitation of military metaphors is always intended to mock the satiric reality that is being inappropriately elevated by the warlike imagery. In his first satire, for example, the gambling at a casino is described in mock-epic military language: *proelia quanta illic dispensatore videbis | armigero* ("what battles you will see, with the bank-manager acting as squire!", I.91-2). The games are incongruously viewed by the gamblers themselves as battles, with cash acting as their weapons: these delusions therefore mock the game-players¹²². Ironically, Juvenal later views his own 'game', the satiric genre itself, as a battle, with the archaic word *duelli* (I.169) highlighting the elements of conflict in the satiric genre (Juvenal's 'heroic' role here will be considered at chapter eight, p. 173).

Juvenal's second satire features several military images which sit incongruously against the main topic of effeminate men: such an image occurs in the first line with Juvenal's desire to flee (*fugere*, II.1) from these effeminate hypocrites¹²³. Juvenal's first

¹²⁰ As Muecke (1993) 234 explains: "the declaration of war is humorously couched in parodic quotation of an epic or tragic catchphrase ... the epic language reminds us of the 'wars' which could break out at parties" (this foreshadows the dinner-table fight in Juvenal's fifth satire).

¹²¹ Muecke (1993) 236 expands that "the style has general epic colouring, and the simile is epic, with the dust recalling that of battle scenes" - he specifically cites *Il.* XI.151ff., *Ann.* 264S, and *Aen.* XI.876ff as examples.

¹²² Braund (1996) 96 considers the fact that "the gambling scene has an epic flavour" to be an example of the satirist fulfilling his primary, exploitative agenda (i.e. "to show that satire is more relevant than epic").

¹²³ Braund (1996) 121 mentions this military metaphor.

mouthpiece in this satire, Laronia, then continues this process when she claims that the effeminate hypocrites are able to protect themselves from prosecution and persecution by sheer force of numbers (*defendit numerus*, II.46); the manner in which this defence is carried out is a particularly incongruous military image of the effeminate men adopting a formation of interlocked shields (*iunctaeque umbone phalanges*, II.46)¹²⁴. Laronia's coarse accusations (themselves incongruously raised as *canentem*, II.64)¹²⁵ finally cause the effeminate hypocrites to desert their posts (*fugerunt*, II.64) in disgrace. The parade of flamboyant and effeminate men features an ironic warrior in its midst: the owner of the grandly-described mirror (see chapter six, pp. 141-2, on the two Virgilian reminiscences here), sees a wishful reflection of himself in it as the parade's general, ordering the standards to be raised (*quo se ille videbat | armatum, cum iam tolli vexilla iuberet*, II.100-1). This scene is ironically held up as worthy of mention in the history-books, since military excellence and obsession with one's appearance have supposedly never been found together before: this contrast is exemplified by two amusing juxtapositions of glory in battle and beauty tips. Firstly, there is the murder of Galba by someone who took care of their skin (*occidere Galbam | et curare cutem*, II.104-5); and secondly, there are the political aspirations of somebody applying a bread poultice to their face (*adfectare Palati | et pressum in faciem digitis extendere panem*, II.106-7). The subversive military connections in this satire conclude with the revelation of the worst sin of the noble effeminate Gracchus: his shameful gladiatorial appearances¹²⁶ (II.143ff.) are deemed even more depraved than his homosexual marriage (II.117ff.). Gracchus' pretence at this martial role is compounded by the fact that he is soundly beaten by his opponent in front of "the stern old Romans of the past", such as the Marcelli and the Catuli (II.145-6), whose nobility is "held up as exempla to shame the Romans of today"¹²⁷; Gracchus' reality is hence another sham of masculinity.

In the third satire, the busy streets of Rome are briefly elevated as "a mock-epic battle"¹²⁸, despite the mundane activities of the people as they go about their everyday business: Umbricius is (probably unintentionally) 'attacked' by various lowly weapons amidst this crush, including elbows (*cubito*, III.245), planks (*tignum*, III.246), and wine-

¹²⁴ Anderson (1982) 211 suggests that "while the false moralist assumes the pose of a hero ... his martial appearance serves only to disguise his effeminate characteristics"; Braund (1996) 132 explains the specific military manoeuvre as "each man's shield overlapping and protecting the man to his left".

¹²⁵ Scott (1927) 67 makes a connection here with the utterance of prophecies by the Sibyl.

¹²⁶ The hierarchy of the ignoble profession of gladiators is discussed by Braund (1996) 159.

¹²⁷ Rudd (1986) 222; Anderson (1982) 113 marks the contrast here between Juvenal and Horace in their comparisons of virtue and ignobility: Juvenal has a "complete absence of hope".

¹²⁸ Braund (1996) 35.

jugs (*metretam*, III.246)¹²⁹. A handful of military metaphors appear in the fourth satire, aiding the general mock-epic atmosphere of Domitian's council chamber. The councillor Crispus' sycophancy is ironically viewed as his armour (*his armis*, IV.93), this military word pointing to the threat of violence in the court against which the council members required some kind of protection¹³⁰. Mainly, however, it is the satire's 'heroic' big fish who is elevated with military phrases once it enters the discussion. First, Veiento prophetically (*divinat*, IV.124) interprets the fish as a sign of impending victory¹³¹, metaphorically turning the fish into either a captured king (*regem aliquem capies*, IV.126), from its size and its own captivity, or a British chariot (*temone Britanno*, IV.126), because of the spikes (*sudes*, IV.128) on its back. Montanus' suggestion that a large plate be built for the fish then holds the ridiculous military image of his wish that the Emperor's camps may always be armed with potters (*figuli tua castra sequantur*, IV.135), if only for the ironic purpose of making large platters for other big fish.

The assorted grand periphrases that are used to elevate the fifth satire's dinner-party (see pp. 41-2, p. 46 and p. 49 above) seem to reflect the host's pretensions: the grand mood is then deflated by the similarly elevated military metaphors that describe his lowly guests' antics, as the meal enters the epic realm in an entirely different manner¹³². The meal begins with the unruly fighting of the greedy parasites: the hunger of this mob (*cohortem*, V.28) results in an initially vocal skirmish (*iurgia proludent*, V.26)¹³³, although wounds (*vulnera*, V.27) are soon endured from the hurled cups (*pocula torques*, V.26) and cheap plates from Sagunta (V.29)¹³⁴. The feast finally ends with a further mocking military image of the guests: they are mindless soldiers, with bread drawn at the ready like weapons (*stricto pane*, V.169), approaching the dinner-table / battleground under the host's orders¹³⁵. The sixth satire turns these military metaphors from the dining-room to the bedroom, with two

¹²⁹ Scott (1927) 31 explains that this military imagery gives "an exaggerated picture of the confusion of the street", while Braund (1996) 217 notes that "bathos is conveyed by ... the unglamorous 'weapons' with which the poor man is assaulted".

¹³⁰ Ferguson (1979) 171 points out a general link between military metaphors and the air of violence in the council chamber; Braund (1996) 255 specifically labels this military metaphor as "sarcastic".

¹³¹ Braund (1996) 263 claims that Veiento's "direct speech is an epic touch".

¹³² Scott (1927) 83 points out the slightly different approach by Juvenal here, as he "even attains humorous effect by a mocking grandiloquence rather than by lightness of tone"; the comment by Ferguson (1979) 184 that Juvenal was "creating an atmosphere by allusions and associations" also holds true outside of this satire.

¹³³ Juvenal's juxtaposition of the military word *proludo* (used elsewhere with a sense of 'entering into initial combat' at *Aen.* XII.106 and Cicero *De Oratore* II.325) with the lower word *iurgium* (admittedly carrying a sense of conflict, although normally just at an argumentative level) creates a somewhat incongruous image.

¹³⁴ Braund (1996) 281 discusses the contrast between the "military vocabulary, some of it associated with high poetry, [and] the drunken brawl described"; Ferguson (1979) 175 notes a further military allusion, namely that Sagunta, as well as being infamous for its cheap crockery, was also actually the site of the first battle of the Second Punic War.

¹³⁵ *Strictus* is used for 'weapons being drawn' at *Aen.* II.334 and XII.175; Braund (1996) 303 simply explains the entire satire's militarism with "this *cena* is a battle-field".

examples of a “sexual-military psychological link”¹³⁶. First is the suggestion that women are most desirous of a man’s “sword” (*ferrum est quod amant*, VI.112), with its double-meaning that men should be both (straightforwardly) belligerent and (euphemistically) well-endowed; then the overly-masculine women who boss about their slaves are seen as generals, ordering their ‘camp’ to be shifted to the baths (*castra moveri*, VI.419)¹³⁷. This exploitation of military imagery about women is more extensive when women are shown to have become gladiators (VI.246-267): the standard images of armed and armoured warriors in these twenty-two lines are subverted by their application to women, the most obvious juxtaposition being between these female warriors’ current weapons (*armis*, VI.264) and their previous, more feminine tool, the lowly bedpan (*scaphium*, VI.264).

The rhetorical teachers in the seventh satire are twice elevated by military metaphors, thus highlighting the ‘struggles’ that they face in life. First, they must come down from their rhetorical schools in order to ply their trade in the law-courts (*ad pugnam qui rhetorica descendit ab umbra*, VII.173): *pugnam* is a military metaphor that turns the bustle of the Forum into a battle. The satire concludes with the deflated comparison of the *rhetor* with a victorious gladiator, regarding the paltry payment that both men receive: the plight of the educated man to gain monetary recognition of his education is thus turned into a metaphorical gladiatorial contest, although the chances of becoming *victori* (VII.243) are unlikely given the topical flaws of the patronage system. The eighth satire’s theme of the disparity between the past nobility and their dubious descendants is initially demonstrated with a juxtaposition of the military deeds of the former and the frivolous antics of the latter: a contemporary figure is shown to be gambling (*luditur*, VIII.10) until dawn, the very time when his ancestral generals (*duces*, VIII.12) would have been setting up camp (*castra movebant*, VIII.12). The contrast of noble figures indulging in lowly gladiatorial events is then repeated from the second satire, as the very same nobleman, Gracchus, is pictured as a disgrace (*ignominiam*, VIII.209) when he wields a trident (*tridentem*, VIII.203) and net (*retia*, VIII.204) in the arena.

Military glory is purposefully deflated in the tenth satire, as Juvenal satirises the wish for a long and distinguished military career, visualised as “the spoils of wars” (*bellorum exuviae*, X.133). These supposed benefits are immediately inverted by images of defeat: a breastplate mounted on a tree (*truncis adfixa tropaeis | lorica*, X.133-4), a broken cheek-plate (*fracta ... buccula*, X.134), and a hanged prisoner-of-war (*captivos in arcu*, X.136). The implied inspirational qualities of such images for soldiers are further debased

¹³⁶ Ferguson (1979) 204.

¹³⁷ *Castra movere* occurs at Livy II.58.3 and XXII.36.6 (and at Juvenal VIII.12 above).

as Juvenal points out that it is all too often the idea of gaining glorious renown (*famae*, X.140) which spurs warriors on, rather than the thought of proving their virtue (*virtutis*, X.141). Juvenal exploits a further military metaphor later in the satire in order to show the frailty of old men: a huge number of diseases (*morborum omne genus*, X.219) group together like a besieging army (*circumsilit agmine facto*, X.218)¹³⁸ in order to assail the old men's weak bodies, a somewhat comical image of belligerent germs. A final military image (assuming that the military references in Juvenal's incomplete sixteenth satire are both topical and serious) comes in the thirteenth satire, with regard to the natural world: the concept that such natural impediments as storms (*tempestas*, XIII.228) are to be considered "the weapons of the gods" (*deorum | ... tela*, XIII.231-2) appears fairly conventional, although the inclusion of disease (*febre*, XIII.229) as such a weapon seems slightly ironic.

Petronius' 'heroes' can often be found competing in a 'battle' of some sort: of course, given both their effeminacy and their general inability to appropriately adopt any kind of heroic role (as discussed throughout my later chapters), such 'battles' are always deflated in some way. For instance, although the initial meeting between our 'heroes' and the priestess Quartilla and her attendants threatens to dissolve into a fight (*depugnandum*, 19.5), it would not be a typically epic fight: not only is Encolpius quite unheroic in his readiness to face off against Quartilla (*cum Quartilla consisterem*, 19.5) and her "very feeble little women" (*mulierculae ... infirmissimae*, 19.4), but, ironically, he is not even certain of his chances of victory (*sed ne quid tristius exspectarem*, 19.4), which places his supposed masculinity (*virilis sexus*, 19.4) in its actual context. The more rugged scene of a bar-brawl between Eumolpus and some drunken revellers swiftly becomes deflated: the initial violence of hurled earthenware dishes (*urceolum fictilem ... iaculatus*, 95.5) and brandished meat spits (*veru extis stridentibus plenum*, 95.8) gives way to the less serious attacks of an old woman (*anus*, 95.8) and her dog (*canem*, 95.8), which Eumolpus somehow manages to fend off with only the deflated weaponry of a candle (*candelabro*, 95.9) to defend him, a particularly comical image. The apparent subtext of violence towards women recurs on Lichas' ship, when the jealous Encolpius promises to hurt (*iniuriam ... verberanda*, 108.5) Tryphaena for her advances towards Giton. This scene does descend into violence, although Encolpius belittles the actions himself by saying that the fighting was only "similar to a battle" (*veluti ex proelio*, 108.9), and so nobody really got hurt, especially since their deflated weapons of barbers' razors (*novaculam*, 108.10) were blunt anyway from their earlier use to shave the heroes' heads (103.3). A further

¹³⁸ Scott (1927) 65 notes that *agmine facto* appears at the end of *Aen.* I.82; it can also be found at *Aen.* I.434, Livy VIII.28.6 and Seneca's *Epistles* 104.19.

subversive ‘battle’ occurs between Encolpius and a trio of sacred geese (*tres anseres sacri*, 136.4): the third goose, humorously considered by Encolpius to be their general (*dux*, 136.4), attacks his legs, although the first two seem to be trying to remove his clothing (appropriate to their position as Priapus’ geese¹³⁹). Encolpius actually emerges victorious in this conflict (suggesting an association with Hercules in his victory over the Stymphalian birds), although the ironic description of the lead goose as “very ferocious” (*pugnacissimum*, 136.5) only serves to deflate the hero’s unimpressive victory.

Menippean Verse Passages

The satiric sub-genre of Menippean satire allowed the interpolation of brief verse passages into the predominantly prose narrative (see chapter one, pp. 5-6); hexameter verses (while not always a specifically epic conceit) often appear at inappropriately lowly moments in the tale, or are used to mock the general poetic style employed by other authors¹⁴⁰. Seneca first employs hexameter lines to set the scene in the *Apocolocyntosis*:

*iam Phoebus brevior via contraxerat arcum
lucis, et obscuri crescebant tempora somni,
iamque suum victrix augebat Cynthia regnum,
et deformis hiemps gratos carpebat honores
divitis autumni, iussoque senescere Baccho
carpebat raras serus vindemitor uvas*

(“now the Sun had shortened the light of its orbit with a briefer route, and had increased the times of dark sleep, and now the victorious Moon was increasing her own reign, and grim winter was seizing the deserving honours of rich autumn, and, since Bacchus had been ordered to grow old, the late vine was holding on to its few grapes”, III.1). The familiar periphrastic hyperbole here elevates the description of autumn with its respective personifications of the sun, moon, and wine crop as Phoebus, Cynthia, and Bacchus, each deified item being given two lines of over-inflated verse to show the causes and effects of autumn¹⁴¹. Seneca swiftly deflates the grandeur of these verses, however, by explicitly stating the time and date, therefore making the lines appear comically superfluous (see chapter two, p. 23). He then backtracks slightly, considering this latter exact expression to actually be “too plain” (*nimis rustice*, II.3), and suggesting that the details of the time of

¹³⁹ Richardson (1980) has compiled assorted arguments for why these sacred geese might have been considered “favourites of Priapus” (*Priapi delicias*, 137.2).

¹⁴⁰ Fredericks (1974a) 104-5 explains the verse interludes as either “naturally extending what has been said without any clearly stated motivation” or “to illustrate something that has come up in a literary discussion”.

¹⁴¹ These lines are variously labelled as “bombastic circumlocutions ... beloved by poetasters” (Eden (1984) 68-9), “extravagant periphrases” (Roth (1988) 17), and “overblown epic hexameters” (Coffey (1976) 172).

day and year actually require such inflating hexameter lines to do them justice. Hence, Seneca goes on to include a further three hexameter lines: *iam medium curru Phoebus diviserat orbem | et propior nocti fessas quatibat habenas | obliquo flexam deducens tramite lucem* (“now the Sun had split his route in two in his chariot, and he shook the tired reins nearer to the night, and led the winding light on its downhill path”, II.3), which elevate Phoebus’ midday course to even higher levels of ridicule, and therefore seem to mock the grandeur which epic poets perhaps unnecessarily display (see chapter two, p. 23).

Seneca’s longest and most impressive exploitation of hexameters is the mock-heroic passage that combines the divine apparatus that ends Claudius’ life with several laudatory verses towards the incumbent Emperor, Nero, and his promises of a better age (IV.1). The bias of these thirty four lines is towards Nero’s introduction (thirty-two lines) rather than Claudius’ exit (two lines); both figures are mocked, however, Nero because Seneca’s elevated comparisons to assorted rising stars¹⁴² are ironically balanced by the fact that it is just Nero’s artistic skills that are being praised, and Claudius because his life-thread is labelled as “the royal representation of an idiot’s life” (*stolidae regalia tempora vitae*, IV.1.2). A brief passage of fourteen tragic iambic senarii lines during Hercules’ interrogation of Claudius shows that epic was not the only area that the satirists exploited: Seneca provides two jokes at the expense of these tragic lines, though, first by Hercules’ knowing adoption of a tragic actor’s poise in order to speak the lines (*tragicus fit*, VII.1)¹⁴³, and then by his fear of Claudius giving him the parodic “blow from a fool” (*μωροῦ πληγὴν*, VII.3), instead of the more usual tragic act of a “blow from a god” (*θεοῦ πληγὴ*)¹⁴⁴. The eight hexameter lines that conclude the tale (XV.1) then mockingly elevate Claudius’ final fate in the afterlife, which is compounded by the incongruous parallel that is created between Claudius’ lowly chore of playing dice with a faulty dice-cup, and Sisyphus’ perpetual uphill struggles with a boulder.

Petronius interpolates poetry more regularly into the *Satyricon*, a motif which has been much more widely discussed recently by both Connors and Courtney¹⁴⁵: there remain a few relevant comments to make here regarding certain verse passages, however. A fourteen line hexameter utterance, after eight opening trimeters, by the rhetorician

¹⁴² Eden (1984) 79 has compiled a short list of epic heroes who were similarly compared with stars, therefore making the technique a distinctly grand method of praise.

¹⁴³ Coffey (1976) 173 dismisses the suggestion that Seneca is mocking his tragedy *Hercules Furens* here by noting that “the similarity of manner is more convincing than many of the verbal parallels adduced” by other commentators; Eden (1984) 93 considers this knowing adoption of tragedy to be “a Menippean motif”.

¹⁴⁴ Both Eden (1984) 95 and Roth (1988) 30 discuss the numerous instances of this tragic motif; both commentators also mention Claudius’ claims of pretended stupidity during Gaius’ reign.

¹⁴⁵ Connors (1998) discusses at length the various motifs and patterns in Petronius’ poetry, whereas Courtney (1991) simply provides a grammatical commentary on the poems in the *Satyricon*.

Agamemnon (5) is the first verse interpolation in the *Satyricon*: the mentions of Sirens and Triton are appropriate to the meter, but his overall theme of rhetorical learning hints at the fact that the epic meter will later be exploited by Petronius in order to aggrandise inappropriate material. The next hexameter passage, however, reveals Petronius' other key purpose in exploiting poetry, namely the mockery of the poet who speaks the lines: Eumolpus, the usual target of this joke, is revealed in his short outburst of six hexameters (83.10) to be not just a poor poet in financial terms, given the topic of the poem¹⁴⁶, but also a poor poet in artistic terms, given the flawed style and tone of the piece¹⁴⁷.

Once Eumolpus' inept compositional abilities have thus been established, Petronius further mocks his character in a sixty-five line poem on the fall of Troy (89): the epic subject makes this poem relevant here, since the verse form is actually iambic senarii rather than hexameters. This adoption of the 'wrong' meter (a tragic verse form being used to recount epic events) is one way in which Eumolpus' lowly poeticism is mocked here; another is the setting of this poetic utterance, at an art gallery, and specifically in front of a portrait of the fall of Troy (*quae Troiae halosin ostendit*, 89.1), thereby juxtaposing an apparently good representation of the epic tale against Eumolpus' definitely bad account. Since Eumolpus' version of the story doesn't descend into the perhaps expected parodic treatment of Virgil's account (as will be discussed further in chapter seven, p. 165), Petronius' satiric point here must be not so much the fact that the epic stories of Laocoon and the Trojan Horse are dealt with in uninspiring lines of flat (and decidedly non-epic) poetry¹⁴⁸, but rather that Eumolpus does not realise his unsuitability as an epic poet¹⁴⁹ (and is therefore a counterpart to his new-found friend, Encolpius, who is similarly unfit to play the part of the epic hero). The most obvious hint at Eumolpus' lack of talent, however, is the immediate aftermath of his recital, as an abusive crowd of bystanders in the gallery hurl stones at him (*ex is, qui in porticibus spatiabuntur, lapides in Eumolpum recitantem miserunt*, 90.1); but Eumolpus' idiocy is amusingly compounded by his blissfully unaware belief that the stone-throwing is a tribute to his poetic ability (*plausum ingenii sui*, 90.1).

Eumolpus tackles a further epic subject later in the *Satyricon*, this time in the more appropriate epic meter of hexameters: his mini-epic on the Civil War (119-124) is developed at much greater length than the previous poem (295 hexameter lines), but must

¹⁴⁶ Slater (1990) 167-8 considers the point of Eumolpus' brief poem to be "a sample of his stock in trade ... proof that he is a poet"; moreover, the mention of his poverty seems proof that he is an untalented poet.

¹⁴⁷ Eumolpus' poetry is variously described by commentators as "[a] rambling rhetorical rag-bag" (Coffey (1976) 191), "truly awful" (Bodoh (1987) 271), and "bombastic and second-rate" (Slater (1990) 121).

¹⁴⁸ As Bodoh (1987) 274 suggests.

¹⁴⁹ Slater (1990) 100 discusses Eumolpus' various flaws as a poet; as Walsh (1970) 47 further notes, Petronius' satiric target in Eumolpus' account of the Fall of Troy is "certainly not Virgil", but rather "a city of tragic versifiers" whom Eumolpus represents.

be further seen in relation to the list of ‘epic rules’ just mentioned (118). While Eumolpus’ account of the Civil War is supposedly brought in to back up and exemplify his ‘rules’ on the techniques of epic style and composition, his failure to support this claim again mocks the poet’s total ineptitude and accompanying ignorance. Similarly, the implicit identification of Lucan as a poet who not only appeared to ignore Eumolpus’ rules, but also specifically wrote his own account of the Civil War, should not be taken as meaning that Eumolpus is parodying Lucan’s *Bellum Civile* (surely he is not competent enough?), but should rather be seen as an example of Eumolpus’ arrogance and ignorance regarding poetry (see chapter two, p. 29)¹⁵⁰. Although Eumolpus does appear to follow the events of the Civil War as Lucan presents them in his first book¹⁵¹, stylistically his poem has more in common with Virgil’s epic writing (apparently following on from Eumolpus’ affirmation of his inspiration by Virgil at 118.5). The prevailing example of these allusions to the *Aeneid* comes with the recurring grand imagery of the Underworld (as will be covered at chapter four, p. 79), which seems to have been appropriated from *Aeneid* VI: arguably, this could be a jibe at Lucan as well, since the *Bellum Civile* is notoriously lacking in any kind of supernatural machinery. Elsewhere, though, Eumolpus also borrows liberally from assorted scenes in the *Aeneid*, a practice which treads a fine line between inspiration and downright plagiarism: his monstrous personifications of the abstracts *Fortuna* (79ff.) and *Fama* (210ff.) are quite similar to Allecto’s winged appearance at *Aen.* IV.174ff., and Eumolpus also copies Virgil’s implicit comparison between Augustus and Aeneas in the *Aeneid* by forging a similar connection between Caesar and Aeneas, based on their initial reluctance to do battle (156ff. / *Aeneid* II), before finding inspiration in omens (177ff. / *Aeneid* II and VIII), and then belligerently entering Italy (183ff. / *Aeneid* VII-XII)¹⁵². The narrative surrounding Eumolpus’ poem also features Virgilian reminiscences, such as the quotations from *Aeneid* IV during the tale of the Widow of Ephesus (see chapter six, pp. 146-7), and an epic storm (see chapter four, pp. 86-8), which enhance these connections.

Petronius’ most continuous exploitation of verse passages in the *Satyricon* comes towards the end of our surviving text addition: unfortunately, the majority of these poems have survived only as individual fragments, and therefore it is often difficult to assign an immediate surrounding context to any given poem. The general theme of this last section, however, is Encolpius’ affair with Circe; hence, we can suppose that Petronius’

¹⁵⁰ Relihan (1993) 19 rightly points out that “the larger target is Eumolpus”, explaining that the poet “does not view [his verses] as parodies”.

¹⁵¹ Luck (1972) 137-9 has an exhaustive list of exact correspondences in subject matter between the poems.

¹⁵² George (1974) 123-30 discusses (and in some cases dismisses) an apparent list by Rose of 152 verbal parallels between Eumolpus’ version of events and Lucan’s; but, as Zeitlin (1971) 76-8 notes, “emphasis should fall on the nature and selection of these [i.e. Virgilian] borrowings and adaptations”.

exploitation of poetry here is for the purpose of inappropriate elevation, raising the sexual themes into incongruously grand levels. For instance, two of the hexameter poems (128.6 and 132.8) refer explicitly to Encolpius' impotence, an obvious juxtaposition of a base, sexual subject matter with an epic mood¹⁵³. Often, the poems include references to the exploits of mythological figures; however, the overall context of these hexameter poems acts as a simultaneous deflation of the myths and an elevation of the central love affair. Hence, Encolpius' attempts to make love to Circe are inappropriately likened to the grand passions of *Iuppiter* (127.9)¹⁵⁴, while the description of the woodland setting of their love-making makes incongruous references to both *Daphne* and *Procne* (131.8); the attempts of the priestess Oenothea to 'transform' Encolpius feature parallel references to the standard epic 'transformers', *Circe* and *Proteus* (134.12), although the nature of Encolpius' transformation (i.e. from a sufferer of impotence into a virile man) mocks the mythical characters' metamorphoses; and Encolpius' mock-heroic defeat of the sacred geese is further elevated by the poetic comparisons with the epic defeats of such monstrous birds as the *Stymphalidas* and the *Harpyias* (136.6). But perhaps the most important of these verses, with regard to its overall connection to the story, is Encolpius' prayer to Priapus in a final effort to cure his impotence (139.2); the various references to divine wrath, including the *ira Priapi* that Encolpius believes he has specifically incurred (see chapter eight, pp. 185-6), are a final example of Encolpius' recurring attempts to view himself and his actions in heroic terms, despite the lowly reality of the situations¹⁵⁵.

¹⁵³ Connors (1998) 32 calls Encolpius' poem towards his impotent penis at 132.8 a "histrionic outburst", which she later qualifies (Connors (1999) 74) as an example of Encolpius' "erotic verse in accounts of his disappointments with Giton and with Circe ... [and] poetic allusions and quotations to frame his own adventures in absurdly 'epic' terms"; Zeitlin (1971) 71 unnecessarily attempts to find links with the *Aeneid* in this general epic-style lament to impotence - in fact, as McDermott (1983) 83 notes, the closer epic connection is *Od.* XX.18ff., where Odysseus argues with his own organ, although, as Encolpius himself adds in his typical self-aggrandising manner, the argument was actually with Odysseus' heart (*corde*, 132.13).

¹⁵⁴ Connors (1998) 41 considers the specific scene evoked here to be "Zeus and Hera on Mount Ida in the *Iliad*" (*Il.* XIV.346ff., to be exact).

¹⁵⁵ Baldwin (1973) 295 suggests that Encolpius "is doing no more than canonize himself as a Homeric hero"; Conte (1996) 2 agrees that "it is easy for Encolpius ... to yield to the temptation of the epic-heroic model".

Chapter 4 - Epic Motifs

The nature of the epic genre meant that its readers had certain expectations of their epic poetry to contain battles and voyages, heroes and heroines, monsters and gods; there were also a certain number of typical, related scenes that essentially became motifs of the epic genre, stock epic situations or themes that an epicist was compelled to exploit in his poetry. The satirists also exploit these generic clichés, with the two usual, contrasting effects: the general satiric context surrounding the scene or motif is incongruously elevated by the epic connection, while the grand motif itself can be turned into a mocking parody of its usual epic form because of this satiric context. And so, again, we find the lowly elements of the satiric realm being presented within a device or scenario more appropriate to epic figures and themes, in order to equate the satiric and epic genres on a further level.

The Golden Age

The satirists' exploitation of the motif of the Golden Age is slightly different to the other themes and scenes discussed below. The Golden Age of mankind is represented in didactic epic works such as Hesiod's *Works and Days*, the opening section of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*, as an idyllic time in the past, shortly after the very beginnings of humanity, and a lot of mythological tales are furthermore considered to have occurred in this distant era of peace, tranquillity and morality. This period is quite an obvious and, indeed, appropriate area for a satirist to mention, since the overriding concern of the satiric genre is the condemnation of contemporary sins: attacks on vice and folly in the present are made more potent by highlighting the contrasting virtue and decency that existed in the past - and what could be a more perfect representation of this sin-free past than the Golden Age? The exploitation of the Golden Age in satire, then, is intended to expose and ridicule the contrasted elements of the satiric realm, setting up quite sincerely the grand exempla towards which their contemporary society should look for inspiration¹. Hence, while the tone surrounding these allusions to the Golden Age is quite elevated, the thematic sins of society are not themselves elevated by the exploitation of the epic motif; and similarly, the motif itself is generally not being mocked by the satiric juxtaposition. However, there do exist within some of the satires a handful of subtly harmless jokes relating to the Golden Age, which therefore shows that the satirists should never be viewed as taking themselves (or their work) too seriously.

¹ Toohey (1992) 19 generally suggests that "the 'world' of epic will often represent a past time that is in some way more desirable than the present".

Horace exploits the Golden Age in the third satire of his first book, although with the slight twist that crime is atypically said to have existed at that time: Horace's satiric point, however, is that, while there did exist among humans the basic instincts to become a thief, a robber, or an adulterer (*fur ... latro ... adulter*, i.III.106), there were appropriate attempts to restrain this type of action by imposing laws (*ponere leges*, i.III.105), an action which seems to have failed among Horace's contemporaries. Horace also exploits the Golden Age in the second satire of his second book when he claims *hos utinam inter heroes natum tellus me prima tulisset!* ("I wish that I had been born among such heroes", ii.II.92-3). Although Horace is sincerely referring to the usual heroes of the mythological past here, his context and reasons for making the appeal are slightly mocking, since it is the unpretentious and basic food of the Golden Age that look desirable against the present culinary excess, a minor deflation of the actually positive simplicity of these *heroes*².

Juvenal exploits the nostalgic appeal of the Golden Age more regularly, in order to criticise the morality of his peers. His sixth satire on contemporary female flaws opens with a reminder of what women used to be like in the distant past of the Golden Age (VI.1-24): the focus on the chaste and innocent aspect of this former idyll (*Pudicitiam*, VI.1) is an immediate twist on the usually applauded aspects of peace, law, and society³. Juvenal's mood in this opening passage has been described as "approaching epic grandeur in its general breadth"⁴, since he exploits the usual features of the past's Golden Age with appropriately elevated language (including a quotation from Lucretius' account of creation - see chapter six, p. 151) and little subversion. Although Juvenal's main theme in his exploitation of the Golden Age here is Chastity, he still sets his time-frame by the standard mentions of caverns providing homes (*praeberet spelunca domos*, VI.3), a communion with nature (*vicinarumque ferarum*, VI.6), and freedom from crime (*furem nemo timeret*, VI.17)⁵. A brief, witty remark on the differences the Golden Age's chaste women, and the present likes of Cynthia and Lesbia (VI.6-7) - elegy's modern mistresses exemplifying most of the forthcoming flaws upon which Juvenal will elaborate - does not mock the grand motif, but simply reinforces in an amusing manner the reason for its inclusion here⁶; similarly, although Juvenal has chosen Pudicitia as the goddess whose presence defined his

² Muecke (1993) 126 notes that Horace "mocks the poets' nostalgia for a golden age of heroes" here, although he does at least use an "appropriately elevated tone".

³ Duff (1970) 202 labels this time as "the golden age of innocence"; Ferguson (1979) 186 mentions "primal innocence", although he also recognises that "normally it is Justice who characterises the Golden Age".

⁴ Anderson (1956) 75.

⁵ Scott (1927) 102 points out Juvenal's debt here to "the style of Lucretius", while Singleton (1972) 154 notes that "Juvenal's Golden Age" has similarities with "the Hesiodic version of the myth".

⁶ Braund (1989) 45 explains the "rather ambivalent" image of the women of the past as "a satirist's typical deflation", which should not be seen to "detract from the prime function of this Golden Age country scene".

Golden Age here, her eventual flight is alongside her sister *Astraea* (VI.19), the goddess whose withdrawal marks the more usual end of the Golden Age⁷.

This satire's account of the Golden Age also holds a non-subversive reference to one of the key figures in various creation myths, namely the Titan Prometheus: Juvenal's depiction of the creation of mankind as *compositivo luto* (VI.13) is an elevated reminder of Prometheus moulding the human race from mud and clay. The fourteenth satire also exploits Prometheus' role in an elevated manner: Juvenal wittily characterises the few rebellious youths who have not been corrupted by wicked parents as having been moulded from a better quality of clay (*melioe luto*, XIV.35), a charming appeal to the past that elevates the humility of these few good people much further apart from their corruptive parents' influence⁸. However, Prometheus does not always escape subversion: in the fourth satire, the plate that Montanus requests be built for the big fish is elevated by being deemed worthy of only Prometheus himself (IV.133) as its maker - while the mythological association flatters the 'heroic' fish, Prometheus himself is somewhat diminished by being turned into a simple potter with the essentially lowly task of creating a large plate⁹.

In his eighth satire, Juvenal mentions a vague period in Roman history, "when Rome's allies had just been conquered" (*sociis ... modo victis*, VIII.99)¹⁰, that seems, for him, to be comparable to the Golden Age in its virtue and excellence, especially when contrasted with the contemporary sinners in that satire. Juvenal turns this militaristic and virtuous aspect of the Golden Age on its head in his eleventh satire, however, as he now praises his ancestors for their frugality and lack of luxury at the dining table, which was only ever indulged after a triumphant victory (XI.86-98). Juvenal sums up his beliefs on contemporary sin in contrast to the Golden Age in his thirteenth satire, opining that his own age is more base than iron (*peioraque saecula ferri | temporibus*, XIII.28-9), so base in fact that there is no metal lowly enough to give it a name (XIII.29-30)! Calvinus, the addressee of the thirteenth satire, is then mocked for his naïveté in believing that people still adhere to values more appropriate to the Golden Age, a period alluded to as "prior to Saturn's cowardly flight" (*priusquam | ... | Saturnus fugiens*, XIII.38-40)¹¹. This mythological

⁷ Singleton (1972) 151 quotes a succinct summation by Anderson (1956) 75: "Juvenal represents Man's degeneration through a double withdrawal: that of mankind from direct relation with Nature, that of the goddess Pudicitia from the earth"; Smith (1989a) 817 portrays the now godless Earth as "a stark and grim landscape in which the high ideals of epic and tragedy can play no part".

⁸ Scott (1927) 60 actually considers *lutum* to be "commonplace", intended "to bring the allusion down to the satiric level"; but Courtney (1980) 565 recognises the wider context of *lutum* being "commonly used of the creation of man by writers who wish to emphasise his humble beginnings".

⁹ Duff (1970) 178 considers that Prometheus might have been "a nickname for a potter".

¹⁰ Scott (1927) 102-4 notes that Juvenal is "waxing eloquent" about the past's military glories here.

¹¹ Scott (1927) 59 and Courtney (1980) 542 both note that Saturn's essential cowardice here is traditional rather than subversive, citing *Aen.* VIII.320 as a prior example that may have influenced Juvenal.

reference-point for the Golden Age is followed by several particularly comical images of other gods during this period (addressed further at chapter five, pp. 109-10); while the gods are mocked by their adherence to human aspects of the Golden Age, this motif is not itself ridiculed here, although the later suggestion that the Underworld had its own Golden Age (see p. 77 below) is a more likely case of mild subversion. Juvenal's return to criticising Calvinus' archaic values does feature a joke at the expense of the Golden Age, although again it is the simplicity of this time that is deflated against contemporary excess, rather than the motif itself: wealth in the past is said to have been judged on how many berries and nuts (*fraga et ... glandis*, XIII.57) people possessed, instead of treasure and gold, a rather charming image showing Juvenal's multi-layered contrast between past and present.

Council of the Gods

The inclusion of the gods is, of course, one of the key features of the epic genre, and their interaction in the world of human affairs accounts for much of the plotting in epic tales: the gods can essentially be visualised as puppeteers, with the so-called mortal 'heroes' therefore being reduced to simple playthings, for the amusement of the dwellers of Olympus. When a meeting has to be called in order to determine the exact level of interference which the gods should provide, we know that the situation on Earth must be extremely serious: epic examples include the discussion on the deification of Romulus (from *Ann.* 51S onwards); Jupiter's call for a debate on mankind's fate, provoked by Lycaon's barbaric actions (*Met.* I.163ff.); and Virgil's scene of the council on the continuation of the War in Latium (*Aen.* X.1ff.)¹². Lucilius is the first satirist to exploit such a scene, when he pictures a council meeting of the gods discussing "the highest affairs of mankind" (*consilium summis hominum de rebus habebant*, 5W / 4M): this apparently elevated topic of discussion is initially elaborated upon, as the gods try to save the people of Rome from an imminent disaster, or at least "to preserve it for another few years" (*lustrum hoc protolleret unum*, 8W / 7M). It soon becomes apparent, however, that Lucilius is parodying this motif, since, rather than an invasion or a war threatening Rome's downfall, it is simply the evil actions of one man, Lupus, that have prompted this emergency discussion¹³. Lucilius builds up the epic mood with his celestial setting, but then mocks the gods by their worries over one man's actions: similarly, Lupus' immorality

¹² Eden (1984) 98 mentions these references in his discussion on Seneca's godly council; Gowers (1993a) 202 believes that Ennius' scene is the direct source of Lucilius' parody here - Lucilius' scene may then have even inspired these later epic versions (cf. Servius on *Aen.* X.104ff., and Ahl (1985) 98 on the obvious 'wolf' link between Lucilius' subject of divine debate, Lupus, and Ovid's cause for celestial concern, Lycaon).

¹³ Courtney (1980) 197 suggests that Lucilius probably didn't invent such a parodic scene, since "Menippus, who appears to have parodied Homeric councils, evidently gave to Lucilius the idea of a mock-epic council".

is in apposition with the grand deeds of the usual heroes which would have been discussed by the gods in the epic realm. The integrity of the Gods is then brought down a further notch in their speeches at this meeting, as they behave like human orators (see chapter five, p. 105, on this belittlement of the gods). The conclusion to this meeting, as a decision is reached on Lupus' fate, is also to be viewed as a parody: while Lupus is at first metaphorically elevated as the "strong Emathian wind" (*venti ... Emathii vim*, 43W / 41M) whose destruction would end the "waves and ripples" (*fluctus undasque*, 42W / 40M) of his chaos, his death turns out to be somewhat deflating, as it is foretold that he will be poisoned by the juice of two small fish (*saperdae ... et iura siluri*, 46W / 54M)¹⁴.

The trivial topic, and deflating outcome, of a supposedly elevated meeting is repeated by Juvenal in his fourth satire: this poem has been labelled as "the most conspicuously epic in tone" out of all of Juvenal's satiric works¹⁵, for various reasons discussed throughout my thesis, but not least because of the parodied scene of a council meeting. Rather than reprise Lucilius' scene directly, however, the satirist instead presents a slight twist on the council of the 'gods', by re-enacting such a scene with the Emperor Domitian (an initially appropriate substitute for Jupiter as convenor of the debate) and his inner circle of cronies (an immediately less appropriate collection of debaters). These *quasi*-Olympians are holding their own debate on the fate of a large fish which has been caught: the lowly topic of discussion, the comic portraits of Domitian's elite group of friends, and the rather obvious decision made about the fish (to be cooked and served in suitably large receptacles) all combine to make this scene a typical deflation of a stock epic motif by a satirist. It has been suggested that this satiric meeting is based more directly on a specific scene from a lost epic work by Statius: the inclusion of the names Crispus, Veiento and Acilius in both Juvenal's scene of Domitian's trusted clique and Statius' similar fragment seems more than a coincidence¹⁶. While we may never know how closely this satire follows Statius' account of an imperial meeting, there are nevertheless enough examples of other council scenes in epic works for this satiric version to be counted as a general subversion of a grand cliché, rather than as a direct parody of merely one source.

The usual reasons for divine discussions on (and subsequent interventions in) human affairs are based on the actions of epic heroes and mortal 'favourites' of specific deities: the *Iliad*, for example, features a slighted Apollo sending a plague on the Greeks,

¹⁴ Warmington (1938) 16-7 notes that there seems to be a double pun in this fate, since the *lupus* was also a type of fish, while *iura* could also be taken to mean "justice".

¹⁵ Scott (1927) 77; Winkler (1989) 433 also notes the "sustained epic tone", which Gowers (1993a) 202 further labels as an "exaggeratedly heroic style".

¹⁶ Scott (1927) 81 accepts this connection with Statius' lost *De Bello Germanico*, while Braund (1996) 272 further notes that Statius' catalogue of the councillors' names would be an easy target for Juvenal to parody.

Thetis' retribution on behalf of her son Achilles, and a united divine dissolution of an early truce between the Trojans and the Greeks, in the first few books alone. The satiric examples above show the less important affairs in which the gods (or their closest human counterparts, the Roman senate) might indulge themselves: Seneca, though, returns to the more important issues for the gods to discuss in his *Apocolocyntosis*. The scene of a divine decision being made regarding an earthly problem occurs several times in this satiric work, and, even though the general scenario is appropriately grand, Seneca manages to deflate the epic machinery by clogging it with comical imagery. The initial earthly problem is actually rather serious, but is addressed in a somewhat scatological manner: the Emperor Claudius is on his deathbed, suffering from extreme constipation. Further irony is added in the attitude of the divine patron who has been appointed to oversee this problem: not only was Mercury chosen because he is sarcastically said to admire Claudius' wit and eloquence (III), but it is actually the Empire's fate which bothers him more than the Emperor's¹⁷. After Claudius' divinely-approved demise, his arrival in heaven presents a further problem for a god to pass judgement on, the slightly more appropriate decision on his deification. Some of the subsequent debate is apparently missing from Seneca's work, unfortunately, as we arrive at the gods' discussion (VIII) *in medias res*: evidently, the missing passages involved the divine ambassador Hercules being convinced of Claudius' appropriateness for deification, and the subsequent admission of these two characters into the Senate-house for the debate¹⁸. The majority of the rest of the poem does cover this meeting, however, and, in typical satiric manner, Seneca deflates the importance of the discussion on the Emperor's deification, not just from the circumstances of Claudius' imperial ineptitude and personal defects (see chapter five, pp. 102-4), but also from the lack of interest which the gods therefore display in the debate (see chapter five, pp. 110-1). The gods dismissively decide to 'pass the buck' to the Underworld, where the debate on the fate of Claudius' soul is finally resolved: he does not become a god, but rather his nephew Caligula's slave (XV).

The Underworld

Just as the epic motif of the supernatural machinery of the gods is exploited by the satirists, so the 'evil' opposition of the Underworld is often dealt with in a less-than-serious manner. Lucilius exploits two of the standard punishments in the Underworld in order to exaggerate the offensive qualities of a particularly awful meal: the chef is turned into the Fury Tisiphone (162W / 169M), taking out some kind of mad vengeance with the

¹⁷ Eden (1984) 72 elaborates that "malice sparkles through his pretended concern".

¹⁸ Roth (1988) 31 suggests the former episode, Coffey (1976) 165 the latter.

disgusting dish; and one of the ingredients of the meal is imagined to have been oil taken from Tityus' lungs (*Tityi e pulmonibus*, 162W / *Titini pulmonibus*, 169M) - although it is obviously the actual chef and his putrid concoction that are the targets of Lucilius' derision here, the reference to Tityus' lungs, rather than his liver¹⁹, might be an act of deflation regarding the mythical figure too. Horace refers to a similar punishment of the Underworld in the first satire of his first book, with an apparent digression from his theme of miserliness onto the story of Tantalus "seizing thirstily at the waters that flee from his lips" (*Tantalus a labris sitiens fugientia captat | flumina*, i.I.68-9)²⁰; however, as Horace himself then points out, the story is actually relevant to his theme, and only the names have been changed (*mutato nomine*, i.I.69) from the myth of Tantalus to the reality of a miser, as both figures are therefore considered to be committing an act of *hubris*. This association is an ironic elevation of the miser's mere money-grabbing next to Tantalus' attempts at grabbing the food of the gods, and the miser's punishment of never being able to spend the money that he has amassed (i.I.70-2) is a further incongruous contrast to Tantalus' fate. Horace also obliquely refers to a famed mythological punishment in the third satire of his second book, when he mentions a bronze pot "in which crafty Sisyphus soaked his feet" (*quo vafer ille pedes lavisset Sisyphus*, ii.III.21). Although the point of mentioning this mythological figure in association with the pot is to imply that the item is very old²¹ (just as Horace had earlier suggested with a bowl that Evander was supposed to have made at i.II.90-1 - see chapter five, p. 93), there is also the subtly implied joke that Sisyphus needed to soak his feet because of his constant, literal uphill struggle, an irreverent twist on the myth's reality.

Juvenal first establishes the Underworld as one of those trite epic subjects which he is attacking in his first satire by mentioning the clichéd nature of the various tortures that Aeacus, judge of the Underworld, inflicted on his victims (*quas torqueat umbras | Aeacus*, I.9-10). The Underworld is then developed more fully in the second satire, as the "polar opposite" to the "domain of *turpis*"²² that Juvenal believes his world has become. Although Juvenal mockingly introduces the Underworld as something that not even boys believe in (*nec pueri credunt*, II.152), he concedes that it may be considered real (*sed tu vera puta*, II.153), if only for the purpose of making his satirical point. The details which Juvenal exploits in his portrayal of the Underworld here are actually appropriate to a grander portrait of Hades, with perhaps the most famous literary presentation coming from the epic

¹⁹ Tityus' liver (ἥπαρ) is consumed by vultures at *Od.* XI.578.

²⁰ Horace apparently follows the Homeric version of Tantalus' fate here (*Od.* XI.582ff.), rather than Lucretius' more recent variation of a stone forever hanging over the thief's head (*DRN* III.980ff.).

²¹ Muecke (1993) 135 elaborates that, since Sisyphus was "the legendary founder of Corinth", this piece would therefore count as the very first item of treasured Corinthian bronze.

²² Both quotations are from Anderson (1982) 217.

genre, namely *Aeneid* VI: the rivers Cocytus and Styx (*Cocytum et Stygio*, II.150) actually appear at *Aen.* VI.297 and VI.323 respectively, while Charon's ferry (II.151) comes in between these references, so perhaps Virgil's epic scene was influential on Juvenal at this point²³; however, the inclusion of frogs (*ranas*, II.150) in the Underworld does also suggest Aristophanes' comic depiction of Hades. The contextual point of Juvenal's depiction of the Underworld comes with mention of Curius, Fabricius, and the *Scipiadae* (II.153ff.): these 'historical heroes'²⁴ (who also appeared in Virgil's Underworld) have always been hinted at in contrast to their debauched successors throughout this satire, and now Juvenal explicitly imagines their reactions to the unprecedented introduction of an effeminate ghost among their number, rather than the usual epic hero (see chapter five, p. 91, for their actual response, and on the overall seriousness of their presence here).

Virgil's representation of the Underworld also appears to have acted as a source for a passage in Juvenal's third satire, as the tale of a traffic accident victim is brought to a conclusion there: as the man sits on the banks of the muddy river Styx (*sedet in ripa*, III.265), awaiting the fearsome ferryman Charon (*porthmea*, III.266), he discovers that he must remain in limbo, because, following his violently unexpected death, his soul has arrived without a coin (*trientem*, III.267) between his teeth to act as his travel fare on the ferry, an amusing twist ending to this grand mythological scene²⁵. Juvenal amusingly considers the Underworld to have had its own Golden Age (see p. 73 above); the usual details associated with the Underworld are mockingly subverted in the portrayal of this past time. Pluto did not yet hold power in Hades' depths (*nondum imi sortitus triste profundi | imperium* (XIII.49-50), and Proserpina had not yet become his "Sicilian wife" (*Sicula ... coniuge*, XIII.50)²⁶; also absent from the Underworld at this time were various tools of vengeance (*nec rota nec Furiae nec saxum aut uolturis atri | poena*, XIII.51-2), each of which specifically alludes to a famed mythological sinner²⁷ - while Juvenal is alluding here to the usual Golden Age motif of the absence of crime and punishment, his image of the *umbrae* being a lot happier (*hilaes*, XIII.52) in the Underworld without these tortures is an amusing twist on their traditionally woeful image. These hellish punishments are again briefly exploited when Juvenal elevates the guilty conscience of a criminal as being more cruel than any of the tortures dished out by the Underworld judge Rhadamanthus

²³ Barr (1991) 152 also notes Virgil's *Georgics* IV.467ff. as an influence here; Flintoff (1990) 123 finds these allusions "slightly disconcerting", and rightly notes the contrast with the effeminate frolics from earlier in this satire, while Pollmann (1996) 486 merely cites the phrases as "griechische Mythologie vorstellte".

²⁴ Hight (1954) 63 calls them the "shades of the mighty dead".

²⁵ Fredericks (1973) 66 labels this joke as "a note of epic travesty".

²⁶ Scott (1927) 73 explains these allusive periphrases.

²⁷ Courtney (1980) 544, Barr (1991) 221 and Gifford (1992) 147 all note the specifically intended character connections: Ixion's wheel, Orestes' Furies, Sisyphus' rock, and Tityus' vultures.

(XIII.197). Juvenal's list of punishments in his fourteenth satire - *stridore catenae*, | ... *inscripta, ergastula, carcer* ("clanking chains, branding, dungeons, and prison", XIV.23-4) - may also refer to Virgil's Underworld, since he had already used this image of "clanking chains" (*stridor ... catenae, Aen. VI.558*)²⁸; the tools of torture would thus be made more menacing by the association.

Seneca concludes his *Apocolocyntosis* in the Underworld: its presentation in his satiric work is quite sincere, as the satirist simply exploits the Underworld's typical trappings, such as the hell-hound / guard-dog Cerberus (XIII.3) or a crowd of condemned souls (XIII.4-5), in order to provoke a lowly and therefore mocking response from the supposed 'hero' Claudius (such as, in the above cases, self-ignorance or fear, respectively). Similarly, Petronius' exploitation of the Underworld is not in itself mocking, but rather is intended to mock the *Satyricon*'s unheroic characters. The Underworld is usually evoked as a metaphor by Petronius, rather than the literal scenes set there by Juvenal and Seneca; the main source of this Underworld metaphor is the *cena Trimalchionis* episode (chapters 29 - 77), in which a series of parallels between the details of Trimalchio's meal and the Underworld not only illustrate the insufferable nature of the meal, but also compound the mock-epic adventures of our 'heroes'²⁹. Upon arriving at Trimalchio's house, Encolpius is comically terrified by a huge guard-dog, painted on a wall (29.1): this is a mock-Cerberus guarding the entrance to the Underworld of Trimalchio's lair³⁰. The collection of lowly guests at the meal may then represent the souls of sinners in Hades, as their crude gossip maintains the hellish mood already provided by Trimalchio's tricks³¹. The main moments of allusion, however, occur as our heroes attempt to flee the party: Trimalchio's invitation for his guests to enjoy his hellishly hot baths is the last straw for Encolpius and his companions. First, a more realistic 'Cerberus' than the earlier painted dog assaults the escapees: Giton calms the beast by slipping it pieces of food (72.9), just as the Sibyl fed drugged corn to the real Cerberus (*Aen. VI.420*)³². Then, a porter also hinders their escape, pointing out Trimalchio's superstitious rule that guests could only exit his house via a different doorway than that by which they had entered it (*alia intrant, alia exeunt*, 72.10) - the Underworld also operated under such a rule. Encolpius subsequently labels Trimalchio's house as "a new kind of labyrinth" (*novi generis labyrintho*, 73.1) - this can be connected to Virgil's Underworld, where we find the labyrinth appearing as part of

²⁸ Both Ferguson (1979) 306 and Courtney (1980) 564 suggest Juvenal's adoption of this Virgilian phrase.

²⁹ Both Newton (1982) 316ff. and Courtney (1987) 409ff. discuss most of these Underworld references.

³⁰ As Connors (1998) 36 notes, this "quasi-Cerberus" is only obvious in retrospect after the later parallels.

³¹ Newton (1982) 318 notes that, since Encolpius would view himself as Aeneas descending into the party's hellish depths, this would also make Trimalchio an Orcus-like ruler of his 'Underworld'.

³² Courtney (1987) 409 notes that the sign at 29.1 refers to this real dog (rather than the painted dog).

Daedalus' adventures, which had been recorded next to the entrance to Hades at Cumae (*Aen.* VI.14ff.)³³. The flight from Trimalchio's lair is then delayed again as the friends are actually forced to endure more of their host's witless banter and philosophical nonsense in his baths after all. Finally, a mock-funeral procession for the death-obsessed host provides suitable cover for the heroes to flee (79ff.), just as Aeneas' visit to the Underworld concludes with the funeral of his nurse Caieta (*Aen.* VII.1ff.).

When Petronius' characters are not actively involved in a metaphorical Underworld, they still discuss it: Eumolpus' account of the *Bellum Civile* (118ff.), for example, contains several moments of Underworld imagery. The straightforward depiction of these Underworld elements in Eumolpus' flawed poem is not in itself deflated (since, as mentioned at chapters two, p. 29, and three, p. 68, Petronius had other targets in mind), but their presence does have a satiric point. Eumolpus' poem features references to the river Cocytus (69), the ruler Dis (76ff.), the ferryman Charon (117), and the Stygian shades (121), all familiar from Virgil's Underworld realm in *Aeneid* VI; moreover, the similarities between Petronius' description of the frightful and barren entrance to the Underworld (67-75), and Virgil's depiction of both Aeneas' initial entrance into the Underworld (*Aen.* VI.237-40) and Allecto's exit at Cocytus (*Aen.* VII.562-70), have been convincingly established elsewhere³⁴. Petronius' satiric point in exploiting these allusions, then, must be, as Zeitlin notes, to establish an allegory between these negative aspects of Virgil's epic world and the 'hellish' corruption of Rome in the past (1-66), which, in spite of Caesar's depicted efforts, still exists in Petronius' own time (and work)³⁵.

The Trojan Horse

Petronius' exploitation of Underworld imagery throughout the *cena Trimalchionis* episode is interwoven with a further epic motif: the Trojan horse, which took the outer form of a gift, but was actually a troop-carrier, is implicitly suggested by the recurring motifs of deception and disguise within the *Satyricon*³⁶. The huge guard-dog that our 'heroes' meet on arriving at Trimalchio's house, but which turns out to simply be a mural painted on the wall, is an early example of Trimalchio's fondness for deception that will make itself clear throughout the course of the meal. This deceptiveness often takes the form

³³ Bodel (1999) 44 elaborates that "the image of the labyrinth serves as a metaphor ... for the deceptions and ambiguities of Trimalchio's self-presentation", a metaphor that Cameron (1970) 406 had already associated with the motif of the Trojan horse as representative of the "trickery and deceit [that] pervade the *Satyricon*".

³⁴ Both Zeitlin (1971) 76-8 and George (1974) 123-30 discuss these Virgilian similarities at length.

³⁵ Zeitlin (1971) 79ff.; Sochatoff (1962) 456 suggests that "the seriousness of [Petronius'] preoccupation" is highlighted by the fact that "these moral conditions fill over one-fifth of the poem".

³⁶ Zeitlin (1971) 63 opines that "the twin themes of deception and disguise exemplified by the Wooden Horse form perhaps the most consistent and pervasive pattern throughout the *Satyricon*".

of dishes which are not what they initially appear to be: the most appropriate example of the metaphor of the Trojan Horse is the dish of the wooden hen (*gallina ... lignea*, 33.3), containing ‘eggs’ made of pastry, which themselves held cooked fig-peckers (*ficedulam*, 33.8). The dish therefore initially appears to be a cooked chicken; but this is just a wooden receptacle for eggs; but these eggs are themselves merely receptacles for the actual dish of fig-peckers (and not chicken at all). It is not just the dishes which carry this degree of intentional trickery, but the entirety of the meal: Trimalchio treats the party like a play, concocting little scenes to trick his guests, before revealing a surprise ending. After several of these tricks (usually taking the form of a slave making an apparently clumsy error, which is then revealed to have been part of Trimalchio’s grand design all along), Trimalchio himself finally deigns to join the conversation, rather than merely act as a ringmaster at his meal’s circus. He almost immediately quotes the epic line *sic notus Ulixes?* (“is this the Ulysses you know?”, *Satyricon* 39.3 / *Aen.* II.44), hence showing his self-image as this archetypal cunning epic hero (see chapter six, p. 146, for the deceitful context of this Virgilian quote): just like the leader of the men inside the Trojan horse, Trimalchio’s plans are never accidental, but are rather deliberate attempts to obfuscate and confuse³⁷. Outside of Trimalchio’s deceptive meal, Encolpius himself regularly tries to pass himself off as something he is not: both literally, such as in his disguise as a fugitive slave in order to elude Lichas (103ff.), and figuratively, as in his constant, inappropriate efforts to portray himself as an epic hero (see chapter eight, pp. 184-6).

Prophecies I: Dreams

Dreams in the epic genre tend to take the form of a visitation to the hero by the spirit of a dead companion, whose intention is the revelation or instigation of some future event: Patroclus demands appropriate burial from Achilles in *Iliad* XXIII, Hector warns Aeneas that the siege of Troy has begun (*Aen.* 270ff.), and Julia appears to her husband Pompey, warning him that continuing the civil war against his father-in-law Julius Caesar will only lead to his own death (*BC* III.1-35). Ennius then took this motif one step further in his *Annales*, beginning the book with an account of a dream visitation from Homer, inspiring Ennius on the epic path (*Ann.* 2-11S). The general theme is that epic dreams allowed the dreamer access to knowledge that they wouldn’t otherwise have via some intermediary figure; satirical dreams, however, subvert this visitation motif by both mocking the dreamer’s belief in their dream, and inserting comical imagery within the

³⁷ Cameron (1970) 406 elaborates that “Trimalchio, with his trick delicacies and their hidden contents, is like Ulysses and the Wooden Horse”.

dream itself. In the fifth satire of his first book, the inappropriate ‘hero’ Horace (see chapter eight, pp. 175-8) is made to look ridiculous by a dream that he experiences at Trivicium: a girl fails to follow up on her promise to spend the night with Horace, and so his only nocturnal visitor is an unfulfilled wet dream (*immundo somnia visu*, i.V.84) that mockingly stained his bedclothes (*nocturnam vestem maculant*, i.V.85) rather than make any prophetic rumblings. Petronius’ three brief prophetic dreams do not mock the dreamers themselves, but rather subvert the *deus ex machina* aspect of epic dreams³⁸: the revelation of our heroes’ secrets within the dreams of Quartilla (17.7), Lichas (104.1) and Tryphaena (104.2), by Priapus in the first two instances, and Neptune in the third, merely acts as a convenient plot-device, although the two revelations by Priapus might be seen as evidence of the motif of the god’s ill-feeling towards our heroes (see chapter eight, pp. 185-6).

The remaining satiric dreams are all based on Ennius’ hallucination about Homer’s literary advice in the *Annales*. Horace claims in the tenth satire of his first book that this type of dream was re-enacted in his own youth: it was not Homer, however, but *Quirinus* (i.X.32), Romulus deified, who appeared to Horace; and rather than making any constructive literary comments, the night-visitor instead forbade Horace’s writing of Greek verse (actually an appropriate action for this patriotic symbol). Persius, on the other hand, specifically claims to have *not* had such a dream in his Prologue, and subverts the allusion to Ennius’ dream on two counts. First he incorrectly names the site of Ennius’ dream as Mount Parnassus (*Parnaso*, Prol. 2): Ennius had actually dreamt that he was on Mount Helicon, the true location of the Hippocrene spring mentioned elsewhere in the Prologue³⁹. Secondly, Persius actually claims that, if he did have such a dream, he can’t remember it now (*nec ... somniasse ... | memini*, Prol. 2-3): the suggestion that such an inspirational vision could be forgotten so easily (which also conversely implies that Ennius’ dream may have been made up, since most people tend to forget their dreams upon waking)⁴⁰ combines with Persius’ dismissive lapse of memory regarding the correct details of Ennius’ work to totally belittle the motif. Persius again mocks Ennius’ inspirational dream in his sixth satire (see chapter two, p. 27), recalling that the epic author had once dreamt that he was both Homer and a peacock from Samos (*destertuit esse | Maeonides Quintus pavone ex Pythagoreo*, VI.10-11). The comic image of the poet snoring (*destertuit*), as well as the apparent delusion that he actually was either a peacock or even Homer himself (or rather,

³⁸ Baldwin (1973) 275 considers Petronius to be “merely playing with the stock theme of revelatory dreams in epic literature”, although Kragelund (1989) 437 notes that dreams were also a novelistic tradition.

³⁹ Persius also claims to have dreamt on the mountain (*in*, Prol.2), not about it (*de*) - Harvey (1981) 10 elaborates that “no poet claims to have fallen asleep on Helicon and had a dream there. Callimachus and Propertius merely say they dreamed that they were on Helicon”.

⁴⁰ Witke (1970) 81 explains that the word *memini* “shows the detachment of the speaker from his subject”.

the symbiotic entity ‘Quintus, son of Lydia’, fusing ‘Quintus Ennius’ with ‘Homer’, who was apparently born in Lydia⁴¹), serve to deflate both Ennius himself and his contextual epic authority in advocating the beauty of Luna’s port (see chapter six, pp. 140-1, on the Ennian quotation that precedes this ridiculous image of the author).

Prophecies II: Oracles

The prophetic scenes from the epic genre mentioned above tended to predict wars and grand adversity for the hero: in satire, however, it is typically a far more trivial event that is predicted in this grand manner. Horace heightens the epic mood of his ninth satire by claiming that its events were seemingly predicted in his childhood by an old Sabellan witch (*Sabella* | ... *anus*, i.IX.29-30). This source of a lowly fortune-teller, however, does not impinge on the prophecy’s suitably mock-epic vagueness amid hexameter epigrams: *hunc neque dira venena nec hosticus auferet ensis, | nec laterum dolor aut tussis, nec tarda podagra; | garrulus hunc quando consumet cumque: loquaces, | si sapiat, vitet, simul atque adoleverit aetas* (“neither dreadful poison nor hostile sword shall snatch him away, nor pain in his side nor coughing, nor dull gout; someday, a chatterbox will destroy him: if he is wise, may he avoid the talkative, once he has come of age”, i.IX.31-4). The verses begin with the potentially grand demises of poisoning and violent bloodshed, so common in both tragic and epic tales; the introduction of three fatal illnesses hints at the deflated mood that Horace intends for the ‘oracle’ to possess, which then finally comes to fruition in the most humdrum fate, being bored to death by the harassment of the pest⁴². In his second book, Horace includes a further prophecy, by the seer Teiresias in the fifth satire: this prediction is slightly different in that Teiresias apparently relates a real-life, scandalous event at Rome from Horace’s own era, involving the legacy-hunter Nasica’s failure to acquire his son-in-law’s wealth. The literary use of the Greek blind man’s ability to see the future is cleverly belittled here, since the event he foretells is both obscure and from the Roman world: the story is also mockingly told as advice for the potential legacy-hunter Odysseus. The opening line of Teiresias’ story cleverly sets the time of the event in suitably vague wording, which would mean little to Odysseus, but which is completely comprehensible for Horace’s modern audience: *tempore quo iuvenis Parthis horrendus, ab alto | demissum genus Aenea* (“at that time when a young man, of birth sent down from lofty Aeneas, is a scourge to the Parthians”, ii.V.62-3). The points of reference with which Odysseus can generally identify (Parthians, and his old foe Aeneas) may be specifically recognised by the

⁴¹ Both Harvey (1981) 186 and Hooley (1993) 143 comment on this comical image of symbiosis.

⁴² Fraenkel (1957) 117 labels this language as “awe-inspiring”; McGann (1973) 90 calls it “mock-solemn”.

modern reader (Augustus was supposedly descended from Aeneas via the Julian *gens*, and had conquered the Parthians at Actium in 31BC): this periphrastic description of the noble Emperor contrasts with the baseness of Nasica's attached story. Juvenal also makes brief use of prophecy in his eighth satire, defending the epigrammatic nature of his phrase *spoliatis arma supersunt* ("weapons remain for the robbed", VIII.124) as having been derived from the clairvoyant Sibyl's prophecies (*folium*, VIII.126)⁴³: Juvenal exploits prophecy's trite nature to justify his moralising points here.

The Muses

The typical reverence and sincerity which epic poets held towards their work can be partly seen in their regular invocations to the Muses for poetic inspiration, especially before they tackle a particularly difficult passage⁴⁴. The satirists also exploit these invocations, but with the obvious twist of parodic intent: the satirists will either make a 'serious' invocation to the Muses that elevates the subsequent satiric subject matter into association with grander realms⁴⁵, or they will mock the very concepts of invocation and the Muses themselves. In the first instance, we find Horace, in the fifth satire of his first book, calling for assistance from one of the Muses (*Musa*, i.V.53) so that he may adequately describe the battle (*pugnam*, i.V.52) that he saw at Caudium. Horace's invocation works ironically on two levels: first, the battle's participants were not the expected epic warriors, but merely lowlife slaves⁴⁶; and secondly, the following depiction of their 'battle' does not feature a single blow being delivered, instead becoming a war of (not exactly abundant) wits. Persius' first satire also includes an invocation to a Muse (*Musa*, I.68), for general inspiration in his satirical compositions about "morality, luxury, and the banquets of kings" (*in mores, in luxum, in prandia regum | dicere*, I.67-8); these topics are therefore elevated, since they would normally be considered as inappropriate for such a high invocation⁴⁷.

The above examples feature invocations to singular Muses; often in epic, a crowd of inspirational voices are sought - Homer demands ten such voices before his immense catalogue of ships at *Il.* II.489, a number that Ennius copies in an unknown context at *Ann.*

⁴³ Both Duff (1970) 302 and Braund (1988) 234 cite *Aen.* III.443-51 and VI.74-5 as evidence for the prophecies of the Sibyl being written on leaves.

⁴⁴ Harvey (1981) 124 suggests that an address to the Muse would "indicate [the poet's] difficulty of expression", which perhaps would excuse any ambiguity or error on the poet's part.

⁴⁵ Bramble (1974) 6 clarifies that the usual topics of the satiric genre are "a far remove from the themes [that the Muse] usually recommends" in the epic genre.

⁴⁶ Specifically, Sarmenus the jester (*Sarmenti scurrae*, i.V.52) and the onomatopoeically named 'Messius Cock' (*Messique Cicirri*, i.V.52) - Brown (1993) 145 labels this invocation of the Muse as "deliberately off-key", since "the [very] names of the two combatants ... humorously undermine the epic image of *pugnam*".

⁴⁷ Harvey (1981) 35 notes here that "the populace nonsensically praise their poet for writing epic when there is a need for satire".

547-8S, before Virgil's multiplication of the motif into one hundred voices at *Aen.* VI.625, a number that he believes would still not be able to do justice to his description of the extent of the crimes of the denizens of the Underworld⁴⁸. Persius' fifth satire cleverly exploits this so-called "custom of the bards" (*vatibus hic mos*, V.1)⁴⁹ as a recurring motif that is gradually made to appear more ridiculous. He initially clarifies this "custom" as: *centum sibi poscere voces, | centum ora et linguas optare in carmina centum, | fabula seu maesto ponatur hianda tragoedo, | volnera seu Parthi ducentis ab inguine ferrum* ("to demand a hundred voices, to wish for a hundred mouths and a hundred tongues in his work, whether a play is placed in the sad tragic actor's gaping yawn, or the wounds of a Parthian who draws a sword from his groin", V.1-4). The triple repetition of *centum* in just two lines combines with the hackneyed image of a wounded Parthian⁵⁰ to elevate the epic practice almost too much. Persius' exaggeration of the epic motif is then intertwined with a subversive parody of the subsequent purpose of invoking the voices: the aspect of oration (*voces*, V.1) soon gives way to their physical aspects (*ora* and *linguas*, V.2), before another type of mouth, the gaping hole of a tragic actor's mask (*hianda tragoedo*, V.3), is brought in as a further deflation⁵¹. Mention of a hundred throats (*centeno guttere*, V.6) brings in the consumptive properties of the mouths now, although it is actually "lumps of rich poetry" (*robusti carminis offas*, V.5) that must be swallowed, before the final call for "one hundred jaws" (*centenas ... fauces*, V.26)⁵² to adequately declare Persius' aggrandised affection towards the satire's addressee, Cornutus. Ironically, the Roman pastoral Muses (*Camena*, V.21) are mentioned in amongst this motif as Persius' inspiration in writing this poem, a further elevation of this satirical subject matter as apparently compatible and appropriate for the exploitation of the grand style. After a long central section criticising luxury, Persius finally returns to the 'hundred mouths' motif in his conclusion, initially by exploiting a *quasi*-repetition of *centum* from V.1-2. A centurion (*centuriones*, V.189) considers that "a hundred Greeks are worth a mere hundred-as-coin" (*et centum Graecos curto centusse licetur*, V.191), his derogatory tone being aided by the clucking alliteration of the *c*'s and *t*'s; ironically, Persius' original demand for a hundred mouths has now been totally subverted by their transformation into a hundred Greeks (presumably representing philosophers⁵³), and so have become completely worthless for the task at hand.

⁴⁸ Both Harvey (1981) 124 and Barr (1987) 129 also mention other elevated, non-epic examples of the motif.

⁴⁹ Morford (1984) 78 labels this phrase as "high-flown bombast".

⁵⁰ Horace also shows this wounded Parthian at *Satire* ii.I.15 (see chapter three, p. 34); Harvey (1981) 126 notes that the specific wound to the groin was a favourite image of Homer (e.g. Leucus' wound at *Il.* IV.492).

⁵¹ Bramble (1974) 55 discusses the various effects of the changing mouth metaphor.

⁵² Barr (1987) 129-30 mentions how Persius is "continuing the ambiguity" of the mouth metaphor with these words; Bramble (1974) 8 singles out V.26 as the satire's turning point from epic bombast to a lower register.

⁵³ Harvey (1981) 180 suggests that this is a common soldier's racist stereotyping of Greeks as philosophers.

Juvenal's first invocation to a Muse comes in his fourth satire, and, considering the overall epic mood of this poem, it is appropriate that he chooses Calliope, the Muse specific to epic poetry. However, Juvenal's tongue is firmly in his cheek during this invocation: *incipere, Calliope. licet et considerare: non est | cantandum, res vera agitur. narrate* ("begin, Calliope, although you may sit down: you don't have to sing, for it's a true story - just tell it", IV.34-5). The orders issued to the Muse to sit rather than stand, and to narrate rather than sing (the appropriate style for epic composition), show that the subsequent epic mood is to be viewed ironically, while the comment that Juvenal's tale is true is also a knowing joke at the expense of the incredible epic events usually recounted with Calliope's assistance⁵⁴; it has further been suggested that Juvenal is parodying an actual epic invocation here⁵⁵. This ridicule of the practice of invocation is soon followed by a joke about the Muses themselves, as Juvenal flatters them by calling them *puellae | Pierides* (IV.36-7)⁵⁶: his aside that it might profit him to call them 'girls' (*prosit mihi vos dixisse puellas*, IV.37) mocks the Muses as vain women concerned about their age, whose aid can only be given to flatterers. Juvenal's irreverence towards the Muses therefore serves to deflate his own conceit that this story is worthy of an epic style, thus highlighting the inappropriate grandeur that the satire's 'heroes' will be granted⁵⁷.

The Muses are afforded even less reverence in Juvenal's seventh satire, although this is not directly from the satirist himself. Juvenal explains the Emperor's role as 'poetic last resort', as he claimed in his first line (discussed at chapter two, p. 25), by pointing out that it is the Emperor alone who respects the Muses (*Camenas*, VII.2): this is a clever way for the author to introduce the main theme of this satire, namely his indignation at those who are not providing opportunity or patronage for upcoming writers at Rome (unlike the Emperor), and hence could be said to "not respect the Muses". Juvenal takes the opportunity here to graphically illustrate this disrespect for the Muses by concocting a depraved scene involving one of their number: Clio (VII.7) has been forced to leave her home, the *Aganippes* (VII.6), in search of food, and hence is just another vagabond on the streets of Rome⁵⁸. Juvenal's point in these lines, as seen by *praecones* ("auctioneers",

⁵⁴ Winkler (1989) 434-5 implies, in his suggestion that Juvenal "intends simply to concentrate on the telling itself", that epic style might distort the facts of a story; Wilson (1903) 47 labels "the invocation of the Muse of epic poetry and the mock-heroic tone" as an example of "a burlesque".

⁵⁵ Ferguson (1979) 162 discusses Statius' apparent appeal to Calliope before he wrote on the Germanic war.

⁵⁶ Braund (1996) 243 also considers this phrase to be a sign of a specific parody of Statius' epic.

⁵⁷ Winkler (1989) 437 explains that the significance of the lines "goes a lot deeper than a burlesque of some divinities ... the angry satirist presents himself as a divinely inspired prophet in the great epic tradition, herein finding the justification for his moral purpose".

⁵⁸ Although Clio was specifically the Muse associated with the composition of history, Gifford (1992) 80 explains that her name "is used here for literature in general"; Ferguson (1979) 218, Braund (1988) 30 and Hardie (1990) 155 all discuss the incongruity and inappropriateness of her satiric image here.

VII.6) and *atria* (“auction-rooms”, VII.7), is that the poets whom Clio represents are themselves so poor and hungry that they are forced to sell off all of their possessions. Juvenal’s parallel fate for Clio goes one step further, however, as the poetic Muse has no material wares to pawn off, and so she can only sell herself, reduced to the level of prostitution⁵⁹. In case his point has not been realised, Juvenal reiterates that it is the poverty of the *Pieria ... umbra* (VII.8), another lofty name for the Muses’ home, that has forced the poets to offer up all of their belongings to the auction⁶⁰. In spite of his subversive presentation of the Muses here, Juvenal’s sympathy for them is also apparent, and so the satirist must be seen to ultimately share in the respect that the Emperor is affording them and, by extension, the poets who invoke them (see chapter two, p. 25).

‘The Epic Storm’

One of the key plots of the epic genre was the long journey undertaken by the hero (see chapter one, p. 6): since such voyages invariably happened at sea, it was therefore common for the epicists to create an immense storm (and subsequent shipwreck) as an obstacle for their hero to overcome⁶¹. Juvenal includes this motif in his first satire as one of those trite elements of the epic genre that have become overused and unpalatable in his opinion: his label for ‘the epic storm’ as “what the winds do” (*quid agant venti*, I.9) could be seen as a somewhat mocking indictment of the exaggeration and excessiveness that the epicists applied in describing what was essentially a spot of bad weather. Juvenal then goes on to create his own mock-epic storm in his twelfth satire, which can be seen to parallel earlier epic storms; Petronius creates a similarly excessive storm in the *Satyricon* (114ff.), although shipwrecks and sea-storms were common elements in the Greek romantic novels that Petronius may also have been parodying beyond the epic genre⁶². Juvenal’s twelfth satire takes the shipwreck and its survivor, Catullus (named at XII.29 - see chapter eight, pp. 182-3, on his ‘heroism’ in this satire), as its initial theme before switching to the more standard satiric topic of legacy-hunting at XII.93ff.; Petronius, on the other hand, apparently exploits the epic motif merely as a convenient plot device that will take his heroes from one *quasi*-epic episode to another.

⁵⁹ Hardie (1990) 193 explicitly notes this image of prostitution; Braund (1988) 38 further views the references to Clio as a type of withdrawal myth, although the withdrawal is ironically not to heaven.

⁶⁰ Courtney (1980) 351 considers *commissa* (VII.110) to be a “mock-heroic” touch, equating the auction to a battle; Hardie (1990) 156 notes the juxtaposition of “the chatty style of the auction and courtroom scenes” between the “high-flown opening expressions” and “the elevated language” of Juvenal’s imperial praise.

⁶¹ The “Terrible Storm” is cited by Hightet (1954) 48 as one of the conventions of epic and tragedy; both Ferguson (1979) 289 and Braund (1996) 76 cite several examples of epic storms, including *Od.* V.291ff, IX.67ff. and XII.403ff., *Aen.* I.81ff., *BC* V.630ff., and *Met.* XI.478.

⁶² Sullivan (1968) 96 nevertheless points out that “the Greek romance also is not without its debt to epic”.

Juvenal begins his satire by excessively praising the fact that his friend Catullus has survived his misfortunes (XII.1 ff.); although this might seem to be giving away the ending of his subsequent narration of this misfortunate event, we should note that survival is also presupposed in epic storms, since it is often the survivor himself who tells his story of escape at a later date (e.g. Odysseus in *Odyssey* IX). The actual details of the story begin with the general description of the perils that Catullus faced as *pelagi casus* (“dangers of the sea”, XII.17), which are then made more specific as *fulminis ictus* (“lightning blasts”, XII.17) to show that the ship and its crew were actually endangered by a ferocious storm rather than a sea-monster. This vague introduction, however, is soon followed by much loftier details as the storm progresses, which seem to parallel specific aspects of prior epic storms. First is the darkness (*tenebrae*, XII.18), which was caused by a particularly thick cloud formation (*nube una*, XII.19); Petronius also uses a description of “clouds drawing together on all sides to obscure the day with darkness” (*nubesque undique adductae obruere tenebris diem*, 114.1) in order to introduce the coming storm into his account of the sea-voyage. In epic, darkening clouds had already been used as a sign that a storm was approaching: Poseidon’s wrath caused the clouds to gather at *Od.* V.291ff., while Aeolus’ release of the captive winds had a similar effect at *Aen.* I.88-9. Juvenal then follows up this ominous cloud formation with a lightning strike (*ignis*, XII.19), just as Virgil did at *Aen.* I.90; the subsequent terror felt by Catullus (*attonitus*, XII.21) is mirrored by the fear of Lichas’ crew (*trepidantes*, 114.1), and this was of course both Odysseus’ and Aeneas’ reaction to the storms that they were facing too (*Od.* V.296-7 and *Aen.* I.92-3)⁶³.

While Petronius was able to deflate his epic mood simply by placing his inappropriate characters in that common literary situation⁶⁴, Juvenal’s inevitable twist on exploiting the motif of the epic storm does not become clear until his next remark, where he deflates the gravity that he had created in his previous grand lines by summing them up as “the usual serious details of an epic storm” (*omnia fiunt | talia, tam graviter, si quando poetica surgit | tempestas*, XII.22-4). The realisation of this storm as a mere *poetica tempestas* not only explicitly shows that Juvenal is parodying the epic motif, but also suggests that the earlier epic attempts at elevating a storm’s threats were less than sincere by their typical resort to apparent clichés⁶⁵; there is also a suggestion that, like the would-

⁶³ Scott (1927) 54 first suggests that “the similarity is not sufficient to prove that Juvenal had the Virgilian passage in mind”, but later (p. 84) admits that, “while he bases the description of the storm upon no particular epic passage, he has introduced the details which occur most commonly in the epic descriptions”.

⁶⁴ Conte (1996) 56 mentions the storms at *Odyssey* V and *Aeneid* I as comparable material to Petronius’ storm, but rightly adds that the satiric storm is intended to be “unreal”.

⁶⁵ While Scott (1927) 84 and Ramage (1978) 227 both discuss Juvenal’s mockery of this specific epic motif, it is Fredericks (1979) 182 who recognises the bigger picture that Juvenal is again criticising “the unreality of much poetic discourse, especially epic”.

be hero Encolpius later, Catullus himself may have exaggerated his exploits in order to make himself appear more heroic by somehow managing to survive these horrendous conditions. Juvenal's epic mood is further diminished as Catullus' subsequent story of his imperilment is reduced to a series of boring repetitions (*aliud*, XII.24, and *cetera*, XII.25): Juvenal implies that he has tired of recounting all the details of Catullus' experience, since, although they were undoubtedly awful for the victim to bear (*dira quidem*, XII.26), the cliché-ridden narration has now become even worse fate for an audience to endure.

Juvenal does, nevertheless, recount a handful of the later details of Catullus' storm, some of which bear further resemblance to the specific epic storms above. The eventual destruction of the ship on which Catullus was travelling mirrors Odysseus' shipwreck at *Od.* V.315-6, as the mast of each ship collapses, making the craft much smaller (*minorem*, XII.56): however, the literary echo is not completely appropriate, since the mast was snapped by the winds in the *Odyssey*, whereas the satiric mast is chopped down by the captain (*malum ferro summitteret*, XII.54) to compensate for the fact that he greedily refuses to jettison his precious cargo⁶⁶. The eventual climax to the storm also resorts to a final cliché of the epic storm motif, namely divine intervention: just as Aurora brought an end to Odysseus' trial-by-sea (*Od.* V.390ff.), and Neptune quelled the storm that ravaged Aeneas' ship (*Aen.* I.142ff.), so Catullus' life is saved when the Fates decide to extend his life, and hence intervene in the weather on his behalf (XII. 62ff.)⁶⁷. Ironically, Petronius's storm is actually lengthened by the intervention of the Fates at 114.13, to the extent that the passengers are cast adrift among the ship's flotsam and jetsam; hence, Encolpius' final salvation does not actually come from divine intervention, but from the much lowlier means of being caught up in the nets of some passing fishermen (114.14 - presumably, such an ending would have been a common climax to a storm in the novelistic genre). An amusing footnote to this storm comes when Eumolpus has to be forcibly rescued from the ship, since, apparently inspired by this epic storm, he is frenziedly finishing off one of his own epic compositions (115.2); whether this is on the appropriate subject of a *poetica tempestas*, or is in fact his own attempt at describing the *Bellum Civile* from a few chapters later, is not made clear, although Eumolpus' typical lack of talent is amusingly conveyed by the comparison between the sound of his recitation, and a caged animal's baying for freedom (*quasi cupentis exire belvae gemitum*, 115.1).

⁶⁶ Scott (1927) 85 briefly mentions this Odyssean similarity.

⁶⁷ Scott (1927) 85 comments on Juvenal's "lofty epic tone" in exploiting the Fates here.

Chapter 5 – ‘Epic’ Characters

Two of the main defining characteristics of the Roman race were its patriotic sense of history, and its association with mythology (shared by the Greeks); these traits are brought into focus by the epic genre. Historical epic poetry differed from normal historiography by telling the glorious acts of the recent Roman past in appropriately elevated form, thereby praising important military and political figures rather than simply narrating their exploits; and mythological epic poetry did the same for the heroes and heroines of legend, preserving their tales in a memorable and grand manner, and sometimes even tying these legends in with the history of their nation. The tone of these epic works in approaching their mythological and historical characters was therefore often quite reverent and solemn, appropriate to the importance of these figures’ deeds; later epicists such as Ovid and Lucan did add an occasionally mild degree of ridicule and fun towards their mythological and historical characters, but this is extended into outright mockery and irreverence when these figures are brought into the satiric arena. Whether these figures had specifically appeared in the epic genre before, or were merely appropriate material for an epicist, their presence alongside the lowlier and more realistic tone and subject matter of the satiric genre was an automatic deflation of any intrinsic grandeur, which is increased by the satirists’ constant jokes and twists. Although the aforementioned importance of history and mythology to Roman society as a whole could serve as a simple justification for the satirists’ inclusion of these characters, their further association with the epic realm must also be considered. Satire’s exploitation of these mythological and historical figures is a general source of amusement and entertainment, rather than the over-earnest and laudatory portrayal that they would have typically received in epic; the simultaneous elevation of the cast of juxtaposed satiric characters from the ‘real’ world yet again shows how the importance and relevance of the satiric genre is set up against epic’s incredibility and remoteness.

‘History’s Heroes’ (and Villains)

Ennius’ main innovation in the *Annales* was in making his epic poem a very *Roman* work, by associating mythology and history, and therefore introducing a subtextual element to the epic genre (see chapter one, pp. 6-7). Primarily, Ennius had conceived his epic as being an almost panegyric hymn to the founders of the Roman Empire: by glorifying these historical figures in the form of epic poetry, he was identifying them with the mythological heroes of ancient legend¹. But moreover, his continuation of the chronology of the *Annales*

¹ Toohey (1992) 98 goes so far as to call the *Annales* “a national encomium”.

to include leaders from his own lifetime introduced a subtext into his work whereby he was equating contemporary figures with historical leaders and epic heroes all at the same time, hence creating a very patriotic allegorical work; we should not discount the possibility that there was also some sycophancy in elevating important contemporaries in such a way, possibly in the hope of currying political favour². Lucan followed Ennius' technique by writing about recent historical figures (primarily, Julius Caesar and Pompey) as if they were ancient epic heroes; whereas Virgil had already come up with the alternative process of writing about an actual ancient epic hero (Aeneas had already appeared in two different episodes of the *Iliad*), but then adopting a common legend about his descendants to present him as a real-life historical figure linked to Rome's foundation.

The exploitation of these political and historical figures by the satirists, however, is often not so flattering. Whereas other authors chose to elevate these heroes of the past by writing of their exploits in an epic form, the satirists are somewhat ambivalent: as often as the key figures of history are brought in as an example of the good past versus the amoral present, they are just as often mentioned in a comical or dismissive manner, a further source of mockery for a satirist's scorn. Typically, it depends on the poet's intention during any given satire (or indeed, at different points in the same satire) as to which way he will go: on the one hand, it might help him to exploit history's key figures as heroic antitheses to his contemporary society (in a similar manner to the general exploitation of the 'Golden Age' in satire, as covered at chapter four, pp. 70-3); on the other hand, their appearance in the satiric realm might just be as the brunt of one of the satirist's jokes.

Horace is the first satirist to elevate the virtue of history's heroes as a contrast to the total lack of virtue in his contemporaries. He actually equates his own father with such high ideals in the fourth satire of his first book, citing his paternal influence as responsible for Horace's own vice-free life (i.IV.105-126): generally, however, it is a more distant past age that has its moral heroes brought into the satires. In the sixth satire, Horace debates the importance of genealogy in Roman society, where a family tree could mark a man out for distinction or not. The first ancestral path that he traces is that of his patron, Maecenas, who can claim military prowess from both his mother's and his father's side (*avus tibi maternus fuit atque paternus*, i.VI.3): this recollection of Maecenas' ancestors, presented alongside the great legions (*magnis legionibus*, i.VI.4) under their command, serves as a laudatory introduction to the element of autobiography in this poem, as Horace points out that his own lowly background - as the son of a freedman (*libertino patre*, i.VI.6) - did not deter Maecenas from getting to know him. And so he sets about to attack this fascination

² Boyle (1993) 2-3 discusses subsequent panegyric and "politico-historical" works of epic.

with pedigree using examples from Roman history where a family tree was not important, or indeed proved worthless. The two extremes of this situation are Tullius (i.VI.9), a powerful man of lowly birth, and Laevinus (i.VI.12), a wastrel with eminent ancestry. The former, the sixth king of Rome, had the cognomen Servius, which certainly implies a servile heritage; the latter figure, however, as presumably a contemporary layabout, did not then deserve to be able to boast of his descent from the consul Valerius Poplicola, who had helped Brutus to overthrow Rome's tyrannical seventh king, Tarquinius Superbus, in 509BC (i.VI.12-3 - both of these kings also featured in Ennius' *Annales*). Horace then goes on to question the public's motives in their election of officials, claiming that a high-born incompetent like Laevinus would still be favoured over a 'new' man like Decius Mus (*novo Decio*, i.VI.20), whose devotion to the Roman people was beyond compare. Recent evidence of this prejudice is then provided by a final historical figure, Appius the Censor (i.VI.21), who had removed all such 'new' men from the Senate in 50BC.

It is not just the morality of the past which is sometimes praised by the satirists. Persius notes that such Roman ancestors also possessed a bravery and fortitude similarly lacking in their descendants, likening the literary collapse that is his subject in the first satire to a social collapse in morals too: *haec fierent si testiculi vena ulla paterni | viveret in nobis?* ("would these things happen if any seam of our forefathers' balls were still living in us?", I.103-4). Juvenal's second satire extends this masculinity by bringing in "the honourable Roman warriors of early times", such as Curius, Fabricius, and the *Scipiadae* (II.153ff.), as a contrast to the effeminate and passively homosexual men of his own time, "their degenerate successors" who are Juvenal's key target in this satire³. These aforementioned virtuous historical figures had also appeared in Virgil's Underworld⁴ (see chapter four, p. 77), and Juvenal's own Underworld scene shows how these paragons of virtue would react when confronted with the spirit of one of these effeminate men: sheer horror, demanding purification (*lustrari*, II.157) of such a monstrosity. Further virtuous heroes from a past age, including Scipio, Numa, and Metellus, are also brought into Juvenal's third satire for the purpose of being contrasted with the immorality of the present: in the hell of modern Rome, their morally incomparable deeds of great bravery and military success would be ignored, and their social status would instead be rated by the extent of their wealth and assets (III.137-42). Similarly, in Juvenal's fifth satire, ancient virtuous figures are judged inappropriately by contemporary standards: the pretentious host of an elaborate feast is said to have amassed levels of wealth that are greater than the

³ Both descriptions are quoted from Coffey (1976) 125.

⁴ Braund (1996) 162-3 discusses both the exact military histories of these figures and the manner in which Virgil had presented them in *Aeneid* VI.

treasures of the ancient kings, Tullus and Ancus (V.56-9), which are considered as mere trifles (*frivola*, V.59). Juvenal also nostalgically recalls one of the virtues of the very recent past that has nevertheless disappeared in his seventh satire: then, poets could thrive under the educated patronage of Maecenas, Proculeius, and others (VII.94-5). Looking further back into history, Juvenal also mentions such historical figures as Ventidius and Tullius (VII.199), whose successes in the political field (alluded to at VII.201) are said to have been mainly influenced by the one element which modern poets and scholars are often lacking: luck. Juvenal then harks back to those earlier times when fortune was unnecessary among teachers in an atmosphere of piety towards them equally with parents (VII.207-9).

Juvenal's eighth satire takes this contrast between the noble past and the impious present as its overall theme, as he seeks to answer the *quasi*-rhetorical, epigrammatic question "what use are family trees?" (*stemmata quid faciunt?*, VIII.1)⁵. Juvenal's criticism of those contemporaries, who attempt to imbue themselves with the honour that their family-name has merited in the past without attempting to earn it themselves, nostalgically appeals to the honour of Roman history (and, to an extent, mythology) in contrast to modern-day villains. Juvenal satirises his contemporaries' association with the mythological past by pointing out that everybody could claim descent from the grandest mythological figures by virtue of creation myths, with such ancestral mythological figures as *Pico* (VIII.131), "son of Saturn and father of Faunus, first of the Laurentine Kings"⁶, or the Titans, with Prometheus being singled out. Juvenal jokingly calls these mythical figures *maiores* ("ancestors", VIII.133), since their roles in creating the Roman and indeed human races respectively could technically, if not literally, establish them as the forebears of current figures at Rome. Juvenal's theme also allows him to differentiate between recent historical figures with regard to their social standing and their morality: Catiline and Cethegus, who were born of the highest families yet became treacherous in their attacks on Rome (VIII.231-5), are suitably contrasted with the ironic saviour of the city, Cicero (allusively referred to by the grand periphrasis *hic novus Arpinas*, VIII.237)⁷, who may have been *ignobilis* (VIII.237) and only an *eques* (VIII.238), but was surely deserving of the highest accolades in his patriotic actions. Juvenal also praises such historical figures as Marius (allusively known as *Arpinas alius*, VIII.245), whose early farming days were soon replaced by a soldier's duties and a famous victory against the Cimbri in 101BC (VIII.245-53)⁸; he mentions that the Decii, whose sacrifices in their military campaigns are recorded

⁵ Braund (1988) regularly notes the relative lack of indignation in this satire compared to its predecessors, a point which Anderson (1962) 155 had already explained: "indignation has nothing to do with this poem".

⁶ Courtney (1980) 404.

⁷ Scott (1927) 100 briefly notes this allusion.

⁸ Barr (1991) 199 relates Marius' legend.

in Ennius' *Annales*, were also *plebia* (VIII.254), but their religious faith produced victory and renown for their name (VIII.254-8); and Servius Tullius, so called because he was "born of a slave-girl" (*ancilla natus*, VIII.259), is nevertheless said to have aspired to follow in Romulus' (*Quirini*, VIII.259) footsteps as king of Rome, but was ironically murdered by Tarquinius Superbus, son of the true nobleman Brutus (VIII.259-65). A final allusion to this part of history is the heroic *servus* (VIII.266) who revealed the assassination plot against Tullius, with the result that the 'virtuous' conspirators were deservedly punished by flogging (*verbera*, VIII.267) in public; Juvenal sincerely exalts the past in this satire, going out of his way to show how his own reason for praising the past (the presence of virtue) is better than his contemporaries' reason (the inheritance of virtue).

In spite of the above passages where the virtue of historical figures was sincerely elevated against modern immorality, these figures are more often exploited in the satires for the purpose of a joke or witty comment, and again it was Horace who first displayed this trait. In the third satire of his first book, Horace characterises the clumsiness of a friend as he knocks over "a bowl which was well-worn by Evander's hands" (*catillum | Evandri manibus tritum*, i.III.90-1). The fact that the apparent first owner of this antique dish is said to be the ancient king of the Arcadians is probably intended as a mere embellishment to make the bowl seem older, but there is nonetheless also a degree of humour created by the humorous apposition of the ancient ruler and the clumsy, incontinent oaf. A more direct attack against a historical figure comes in the seventh satire of Horace's first book: this short poem revolves around a lawsuit between the disgraced statesman Rupilius Rex, and the half-Greek businessman Persius, presided over by the provincial leader Brutus. The punch line to the two litigants' various skirmishes during the satire comes with Persius' grand entreaty to the judge (*per magnos, Brute, deos*, i.VII.33): he beseeches Brutus to cut Rupilius' throat, since he is used to regicide (i.VII.33-5). Horace appears quite audacious in making such an inappropriate joke about Brutus' part in the assassination of the self-proclaimed 'king' Julius Caesar in 44BC, an event only ten years or so before Horace published his satires; later satirists will adopt this spirit of irreverence more widely.

The exploitation of historical characters in Persius' satires generally creates some quite comical images. In his first satire, for example, Persius sums up entire outlook on contemporary Roman morality with the question *an, Romule, ceves?* ("are you too, Romulus, flaunting your buttocks?", I.87); his society's descent into shameful activities is metaphorically pictured as a literal defilement of the figurehead of Rome's glorious beginnings⁹. Persius goes on to create a comical image of the entire city by comparing

⁹ Bramble (1974) 126 clarifies the contrast of "a symbol of prior greatness" and "homosexual gratification".

himself to the barber of King Midas, who, according to the legend, was the only person who could see that his monarch had developed donkey-ears (*auriculas asini*, I.121 - admittedly, a mythical image, but related to an actual person from history). The point of the comparison is that, just as Midas' barber was compelled to shout his secret into a hole in the ground, so Persius must shout his own secret (that the majority of his peers have 'donkey-ears', or, metaphorically, skeletons in their closets) into his book of satires (*libelle*, I.120): contemporary society is therefore imitating Midas in a subversive manner.

In his third satire, Persius condemns the *saevos tyrannos* ("bloody tyrants", III.35) who have scorned any semblance of virtue throughout their reign. The majority of subsequent discussion on the significance of these bloody tyrants revolves around the inclusion of the theme of tyranny in earlier moral discourse and rhetorical exercises, but it has also been suggested that Persius may have intended for Nero to be inferred as one such tyrant, a dangerous intention given that Persius was writing during Nero's reign¹⁰. Persius does allude to two specific historical tyrants, however, one of whom is also mocked slightly; the satirist considers that the combination of an excess of guilt and a lack of virtue in a tyrant must make their lives more mournful than "the sounds from the bronze bull of Sicily" (*Siculi gemuerunt aera iuveni*, III.39) and more terrifying than the proverbial Sword of Damocles (*pendens ... ensis*, III.40). The former allusion is to a hollow statue of a bull used by the tyrant Phalaris to cook his victims in¹¹; the latter reference is to a sword hanging over Damocles' neck by a single thread as a lesson by the tyrant Dionysius in the potential threats of a life in power. The second reference is therefore slightly subverted by its connection with the first reference: the metal bull was a form of torture, whereas the hanging sword strictly was not, but the connection implies that both were intended as acts of torture by a malicious tyrant¹²; the fact that both 'tortures' are then considered to be insignificant compared to the fear of knowing that one's life is corrupt (III.41ff.) is a further diminishment of the historical tales, albeit one based on sound philosophy.

Juvenal's seventh satire features a brief reference to Hannibal that is contextually deflating; a teacher of rhetoric declaims against his pupils' continual, repetitious essays on the Carthaginian leader (VII.158-166), showing that the warrior-king's presence in rhetorical debates has robbed him of his deserved epic glory¹³. It is Juvenal's tenth satire,

¹⁰ Barr (1987) 106-7 and Jenkinson (1980) 80 both discuss the subject of tyranny as a philosophical cliché; Rudd (1986) 68 mentions the potential allusion to Nero.

¹¹ Barr (1987) 107 explains how this instrument of torture worked: "it 'bellowed' to the screams of those roasting inside it".

¹² Harvey (1981) 89 also notes that the story of Damocles' sword "does not elsewhere represent wanton and regular torture ... it is therefore hardly to be ranked alongside Phalaris' bull".

¹³ Courtney (1980) 371 considers Juvenal's use of Hannibal's standard epithet *dirus* (VII.161) here to be for the sake of a joke: Hannibal has now become "particularly *dirus* to the *rhetor*".

however, that features a much more elaborate deflation of Hannibal, alongside several other historical figures; Juvenal's point in this satire is to physically bring figures from the past, both mythological and historical, into contemporary reality, where the truth behind their respective situations can be exposed and then deflated. Hannibal acts as an example of the downside to military glory in the tenth satire: first, his actions are shown to have been unable to prevent him from being reduced to dust and bones, an idea conveyed by *expende* (literally, "weigh him", X.147). Juvenal then reveals the deflated circumstances behind the military leader's death: he was defeated (*vincitur*, X.159) at the hands of the Romans, sent into exile (*in exilium*, X.160), and finally killed, not by any weapon, but rather by a ring (*anulus*, X.166). Hannibal's suicide may actually have been helped by poison contained within this piece of jewellery, but Hannibal's situation is deflated by the delayed mention of *anulus* as the cause of his death after the presumed weapons in the preceding lines (*gladii* and *tela*, X.164)¹⁴. Hannibal's final deflation here is an extension of his mention in the seventh satire, since, rather than rightfully appearing in epic poetry, he has merely become the subject of schoolboys' rhetorical exercises (*declamatio*, X.167)¹⁵.

A further historical figure for whom the reality of their supposedly glorious situation becomes subversive in Juvenal's new context is Xerxes. The Persian leader's reputation is first built up by Juvenal as the man "who dared to whip the winds" (*in Corum atque Eurum solitus saevire flagellis*, X.180)¹⁶, and as the captor of Neptune himself (*vinxerat Ennosigaeum*, X.182)¹⁷. This personal glory, however, did not reflect on Xerxes' army; Juvenal reminds the reader of their fate of becoming a sea of corpses through which Xerxes' boat alone managed to arrive home (X.185-6). Just as people are keen to ignore Hannibal's suicide in favour of his military exploits, so the savage cost of Xerxes' victory is brought in alongside his more favourably recalled glory: Juvenal ironically deflates the revered heroes with these suppressed moments of reality, thereby backing up his theme of inappropriate wishes. Juvenal finally brings in Pompey, whose historical glory is deflated by a mocking depiction of the manner and timing of his death: the illness (*febres*, X.283) which afflicted Pompey at the time of his finest victory did not kill him, and he lived for two more years, only to be beheaded in exiled defeat. Juvenal's ironic point is that it would have been a more glorious time for Pompey to have died in 50BC at the very moment of

¹⁴ The anticlimax of *anulus* is considered as "noteworthy" by Barr (1991) 207, while Courtney (1980) 470 believes that "the one-word climax in a new line punctures the preceding grandeur".

¹⁵ Bonner (1969) 22 cites evidence for rhetorical arguments on Hannibal being "popular in the Sullan age".

¹⁶ Barr (1991) 208 notes that Xerxes is famed for lashing the Hellespont, not the winds; Courtney (1980) 472 takes the phrase to mean that he overcame a storm, created by these two conflicting winds.

¹⁷ Both Pearson & Strong (1892) 199 and Scott (1927) 66 mention that *Ennosigaeum* ("earth-shaker") was a Homeric epithet for Neptune / Poseidon.

his triumph, and so dying from this illness would, in retrospect, have actually been more preferable (*optandas*, X.284) than his eventual death by decapitation.

Juvenal's fourteenth satire treads similar ground to his eighth satire, although his point is now actually the opposite: rather than his earlier theme of good begetting evil, Juvenal now approaches evil begetting good, and specifically the corrupting influence of evil parents on the innocent youths. The handful of historical images brought into the fourteenth satire are still intended to evoke the glorious virtues of the past, but these moral figures are now seen as being eclipsed, because the present is always being converted into the past, and Juvenal's contemporary villains are now becoming the more immediate representatives of history. For example, Juvenal characterises a miser's greed for requiring large estates by making their size seem greater than Rome at the time of Tattius (*si tantum culti solus possederis agri | quantum sub Tatio populus Romanus arabat*, XIV.159-60): the historical reminiscence is intended to juxtapose the innocence of the past with the immorality of the present, but the past is also deflated because it has been outdone by the present in terms of size. Similarly, the parents' excessive love of wealth is characterised as being greater than the Decii's love of Rome (XIV.238-9) and Menoecus' love of Thebes (XIV.239-41 - note the extra grandeur afforded to the mention of Thebes by Juvenal's vivid periphrastic description of an epic scene played out there, as mentioned at chapter three, p. 44): these grand images of military patriotism are intended to deflate the present's greater lust, but the 'virtue' of greed is also ironically made greater than epic's usually honourable and beautiful details, a unique twist on the typical appeals to the past.

Perhaps the most amusing exploitation of history's virtuous heroes, which both Persius and Juvenal regularly employ, is the ironic association between the immorality of the present and the morality of the past that is established by specific words and phrases. The link between the mythological past and the historical past that Roman epic sought to show was the descent of the Roman race from Aeneas' band of exiles and their brides in Latium¹⁸; whenever the satirists make this epic link explicit regarding contemporary Roman figures, it is with a heavy degree of irony, since the 'descendants of Aeneas' have very few good traits in common with their epic 'ancestors'. For example, in his first satire, Persius labels the general Roman public first as *Polydamas* (a critic of Hector at *Il.* XXII, 99ff.) and then as *Troiades* (I.4): contextually, these elevations become ironic when he is dismissing the literary ignorance of the Roman people. The public who take such delight in poor poetry are then mockingly called *Romulidae* (I.31), an epic-style diminutive that ironically raises his damned critics by their association with the founder of Rome. Juvenal

¹⁸ Ferguson (1979) 236 and Courtney (1980) 394 both explain this route of descent.

first exploits these incongruous reminders of his immoral contemporaries' supposedly grand ancestry in his first satire; the "descendants of Troy" (*Troiugenas*, I.100) have been reduced to the common practice of dole collection, the epic allusion showing how the mighty have truly fallen. Umbricius' tirade in Juvenal's third satire mocks those allegedly true Romans (*Quirites*, III.163, referring again to Romulus) who are actually not brave enough to follow the example of the one true Roman (Umbricius himself - see chapter eight, p. 181, on Umbricius' 'Romanity') by leaving their fallen city *en masse*. Since the eighth satire actually hinges on this ridiculous conceit of mythological ancestry, Juvenal exploits two of these mocking phrases: his initial, scornful address to those who would boast of their epic heritage as the "progeny of the Trojans" (*Teucrorum proles*, VIII.56) is repeated in Juvenal's belief that these elite "descendants of Troy" (*Troiugenaee*, VIII.181)¹⁹ are allowed to get away with offensive behaviour, while lowlier types are not. In his tenth satire, Juvenal incongruously labels the Roman people as "Remus' throng" (*turba Remi*, X.73) while noting their very non-Roman behaviour. Similarly, having noted the traditional simplicity of early Roman life in the eleventh satire, Juvenal mocks those who consider themselves of Trojan descent (*Troiugenis*, XI.95) for their contrasting luxurious excesses. This practice highlights the satirists' general sincerity of idealising the past amidst a present generation whose actions and literature both misrepresent it.

The Emperor

A specific type of historical figure who was most regularly exploited by the later satirists was the Emperor: while the Emperor is not naturally considered to be an epic feature, the point here is that the Emperor's appearance in the epic and satiric genres is completely juxtaposed. Within the epic genre, the mythological / historical subtext that Ennius had established in the *Annales* was extended in Virgil's *Aeneid*, by virtue of the 'Aeneas as Roman forefather' motif mentioned above, in order to directly praise Aeneas' 'descendant' Augustus and so also his promise of a better age under an Empire; further, allegorical connections between Aeneas and Augustus in Virgil's text have even been suggested, which would clearly elevate the Emperor as an epic warrior / hero²⁰. Central to this allegorical association is the fact that Augustus actually appears at two points in the *Aeneid* (with, of course, rather glowing descriptions extolling his Imperial virtues): first, as a central figure in the parade of future Roman heroes that Aeneas witnesses in the Underworld (*Aen.* VI.752-883); and then again in a prominent position on the elaborate

¹⁹ Courtney (1980) 410 notes that Catiline (later mentioned at VIII.231) would be included in this term.

²⁰ Drew (1927) discusses the Aeneas / Augustus analogy at length, and also notes (pp. 98-101) that this allegory had already been partly realised by the classical commentators Servius and Donatus.

relief, illustrating Rome's future history, that Vulcan had etched onto Aeneas' shield (*Aen.* VIII.731ff.)²¹. A connection is therefore made in the audience's mind between Aeneas' leadership of the Trojans from ruin through diversity to the glories of a new civilisation, and Augustus' imperial rule in Rome after the Civil War; such an allegory could thus be seen as Virgil patriotically revering the concepts of Empire and Emperor, which hence set the standards for subsequent Roman epic poetry²². The satirists, however, are somewhat ambivalent towards these concepts - the Empire is typically viewed as emblematic of the corruption of contemporary Rome in contrast to the past's glory days in the Republic, and so the Emperor is the target of criticism and abuse, rather than allegorical praise.

Horace features an extremely brief image of Augustus in the first satire of his second book; the satirist's discussion on subjects for literary praise (or rather, in the case of satire, subjects for literary attack) comes around to the Emperor (*Caesaris*, ii.I.19), whose reaction to any inappropriate comments about him by an author would be to kick out (*recalcitret*, ii.I.20). The verb is usually associated with horses, and therefore the Emperor is slightly mocked by the imagery of a flighty stallion²³. However, this is only a fleeting moment of irreverence towards an Emperor in contrast to Juvenal's scornful writing, which provides many of these instances of unpatriotic Imperial dissent. Juvenal was afforded the benefit of historical hindsight upon which to view the reigns of several Emperors, and hence he was able to criticise those leaders who did not compare well with their illustrious predecessors; specifically, the Emperors that Juvenal regularly attacks are Claudius, Nero, and Domitian, on account of their historically documented flaws and vices, such as perpetual ignorance, spiteful indifference, and murderous arrogance, respectively.

Claudius' frailties are first mocked in Juvenal's third satire: Umbricius elaborates on the noisy bustle of Rome's busy streets as being enough to wake even Claudius (signified by his cognomen *Druso*, III.238) or a seal (*vitulisque marinis*, III.238). The satirist's joke here relies on the assumption that both man and animal were renowned for their heavy sleeping and laziness, an obvious deflation of the Emperor's dignity²⁴. Juvenal's remaining two comments on Claudius both depend on his wife, Messalina, and her blatant adultery. In his sixth satire, Juvenal latches on to this already debauched Imperial image, and perverts it with further base language in order to illustrate his point that adultery inevitably leads to prostitution: Messalina is said to have actually enjoyed selling herself as *meretrix Augusta* ("the Emperor's whore", VI.118), before returning

²¹ Boyle (1993) 83 notes the intentional "analogy between the *princeps* and Aeneas" in this scene.

²² Ahl (1993) 125 notes that "most Roman poetry from Virgil onwards has a political soul".

²³ Muecke (1993) 104-5 briefly notes this moment of animal imagery.

²⁴ Pearson & Strong (1892) 55 note that the comparison "is not intended to be flattering" to the Emperor.

home with the “smell of the brothel” (*lupanaris ... odorem*, VI.132) upon her. This reminder of the unsuitable vices that are often committed in the highest circles of power acts as a grand example of Juvenal’s more general point about society, although it is also meant to deflate the Imperial imagery. Similarly, Juvenal uses Messalina’s faithlessness in his tenth satire in order to show how beauty can be harmful, if not to oneself, then to those surrounding one: the victim in Messalina’s tale is Silius, the man whom she wished to marry (*cui nubere Caesaris uxor | destinat*, X.330-1)²⁵. Although both Silius and Messalina are considered attractive - Silius is described as “most handsome” (*formosissimus*, X.331), while it is Messalina’s eyes that he finds most appealing (X.332-3) - the danger is entirely to Silius: in spite of the proper wedding ceremonies that were being ritually prepared (X.333-8), Silius’ decision not to follow through with it would result in a swift death at the order of the spurned Empress (X.339), while consenting to the marriage would only delay an equally inevitable demise at the hands of the jealous Claudius (X.340-1). Juvenal’s apparent sympathy for Silius’ dilemma serves to mock the will of the Empress, while Claudius’ brief appearance here shows his ignorance of his wife’s machinations, and so he is similarly belittled.

Juvenal’s initial allusion to Nero’s lesser qualities in his second satire is quite oblique, and actually coexists within a further epic reference: his description of a mirror belonging to an effeminate hypocrite as *Actoris Aurunci spoliū* (“spoils of the Auruncan, Actor”, II.100) is a direct quotation from the *Aeneid* (as will be discussed at chapter six, p. 142). In addition to this subversive quotation, however, there is also the possibility that *actoris*, taken as the simple noun, and not as the epic warrior’s name²⁶, could be taken to refer to Nero, who was born at Antium (an area of land associated with the tribe of the Aurunci²⁷); this allusion would therefore establish both Nero’s vanity, and a connection between himself and the effeminate hypocrites (heightened by the mention of Nero’s crony and successor, Otho, at II.99), neither of which is a suitably laudable Imperial image. Nero’s other negative qualities are more explicitly mocked in the eighth satire, as Juvenal brings the Emperor (*Nerone*, VIII.193) into a discussion on actors and artistic types who, in spite of their nobility, still committed assorted sins and crimes; Nero himself was, of course, a keen fiddler (*citharoedo principe*, VIII.198), and so the Emperor’s own artistry and nobility are brought into deflating association with sinners and criminals. Juvenal then

²⁵ Scott (1927) 100 considers the allusive naming of Messalina as “the Emperor’s wife” at X.330, followed by her direct naming at X.333, to be an example of Juvenal’s usual dismissive technique (see chapter three, footnote 57); Barr (1991) 212 has further details regarding this political scandal.

²⁶ Barr (1991) 150 mentions this common assumption among commentators; since Juvenal’s original Latin text would have been written in just capital letters, both the quotation and the allusion could coexist here.

²⁷ Barr (1991) 150 clarifies that Antium was “not far from the ancient territory of the Aurunci”.

goes on, however, to name some of Nero's actual dirty deeds, in a witty comparison between the Emperor and Orestes (periphrastically elevated as *Agamemnonidae*, VIII.215); both men committed matricide, although Juvenal justifies Orestes' tragic actions because he was avenging (*ultor*, VIII.216) his father's death, and was spurred on by the gods (*deis auctoribus*, VIII.216)²⁸. Juvenal's witty critique of the Emperor now comes in an allusive list of crimes that Nero also committed, although Orestes did not: Orestes never strangled his sister (*Electrae*, VIII.218), although Nero did kill Antonia; he never murdered his wife Hermione (*Spartani* | ... *coniugii*, VIII.218-9), although, again, Nero did kill Octavia; and Clytemnestra's death was not accomplished with poison (*aconita*, VIII.219), although this was Agrippina's method of death²⁹. Juvenal's comical climax to this list of crimes is the fact that, unlike Nero, Orestes never played a role on the stage - especially not the role of Orestes (VIII.220)!³⁰ - nor did he write an epic about Troy (*Troica*, VIII.221): both figures' murderous deeds are made to look frivolous here against these new, most damning charges³¹. Nero's artistic pretensions are further mocked by Juvenal's appeal that, in spite of Nero's various crimes and tyrannies, it should actually be his foul singing (*foedo ... cantu*, VIII.225) that be avenged (*ulcisci*, VIII.222). Nero's love of the arts is finally criticised as being his overriding concern during his reign, since the only trophies of victory with which Nero could adorn his forefathers' statues (*maiorum effigies*, VIII.227) are not the appropriate military spoils, but are rather the costumes of his performances as Thyestes or Antigone (VIII.227-30 - the latter feminine role may also be a joke at Nero's expense).

Domitian's initial satiric appearance, in Juvenal's second poem, is as the most notable climax to a catalogue of hypocritical sinners: Domitian's hypocrisy comes in his harsh legislation against adultery (*leges revocabat amaras*, II.30), despite the fact that he himself was an *adulter* (II.29), and with his own niece at that, an image mockingly elevated as being suitable for tragedy (*tragico ... | concubitu*, II.29-30)³². This deflating image is overshadowed by Domitian's appearance in Juvenal's fourth satire, however: the Emperor is first ridiculed by a comical image of his gluttony (*gluttisse ... | induperatorem*, IV.28-9 - see chapter three, p. 36); he is then further labelled as "a bald Nero" (*calvo ... Neroni*,

²⁸ Smith (1989a) 818 considers Juvenal's justification of the legend to be related "almost with nostalgia".

²⁹ Courtney (1980) 416-7 discusses the Neronian allusions (Nero's crimes are also told in Tacitus' *Annales*).

³⁰ Diggle (1974) 183-4 sees this naming of Orestes shortly after the allusive patronymic at VIII.215 as a game by Juvenal (see chapter three, footnote 57); Smith (1989a) 822 makes the point that, since Nero was merely *playing* Orestes, he cannot fall back on "grand passion" as a justification for *his* matricide.

³¹ Braund (1988) 75 notes that the *real* Orestes did not indulge in "dramatic performance and poetry", although the *character* Orestes was obviously a key figure in these two literary areas; Ferguson (1979) 243 lists a handy checklist of the ways in which Orestes actually differed from Nero: "(a) his [i.e. Orestes'] motive in killing his mother was different: he had divine authority for avenging his father, (b) he did not murder his sister or wife, (c) he did not use poison, (d) he did not perform on the stage or write poetry ... a marvellous satirical climax, at once funny and biting".

³² Braund (1996) 127-8 discusses reasons why this incestuous relationship could be considered 'tragic'.

IV.38), who, as the last of the cruel Flavian line, was “tearing apart a semi-dead world” (*semianimum laceraret Flavius orbem* | *ultimus*, IV.37-8); and even his later association with Agamemnon by the patronymic *Atriden* (IV.65) may have a slightly deflating intention due to the presence of the Greek accusative form (see p. 125 below on the effect of this comparison with Agamemnon). It is not just these directly unflattering epic circumlocutions that mock Domitian; Juvenal’s vitriolic attack on Domitian’s courtier Crispinus in his introduction actually acts as an indirect assault on the Emperor, since Crispinus can be viewed “as a microcosm of Domitian”³³, given their shared cruelty (IV.2ff. and IV.71ff. respectively) and their aggrandised associations with fish (IV.15ff. and IV.65ff. respectively). Juvenal’s grand critique of Crispinus’ sins in this introduction makes the point that Domitian’s subsequent crimes of ignorance and luxury are to be deemed as even worse; similarly, Juvenal’s conclusion makes the amusingly deflated judgement of Domitian’s reign that he should have actually spent *more* time indulging these vices, by wasting his time in council meetings on matters as trivial as the big fish, since this would have kept him occupied during his savage years (*tempora saevitiae*, IV.151) when he exercised his other, more violent vices by both committing and commissioning vengeful assaults and murders among the populace.

Juvenal also mentions a handful of other Emperors in his satires, usually disparagingly, although with one notable exception. In his sixth satire on feminine sin, the poet follows his exploitation of the vices of the Imperial consort Messalina (see pp. 98-9 above), with the similarly evil actions of her immediate predecessor, Caligula’s wife Caesonia; although the Empress is somewhat elevated by her association with Juno (VI.619 - and so, by extension, Caligula is connected with Jupiter), the point of this Imperial image is the deflating story of her procurement of poison in an attempt to drive Caligula mad (VI.610-633)³⁴. In his tenth satire, Juvenal produces an analogy to a mythological story during a discussion on the recent uprising of Sejanus against Tiberius: the speaker worries that “the defeated Ajax will dish out punishments” (*victus ne poenas exigat Ajax*, X.84) in revenge for his defeat. Most commentators settle for Tiberius’ identification with Ajax³⁵ here, since both men were defeated by their friends with acts of betrayal (see chapter seven, p. 170, on the debate over the Arms of Achilles), and Tiberius’ senile reaction to this betrayal may mirror Ajax’s irrational slaughter of the sheep (see p. 125 below). Juvenal cleverly includes this mocking image of Tiberius in a colloquial piece of gossip regarding

³³ Braund (1996) 274; the same comment had also previously been made by Braund (1992) 45.

³⁴ Scott (1927) 100 notes that the periphrasis for Caligula as *avunculus ille Neronis* (VI.615) is not intended to have any pejorative connotations (presumably since the two Emperors were as flawed as each other!).

³⁵ Ferguson (1979) 260 explains his choice of this identification: “his [i.e. Tiberius’] vengeance might hit the wrong victims”.

recent political events (*sermones*, X.88 and *secreta*, X.89 are the phrases used to describe the snippets of overheard conversation at X.81-8): the mockery against the Emperor therefore seems to demonstrate a wider sense of Imperial disrespect in the general public, given their leader's behaviour. The Emperor was also probably intentionally mocked during Juvenal's later depiction of the images of war (X.133-7 - see chapter three, p. 66) that can incite and inspire military leaders everywhere, be they Roman, Greek, or foreign (*Romanus Graiusque et barbarus induperator*, X.138); although *induperator* indicates a general here, it might also allude to the Emperor, who is then mocked by the juxtaposition of the adjacent word *barbarus*³⁶. In fact, Juvenal's only truly positive image of an (unidentified) Emperor³⁷ comes in his seventh satire, with the sincere appeal to this Emperor's sole respect for the Muses (VII.1-3); since Juvenal's targets here are both poor literary patrons (see chapter two, p. 25), and, to a lesser extent, the Muses themselves (see chapter four, pp. 85-6), the satire's opening lines, with their "tactful and complimentary exclusion"³⁸ of the chief literary patron, the Emperor, from Juvenal's satiric invective, therefore actually serve to praise this apparently rare instance of a good Imperial decision³⁹.

The longest piece of sustained satire at the expense of an Emperor is Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*; the central idea of Claudius having to fight for the right to become a god after his death is what holds all of the other satiric ideas and subversive references together⁴⁰. The reason for this unflattering portrayal of the Emperor may have been a post-mortem act of vengeance for Claudius' exile of Seneca for alleged improprieties⁴¹. Even the title itself serves to mock the Emperor⁴²: its simple etymology from *apotheosis* ('deification') and *colocynthe* ('pumpkin') means that *Apo-colocynt-osis* is therefore to be taken as either the process of a pumpkin being turned into a god, or a person being turned into a pumpkin. Although most commentators and translators take the latter meaning (labelling it as 'pumpkinification'), it is apparent that Claudius does not become either a god or a pumpkin; however, the metaphor of a pumpkin as "a silly empty head"⁴³ could easily apply to Claudius' ignorance and stupidity, and so Seneca's point is to show that this

³⁶ Ferguson (1979) 264 notes that "there is some irony: a build-up of dignity to be deflated" here; note that the grand archaism *induperatorem* also appeared in a lowly juxtaposition at IV.29 (see chapter three, p. 36).

³⁷ Ferguson (1979) 218 gives the best evidence for supposing Hadrian, but Kilpatrick (1973) 235 shows the other reasons for accepting Trajan or "even Domitian" as correct.

³⁸ Kilpatrick (1973) 236.

³⁹ In the description of this praise by Jones (1989) 462 as "either incompetent or double-edged", I would find the latter term to be preferable (but only if Juvenal is still seen as being indignant here).

⁴⁰ Hight (1962) 167 considers the *Apocolocyntosis* to be "the first extant book to say openly that the Roman emperors were human, less than human, and far from godlike".

⁴¹ Coffey (1976) 261 cites Tacitus *Ann.* XII.8 and XIII.2 as evidence for Seneca's exile by Claudius.

⁴² Actually, it is not certain that *Apocolocyntosis* is the title of the work - Hoyos (1991) has compiled perhaps the most complete list of the alternative suggestions made by scholars.

⁴³ Coffey (1976) 167: he notes, however, that Apuleius seems to be the only other Roman author who can definitely be said to have used such a metaphor (at *Metamorphoses* I.15.2).

Emperor was an easily satirised figure, and that even his death and subsequent 'heroic' journey (see chapter eight, pp. 183-4) could not change his ridiculous essence.

Claudius' presentation throughout the *Apocolocyntosis* is constantly degrading: Seneca's early statement that "one must be born a king or a fool" (*aut regum aut fatuum nasci oportere*, I.1) carries the key implication that Claudius was actually both. Seneca's subsequent quotation from the *Aeneid* - *non passibus aequis* ("with uneven steps", I.2) - goes on to mock Claudius' physical disabilities too (see chapter six, pp. 145-6); however, there is also the more implicit comparison here between Iulus' and Claudius' inability to follow in their father's footsteps: the epic reference is to a son's physical inferiority to his father, but Claudius must be considered a moral letdown after his familial predecessors, Tiberius and Augustus⁴⁴ (who are then directly mentioned in the following sentence). Once the plot moves into gear, humour is regularly utilised at Claudius' expense. The first episode proper in Seneca's tale (II-III) is the epic device of the divine decision being made regarding an earthly problem (see chapter four, p. 75); the fact that this earthly problem is Claudius' imminent death from extreme constipation is a scatological joke. The decision to end Claudius' suffering produces further humour at the expense of the outgoing Emperor in Seneca's grand hexameter passage (IV.1 - see chapter three, p. 65); the praise of Nero within these verses might also be indicative of the wider reason for Seneca's deflation of Claudius, namely to ingratiate himself with the new Emperor by knocking down his predecessor as an easily bettered failure⁴⁵. Claudius' death itself is presented in a mocking manner, as his divinely-assisted relief from constipation causes him to literally fart his spirit out (*animum ebulliit*, IV.2), both a literal and metaphorical deflation of the aristocrat's supposed sophistication. This expulsion of wind is comically hinted at as the first of two sets of last words, "emitted from the end with which he talked more easily" (*emisisset illa parte, qua facilius loquebatur*, IV.2); the second set of actual words is the rather ignoble *vae me, puto, concacavi me* ("oh dear, I think I've shat myself", IV.3). Claudius' death, a period which should ordinarily be afforded great solemnity and tragedy, is therefore immersed in flatulence and defecation, Seneca's subversive satirical point being that this incapable Emperor had constantly (and metaphorically) shat on his subjects.

The common bawdiness of these previous lines is of course standard fare in the satiric genre, yet it is their presence among the multitude of epic scenes, and in direct relation to the usually extolled figure of the Emperor, which help to remind us that the grand framework of the piece is never truly to be taken seriously, but is rather a comic

⁴⁴ Leach (1989) 206 considers that "text and sub-text [are] united in apparent agreement" at this point.

⁴⁵ Eden (1984) 7 is persuasive in his suggestion that "the work was designed to be appreciated by Nero and his entourage"; indeed, Coffey (1976) 171 labels these lines as "the persuasive language of courtly flattery".

juxtaposition to heighten Seneca's satiric intentions. This becomes increasingly apparent in the following episode, as Claudius' arrival in heaven is recounted in preference to the great joy expressed on earth (*felicitatis*, V.1), although Seneca still finds space to mention this ultimate scorn for the Emperor. The fact that the supposedly greatest living Roman has not been recognised on his entry to heaven is ironic enough: that the divine monster-slayer Hercules must go to meet Claudius increases the degradation of the Emperor tenfold, as the newcomer's speech impediment and club foot turn him into the kind of unintelligible and deformed monster which Hercules had conquered many times in the past (V). Even when the goddess Febris, whose malady had actually killed him, eventually confirms Claudius' identity, his sense of imperial power is still ridiculed as his signals for Febris' decapitation in order to shut her up are completely ignored (VI.1). Seneca's impertinent aside that Claudius' own freedmen would have paid similar inattention to the request (VI.1) only serves to heighten the ridiculous image of Claudius' lost soul. Even the gods make fun of Claudius during their debate on what should be done with his soul: Diespiter initially recommends Claudius' immediate deification in an amassed series of elevated appeals to his ancestral imperial gods, but this is soon deflated by the crass justification of Claudius being then able to accompany Romulus in consuming boiled turnips (*ferventia rapa vorare*, IX.5). This derisive remark not only attacks Claudius' apparently huge appetite, but also denigrates the first Roman leader, Romulus, as a simple yokel. Claudius' subsequent 'heroic' journey to the Underworld passes by his own funeral procession: Seneca adds irony here, as its splendour is said to be worthy of a god (XII.1), which Claudius is now fated not to become. But there is also a by-now inevitable element of witty mockery as the procession's volume can impact on even Claudius' deaf ears (XII.2); the Emperor's stupidity is also ridiculed here, since only now, on viewing his Imperial funeral, does Claudius realise that he has in fact died (XII.3), even after his heavenly encounters.

The Gods

It is a religious conceit of mankind to generally make their gods into their own image, which then becomes reversed by the creator deities being said to have formed man from their own images. In a polytheistic religion like that of the Romans, each deity had dominance over certain aspects of the world, and powers and 'personalities' to match. Although probably not the originator, Homer is nonetheless the first surviving author to expand upon these religious aspects when the gods appear in his epic narrative, and the individual characters of the anthropomorphised deities can be seen in great detail. Homer's simplified treatment of the gods as human characters within his epic stories should be

considered a literary masterstroke: while the Gods all possess individual human characteristics well suited to their areas of power, they also look on the mortal world with a totally inhuman attitude⁴⁶. The satirists take this sense of humanity within the gods a step further, with the usual double-edged intentions of simultaneous elevation and deflation. Since the job of a satirist is, essentially, to point out and ridicule the follies and vices of human life, it makes sense for the human-like gods to share in these lowly activities, but to a greater extent, thus elevating and highlighting the ridiculous aspects of the contemptible practices; at the same time, of course, the gods themselves are deflated and lampooned by their association with these lowly and mundane practices.

This irreverent exploitation of the gods exists as early as Ennius' satires, in the grand self-address *Enni poeta salve qui mortalibus | versus propinas flammeos medullitus* ("hail, o poet Ennius, who serves up to mortal men the flaming verses that were drawn from your own heart", 6-7W). Within Ennius' self-aggrandisement in this phrase (discussed at both chapters two, pp. 19-20, and eight, pp. 171-2), there is also a specific image evoked of Ennius as the god Prometheus: this mythological scene of fire being passed from god to man is belittled, however, by the verb *propinas*, becoming instead a commonplace scene of alcohol-laden cups being served by a bartender to his drunken customers. Lucilius utilises a much more diverse deflation of the gods during his satiric council of the gods (see chapter four, pp. 73-4), the gods are intentionally mocked by the necessity of their meeting about just one man, the corrupt Lupus, which is compounded by their all-too-recognisably-human presentation during the meeting. They appear to criticise each other: one god states that a previous divine speaker was the only wise man at an earlier parliament on similar matters (*concilio antiquo sapiens vir solus fuisti*, 23W / 30M). Apollo displays vanity and a desire to be free of ridicule, since he is regularly depicted as beautiful, which implies femininity, and thus invites comparisons to the true mythological beauties such as Leda or Ixion's wife, Dia (*ut contendere possem | Thestiadus Ledaе atque Ixionies alochoeo*, 28-9W / 24-5M)⁴⁷. Lucilius even has one of the gods point out the general theistic pomposity of all divinities being called *pater*, be it Jupiter, Neptune, Liber, Saturn, Mars, Janus, or Quirinus (24-7W / 19-22M): there is probably also a joke here that the unruly and corrupt senators of the day were all revered with the name *pater*. The gods' lowly subject of discussion and their all-too-human tics, alongside Lucilius' generally jocular manner here, therefore deflate both their usual highness and their council-meeting.

⁴⁶ Feeney (1991) has written an exhaustive account of the treatment and appearance of the gods in epic.

⁴⁷ Servius' comments on this fragment (provided at Warmington (1938) 11) suggest that Apollo's desire to disassociate himself from the tag *pulcher* may also be an attempt to disassociate himself from homosexuals (*exsoletos*) to whom the term may also apply, an extremely subversive implication for Lucilius to have made.

Horace's brief moments of exploitation of the gods are intended as humorous and subversive images. In the first satire of his first book, for example, Horace seems to portray Jupiter as a petulant child: having granted his subjects' wishes, he becomes annoyed that they are acting ungratefully, and so he angrily puffs his cheeks out at them in a huff (*illis Iuppiter ambas | iratus buccas inflat*, i.I.20-1). This juxtaposition of the king of the gods and the lowlier aspects of human emotion is then replicated in the first satire of Horace's second book, as the satirist uses a divine example of small pleasures to reinvent the heavenly twins Castor and Pollux as sport-loving gamblers: *Castor gaudet equis, ovo prognatus eodem | pugnis* ("Castor delights in horses, his brother from that same egg likes boxing", ii.I.26-7). This image not only cites a divine precedent for Horace's satiric target of society's vices, but also deflates the gods' importance with their trivial human pursuits.

It is the eighth satire of his first book, however, that pervasively intends to provide humour at the expense of a god, namely Priapus. This anecdotal satire seems closely related to both the epigrammatic genre and the *Priapea*: the former, a collection of pithy lines, often narrated by an inanimate object; the latter, a coarse series of poems written from the point of view of Priapus, god of fertility⁴⁸. Of course, the fact that neither epigrams nor *Priapea* were often written in hexameters immediately elevates the crude tone implied by these two genres. Horace's joke is to maintain this high tone until his climax brings Priapus back down into his usual realm: in this case, it is the elevation of Priapus which is actually subversive, thus making the final deflation a surprising anti-climax, despite being more obvious material for association with Priapus. The mock-elevated style of the opening lines seems very solemn in antithesis to the light and witty *Priapea* by which it was partially inspired: the contrast between the useless wood (*inutile lignum*, i.VIII.1) of the past and the *deum* (i.VIII.3) of the fig-tree's present existence lends the narrator a sense of nobility, although this is balanced by the humorous juxtaposition of the carpenter's two alternatives of what to carve from the tree-trunk, either a statue of Priapus or a stool (*scamnum*, i.VIII.2). The *quasi-grandeur* of the statue's self-importance is soon subverted, however, by the realisation that rather than being an ornament in a splendid garden, the statue actually serves a purpose, as a scarecrow: though even this is reported with a semblance of pride as "the greatest terror to thieves and birds" (*furum aviumque | maxima formido*, i.VIII.3-4), the superlative restoring the statue's self-belief in its divine heroism⁴⁹. Of course, being an inanimate object, the ersatz god hardly acts in any

⁴⁸ See Fraenkel (1957) 121-2 for more details on both "dedicatory epigrams" and *Priapea*; Sigsbee (1974) 74 elaborates on "some of the standard elements of a Priapeum" that can be found in this satire.

⁴⁹ Anderson (1982) 76 elaborates that, in the *Priapea*, Priapus was usually "the terror and delight of handsome young boys and girls" - his proxy's depleted role is therefore doubly subversive towards the god.

brave manner to terrify both thieves and birds: the first group are scared off by the scarecrow's right hand (presumably holding a blade of some kind) and the red phallus protruding from his groin (*ruber porrectus ab inguine palus*, i.VIII.5)⁵⁰, while the reed attached to his head puts fright into the second group as it flutters in the breeze. The eventual climax to this satire is a deflation in several senses of the word, as the haunting atmosphere which Horace has built up, the sinister appearance of the witches who have terrorised Priapus' grounds, the elevated Odyssean similarities (see chapter seven, pp. 156-7), and Priapus' status as 'hero' are all dispelled with a single fart (*pepedi*, i.VIII.46), the eternal schoolboy prank to bring any occasion to a lowly standstill. The result of this expulsion of both Priapus' fear and wind is that Canidia's teeth fall out, and Sagana's hairpiece comes off, as the two witches flee, becoming even more terrified than the statue ever was (i.VIII.47ff.). Priapus' victory here comes as a ludicrously lowbrow anti-climax after the poetic heights to which this satire had earlier risen, but seems somehow more appropriate to the usual levels of vulgarity associated with this god.

Most of the humour connected with Persius' minimal exploitation of the gods is actually derived from the physical aspects and interactive rituals which humans have established in connection to the gods; it is therefore religion itself that Persius mocks, rather than the gods themselves. In the first satire, Persius is compelled to invoke the name of the god Janus (I.58) in response to the climate of anti-poeticism in Rome: the joke is that the god's two-faced visage would prevent the behind-the-back gestures of mockery of the kind to which poets are unwittingly being subjected (I.58ff.), since he would be able to see any such gestures. The second satire, with its theme of "prayer and its misuse"⁵¹, contains further anaesthetised ridicule of the gods, as Jupiter is described as having "a silly beard" (*stolidam ... barbam*, II.28): again, Persius is not mocking the god, but rather the word 'silly' refers to the religious and artistic presentation of the gods in statues and paintings. Persius does now create an intentionally mocking image of the gods, although this is in order to point out the futility of people's inane beliefs. Jupiter is sarcastically afforded a petty sense of human greed, since humans think that the gods' favour can be purchased "with a lung or greasy tripe" (*pulmone et lactibus unctis*, II.30) from a sacrificed animal. Similarly, Mercury is comically pictured as being lured into favouring his disciples by a sacrificed ox's liver (*caeso bove Mercuriumque | accersis fibra*, II.44-5): these pictures of the gods being tempted out of heaven like wild animals from their lairs may seem degrading, but it is the zealots who believe in this process that are Persius' satiric targets.

⁵⁰ Brown (1993) 170 notes that the blade and the phallus represented the two acts of retribution that the actual god Priapus might exact on a thief: presumably, castration or penetration.

⁵¹ This title was given to the satire by Jenkinson (1980) 23.

Juvenal's satires contain several scenes of humour at the expense of the divine pantheon, although again these are intended as an elaboration on the targeted sins of mankind. Juvenal's initial rant against the trite topics of mythological poetry in his first satire briefly mentions "Vulcan's cave, found near the Aeolian rocks" (*Aeoliis vicinum rupibus antrum | Vulcani*, I.8-9)⁵² as one such overworked subject: his dismissal of Vulcan's forge as being just a cave (*antrum*), with no explicit mention of the forge or any other extra features, seems to turn the god into a hermit or a monster, condemned to squat in a cave. Later in the same satire, Juvenal shows how society's decline has impacted in an adverse way on the gods, twice subverting the role of famed statue of Apollo in the Roman Forum (and so by extension also mocking the god himself). First, this statue is said to have become "skilled in law" (*iurisque peritus*, I.128), a realm not usually associated with this god, but humorously stemming from the statue's constant exposure to criminals and lawyers in the Forum⁵³; second, its marble companions here are not just the *triumphales* (I.129) generals, but also unworthy foreign businessmen, whose statues may be justifiably used as a urinal or worse (*cuius ad effigiem non tantum meiere fas est*, I.131), for bringing the whole honourable band into disrepute. Apollo has thus descended into the company of thieves and human waste here, due to the influence of society's corruption.

As Juvenal points out in his second satire, however, some gods were already debauching themselves. His mention of the adultery laws which Domitian had passed fits in a joke at the gods' expense, since these laws caused concern amongst everybody, particularly Mars and Venus (II.31), literature's most celebrated adulterers⁵⁴. The wit of these guilty gods being compliant with human law is matched by the apparent inability (or lack of desire) of Mars to do anything about humanity's decline later in the satire. Juvenal's invocation for Romulus (*pater urbis*, II.126) and Mars (*Gradive*, II.128) to punish their descendants for succumbing to the evils of the flesh goes unanswered: Mars is pictured as being uncharacteristically impotent against this sin (in which he is actually complicit), as he fails to demonstrate any of his usual epic anger, such as shaking his helmet, banging his spear, or even appealing for help from his father (*nec galeam quassas nec terram cuspide pulsas | nec quereris patri*, II.130-1)⁵⁵. Mars' adulterous affairs are even humorously taken as a matter of contemporary fact, along with Jupiter's similar shenanigans, in the sixth satire, as Juvenal uses their mythological dalliances as justification for his claims that

⁵² Braund (1996) 76 notes that, while Virgil similarly located Vulcan's workshop at *Aen.* VIII.417ff. (and so Juvenal is exploiting this tradition), Valerius Flaccus had suggested the alternative site of Lemnos.

⁵³ Braund (1996) 103 explains that Apollo "has heard so many cases".

⁵⁴ Courtney (1980) 128 mentions this "famous occasion recounted in *Odyssey* VIII"; Barr (1991) 148 also ironically recalls Venus' further infidelity with Anchises, which bore Aeneas, the (indirect) founder of Rome.

⁵⁵ Both Braund (1996) 156 and Courtney (1980) 144 cite specific epic instances of these reactions from Mars.

innocent girls cannot be found in either the sinful city or the countryside haunts of the far from decrepit lusty gods (*adeo senuerunt Iuppiter et Mars*, VI.59)⁵⁶. Juvenal's tenth satire also features a reference to the infidelity and extra-marital affairs of the gods, in order to exemplify the dangers for humans who would wish to indulge in their own sexual indiscretions. The satirist recalls that even Mars was unable to maintain the secret of his affair with Venus from her husband Vulcan⁵⁷, and so, when a god cannot succeed in this demeaning act, what chance do mere mortal adulterers have of doing the same (X.313-4)?

Juvenal's thirteenth satire contains several humorous images at the gods' expense, which are intertwined with a harsh depiction of society's criminal element, hence connecting the two supposedly disparate groups of gods and thieves as being equally responsible for the loss of money suffered by Juvenal's friend at the satire's opening. Juvenal exploits Golden Age imagery here (see chapter four, pp. 72-3), but it is actually the gods' roles during this time that provide a source of humour for the satirist. Saturn is diminished as the outgoing, exiled king, a position represented by his crown (*diademate*, XIII.39), by being transformed into a mere farmer, as signified by his new tool, the sickle (*falcem*, XIII.39). The humble beginnings of Saturn's godly successors are also illustrated: Juno is just a little girl at this time (*virguncula*, XIII.40), and Jupiter merely a simple citizen (*privatus*, XIII.41) living in a mountainside cave⁵⁸. Juvenal is on a roll now, as he continues to subvert the common mythology of the gods in order to show the innocence of the period. Absent at that time were the constant heavenly feasts (*convivia caelicolarum*, XIII.42), and so there was also no need for any cup-bearers to the gods: Juvenal mentions two such mythological characters in epic periphrases, Ganymede being alluded to as *puer Iliacus* (XIII.43), and Hebe labelled as *Herculis uxor* (XIII.43)⁵⁹. The imagery becomes more comical as the fire-god Vulcan's behaviour is also shown to have been different: previously, he had no need to clean his soot-covered arms (*tergens | bracchia ... nigra*, XIII.44-5)⁶⁰ before he began sipping his nectar (*siccato nectare*, XIII.44), a humorous contrast of the deity's lowly toils and his heavenly pleasures⁶¹. The apparent reason for Vulcan's uncleanness is the fact that the gods dined alone (*prandebat sibi quisque deus*, XIII.46), imbuing Vulcan with a very human self-consciousness in the face of the other gods. Juvenal also notes that there simply weren't the same amount of gods in these early

⁵⁶ Pollmann (1996) 484 notes the mocking depiction of "Mars und Jupiter als Ehebrecher".

⁵⁷ Blakeney (1925) 49 explains the exact nature of the supernatural affair's revelation.

⁵⁸ Fredericks' (1979) 181 comment that "Juvenal is not being serious" here somewhat understates the case.

⁵⁹ The identification of these two characters is also made by Scott (1927) 73, Barr (1991) 220, and Hardy (1951) 280, among others.

⁶⁰ Hardy (1951) 281 considers this image of Vulcan cleaning himself off to be "probably a reminiscence" of *Il.* XVIII.414.

⁶¹ Scott (1927) 36 labels the contrast as a "mixture of the mockingly lofty and the ludicrous".

days⁶², jokingly subverting the role of the Titan Atlas who would have less of a burden to bear with so few deities in the world carried on his shoulders (XIII.47-9). This mocking picture of ‘the young gods’ is finally compounded by Juvenal’s own take on the joke made by Persius regarding religious offerings. Calvinus’ grand prayer to Jupiter, asking why he remains inactive (XIII.113-9)⁶³, is deflated by the accompanying offerings of calves’ liver and white pork sausages (*vituli iecur albaque porci | omenta*, XIII.117-8), ludicrous bait intended to win the favour of the king of the gods. Juvenal’s point is made quite clear when he then bluntly states that we should consider the statues of the gods to be no different (*nullum discrimen*, XIII.118) to those of simple men like Vagellius (XIII.119).

The gods are a key feature of Seneca’s *Apocolocyntosis*, since much of the action of the satire’s plot occurs in their realm. The presence of the first god, Mercury (III.1), at Claudius’ deathbed could be accounted for by his role as the deity who escorts souls to the afterlife, but Seneca also exploits here Mercury’s different aspect as the patron deity of wit and eloquence in order to mock the Emperor, who ironically does not possess these traits. Although Claudius is always to be viewed as Seneca’s prime target in the *Apocolocyntosis*, Mercury’s apparent love of the Emperor’s supposed wit (*semper ingenio eius delectatus esset*, III.1) suggests that the presence of the god has a deeper meaning here: either his faith in the Emperor’s pitiful eloquence is knowingly ironic, and so Claudius’ reputation precedes him to heaven; or this is a case of Claudius managing to deceive somebody over his true nature, and so Mercury’s gullibility is targeted. The later appearances of the gods, however, as they debate Claudius’ fate in the afterlife, are never intended to reflect badly on the gods themselves. As was usual with scenes of a council of the gods, whether in a full-fledged satirical version such as Lucilius’, or in a straight-laced epic rendition like the *Aeneid*, the importance and reverence attached to the gods was dependent on their characterisation and the tone of the debate. Seneca’s wit is to make the gods appear to be uncaring and blasé about the supposedly important issue of an Emperor’s deification: the prose-speaking gods treat Claudius’ case as trivial, thereby bringing themselves down to a satirically human and non-epic level, although it is actually Claudius’ unsuitability for both Imperial duty and god-hood that has removed any grandeur from the gods’ debate. Ironically, the only time that Claudius seems to aspire to godly heights is in his incestuous relationships, which the anonymous first speaker in the debate amusingly believes would be approved of by Juvenal, who was married to his own sister (VIII). In response to this lowly joke, Jupiter himself makes perhaps the only direct criticism of the gods, as he likens

⁶² A fact that Fredericks (1979) 181 ironically links to the Golden Age’s perfection.

⁶³ Scott (1927) 52 suggests that this prayer is actually adapted from the spurned Iarbas’ similar rejection of Jupiter’s power at *Aen.* IV.206-18, and so Juvenal “has exaggerated the seriousness of the misfortune”.

the debauched level of their debate to a farmyard (*mapalia*, IX.1): but again, Seneca's point is that it is Claudius' presence among the gods that has caused such a raucous display.

Epic Heroines

The exploitation of the various heroines of epic literature by the satirists is connected to the general satiric depiction of contemporary women. In keeping with the typical sense of morality shown by the satirists regarding the sexual arena (e.g. obsession, lust, and adultery), the women of Roman society are criticised for their own part in these objectionable practices. Subversion comes into the equation when the satirists make similar criticisms against epic heroines, especially considering that mythological females were supposed to represent the very opposite ideal of chastity and fidelity. One of Lucilius' more striking jokes at the expense of the epic realm takes this form, as he essentially calls into question the good looks of typical epic heroines, specifically Homer's female characters, Alcmena and Helen (570W / 543M). The satirist initially points out the kind of terms that are often used in describing real-life beautiful women, such as *calliplocamon* ("lovely locks", 567W / 540M), and then imagines that these descriptions are exaggerated in order to cover up a more shocking truth elsewhere. The idea of one element of physical perfection being teamed with a lesser quality is made more succinctly by Horace some ninety years later in the second satire of his first book: '*o crus, o bracchia!*' *verum | depugis, nasuta, brevi latere ac pede longo est* ("What legs, what arms!' But she has no buttocks, a big nose, a short body and big feet", i.II.92-3) - the opposing perfect and imperfect bodily parts used by Lucilius are lovely ankles coupled with sagging breasts (*callisphyron ... | ... inguina tangere mammis*, 567-8W / 540-1M), but the point is the same. Lucilius' subversive joke comes in his further musings that this rule may also be applied to certain epic beauties: Alcmena, allusively referred to as "the wife of Amphitryo" (*Amphytrionis acoetin*, 569W / 542M)⁶⁴, may actually have been *conpernem aut varam disyllabon* ("cross-eyed or knock-kneed", 569W / 542M); Helen may even have been something he would rather not mention, implying that she was an adulteress⁶⁵, since she was technically married to both Menelaus and Paris at the same time; and any "maiden sired by a distinguished father" (*κούρην eupatereiam*, 572W / 545M)⁶⁶ may have had their incomparable beauty blemished by some mark of ugliness, such as a wart or a mole (*verrucam naevum*, 573W / 546M). Lucilius hence commits a literary sin by again not

⁶⁴ Warmington (1938) 179 notes that this phrase is actually a transliteration of Homer's Ἀμφιτρώωνος ἄκοιτιν (*Od.* XI.266); the words hence act as a reminder of the usual grandeur afforded to these epic heroines.

⁶⁵ Warmington (1938) 179 provides the Latin words as "*scortum*, whore; or *moecham*, adulteress".

⁶⁶ Warmington (1938) 179 again highlights the grand Homeric phrase, used to describe both Helen in the *Iliad* (VI.292) and Penelope in the *Odyssey* (XXII.227).

taking the greatest epicist, Homer, at his word (for Lucilius' belittlement of Homer's trustworthiness elsewhere, see chapter two, pp. 21-2, as well as pp. 117-8 below); the epic genre is therefore shown up as, ultimately, being the merely fictitious visions of the writer.

A preceding fragment may also hint at a further joke at the expense of an epic heroine (probably within the same satire), although this time regarding her fidelity. Lucilius reiterates the infamous temptations from *Odyssey* XIX that Penelope endured during her husband's absence: in a direct address to the hero's wife, the speaker restates Penelope's hope that Odysseus would return so that she wouldn't have to relent to one of her multitude of suitors (*nupturum te nupta negas, quod vivere Ulixen | speras*, 565-6W / 538-9M). Admittedly, the fragment as it stands actually points out that Penelope was very loyal to the memory of her missing husband: however, I feel that the content of the subsequent fragments, discussed above, suggests that Lucilius had a general satiric context in this poem of ridiculing epic heroines. Alcmena and Helen are said to be beautiful and are then pictured with minor disfigurements, like certain contemporary females; hence, Penelope's faithfulness would, within the same satiric context, suggest that Lucilius would have gone on to implicitly consider that Penelope did relent (or at least wanted to relent), since it would seem unlikely that any contemporary woman could remain faithful for so long⁶⁷.

The first satire in Horace's first book features an allusion to a mythological female, when the wretched miser Ummidius is said to have been cut in two by a freed-woman's axe (*hunc liberta securi | divisit medium*, i.I.99-100). The elevation of this freed-woman as the "bravest of Tyndareus' daughters" (*fortissima Tyndaridarum*, i.I.100), referring to Clytemnestra, therefore also turns Ummidius into a modern-day Agamemnon, mockingly killed for his own *hubris* of money-hoarding as opposed to infanticide⁶⁸; Horace's judgement that this contemporary Clytemnestra was *fortissima* may furthermore make her attack seem justifiable, perhaps more so, ironically, than Agamemnon's murder. Elsewhere, though, Horace's heroines are usually brought into a sexual situation or context, and are themselves deflated by the sexual imagery. In the second satire of his first book, Horace compares an attractive girl whom he has bedded to both Romulus' mother Ilia and King Numa's wife Egeria (i.II.126): his point seems to be that sexual fulfilment can elevate any female into equity with "the highest-born *matrona*"⁶⁹, although the mythological women are then deflated by the poem's swift descent into vulgarity (*futuo*, i.II.127). A

⁶⁷ Perhaps the idea is not so subversive after all: although Penelope's test for her suitors to string Odysseus' bow and then shoot through twelve axe-handles (*Odyssey* XX) seems to show her belief that only Odysseus could accomplish this, she would have had to relent, unwillingly or otherwise, if a competitor had succeeded.

⁶⁸ Brown (1993) 98 comments here that "by introducing an epic comparison in a sordid, quite unepic context, Horace exploits the humour of incongruity" - obviously, this technique is common in other satires too.

⁶⁹ Brown (1993) 113; Henderson (1989) 107-8 also mentions the presence of Ilia and Egeria here.

more blatant juxtaposition of a heroine and crudely described sex comes in the third satire of the first book, where Horace's dirty joke at the expense of Helen stands as perhaps the most subversive comment throughout his work. The overall framework of the poem deals with mankind's tendency to sin, and Horace gradually draws together references to humanity's transgressions in the 'golden' past, mankind's prioritisation of sexual expression above all else, and the innate human tendency to wage war (i.III.99-106), before arriving at his subversive climax: *nam fuit ante Helenam cunnus taeterrima belli | causa* ("for a cunt was a bitter cause for a war long before Helen's", i.III.107-8). Obviously, sex was always to be viewed as an undercurrent to the Trojan War, since it was Paris' desire for Helen that essentially caused the conflict; but Horace makes the connection between epic battles and coarse sexuality very explicit, especially with the directly juxtaposed words *Helenam cunnus*, thereby devaluing Helen's essential epic aspect of beauty as being irrelevant, since Paris' only concern was that she could be penetrated. Horace also debases the key aspect of the heroine Penelope (i.e. her loyalty to Odysseus) by applying contemporary standards in the fifth satire of his second book. Teiresias casts aspersions on Penelope's faithfulness, impiously suggesting that the reason she hasn't yet yielded to any of her suitors is because none of them have been old or rich enough (ii.V.75-83)⁷⁰! This irreverent connection between Penelope and legacy-hunting parallels Odysseus' subversive juxtaposition with the modern practice throughout the satire (discussed further at chapter seven, pp. 157-8); Teiresias amusingly applies his greedy modern standards to everybody.

Persius' two references to mythological females both occur in his first satire. First are the "professionally inconsolable heroines"⁷¹, Phyllis and Hypsipyle (*Phyllidas, Hypsipylas*, I.34), who are mentioned as the type of clichéd subjects about which unimaginative, self-proclaimed 'bards' (*vatum*, I.34) would write: of course, the hack writers are Persius' targets here, and not the women themselves⁷². The conclusion to the poem finds Persius suggesting that those who dislike his satires should instead be given Callirhoe after their evening meal (*post prandia Callirhoen do*, I.134): this ambiguous statement could either indicate a play or poem about the eponymous nymph *Callirhoe*, or a contemporary prostitute's name⁷³ - the intentional combination of both meanings would act to deflate the mythological nymph by the fact that her name has entered the sexual arena.

Juvenal, on the other hand, makes several mocking references to legendary female characters, the first of which comes, amusingly, in his second satire on effeminate

⁷⁰ Muecke (1993) 190 explains: "this cleverly perverts the situation of Hom. *Od.* 18.275ff., where Penelope finally shames the suitors into bringing gifts, by contrasting their behaviour with that of normal suitors".

⁷¹ Jenkinson (1980) 70.

⁷² However, Gildersleeve (1979) 85 considers the plural forms of their names to be "contemptuous".

⁷³ Barr (1987) 87 suggests the former, Gifford (1992) 192 the latter.

hypocrites. Juvenal's continual oxymora in this satire has been to place masculine activities alongside their effeminate agents (see, for example, the various military images discussed at chapter three, pp. 60-1); however, he also establishes some gender role-reversals by having (admittedly, effeminate) men indulging in feminine activities such as spinning wool (*lanam trahitis*, II.54ff.), and then women (admittedly, only hypothetical women) who might participate in traditionally male areas such as wrestling (*luctantur*, II.53) or fighting (*comedunt coloephia*, II.53 - literally, "eating the diet of a fighter")⁷⁴. Mythological figures then serve to heroically elevate the effeminate men in their tasks: ironically, these figures are not actually heroes, but rather heroines, specifically the epic heroines who were famed for their weaving abilities, Penelope and Arachne (II.56)⁷⁵. This witty diminishment of the mythological heroines' traits is soon followed by a further deflation of the historical heroines Semiramis and Cleopatra (II.108-9), who are humorously contrasted with the effeminate men's military fantasies because, unlike the effeminate 'warriors', these female leaders "did not engage in beautification while conducting military campaigns"⁷⁶.

Juvenal's sixth satire on the flaws of contemporary women exploits several epic, tragic and historic heroines and villainesses, as exaggerated exempla against which modern women's lack of morals is either harshly contrasted or wittily compared, depending on the nature of these females' actions. Juvenal first mentions a contemporary adulterer, Eppia, whose lust for a foreign soldier caused her to abandon her home and husband (VI.82ff.): Juvenal humorously invites comparison with the reluctant mythological adulterer Helen, because Eppia is also said to have left behind Paris (VI.87), although this actually refers to the infamous *pantomimus* from Domitian's era⁷⁷. Juvenal then holds up the Sabine women (VI.164) as the prime example of noble birth in history, but humorously suggests that the virtuous Sabine example would be intolerable in the present day (V.166). Juvenal's subsequent point that all men fear their wives is illustrated with a doubly deflating reference to the tale of Niobe (as told at *Met.* VI.146ff.). First, he recounts Amphion's cries for sanctuary from his wife's constant, arrogant boasts, as he begs, with an evident amount of foresight, for Niobe herself to be killed by Diana and Apollo rather than her allegedly beautiful children, who were in themselves innocent (*nil pueri faciunt*, VI.173). Amphion's role as an aggrieved husband is then compounded by Juvenal's comparison of Niobe to the white sow of Alba (*eadem scrofa Niobe fecundior alba*, VI.177), specifically in the sense

⁷⁴ Braund (1995) 210 notes that the effeminate men, as passive homosexuals, are specifically taking over the female role sexually, but women can never truly replace men sexually, even in a lesbian relationship.

⁷⁵ Braund (1996) 135-6 also sees a less implicit allusion to the tale of Antiope here.

⁷⁶ Braund (1996) 151; Anderson (1982) 212 regards the recurring military motif as "a value which now places effeminacy in the proper perspective".

⁷⁷ As noted by Ferguson (1990) 189.

of being more productive⁷⁸; Juvenal mockingly contrasts Niobe's claims of divine superiority with this image of her beastly superiority (see p. 120 below on the simultaneous deflation of the white sow). Juvenal's brief discussion on 'blue-stocking' women then exploits Virgil's epic heroine, Dido (signified by her common epic epithet *Elissae*, VI.435); the *Aeneid* is rendered pointless and illogical by these supposedly educated women's sympathy for Dido, since Rome would ultimately not have been founded if Aeneas and Dido had lived happily ever after in Carthage⁷⁹! A critique of contemporary female vanity and beautification then exploits another epic heroine: the women who must use armies of slaves in order to set their hair just right are said to look as big as Andromache (VI.503); Juvenal subversively juxtaposes the modern women's unnatural height (from their piled-up hair) with Andromache's natural height⁸⁰.

The majority of the sixth satire's mythological females, however, come in its concluding twenty lines; Juvenal brings these figures into his contemporary reality, for the purpose of both "comic incongruity"⁸¹, and in order to show that "the present has all the evil of tragedy, but none of the dramatic illusion"⁸². The first such time-travelling heroines are shown as moral role models who would actually be ignored in contemporary society. The tale of the modern murderess Pontia, who killed her two children, and is quoted as being willing to have killed seven children, if she had had that many (*septem, si septem forte fuissent*, VI.642), is contrasted with the similar infanticides perpetrated by Procne (VI.634) and Medea (in a periphrasis as *Colchide torva*, VI.643); ironically, these evil crimes perpetrated by epic villainesses are actually to be viewed as forgivable, semi-heroic examples alongside Pontia's infanticide, because the mythological murders were not committed for the sake of money (*non propter nummos*, VI.646)⁸³. The subsequent example, Alcestis (VI.653), is more appropriate, since she was willing to die in the place of her husband Admetus, whereas modern women wouldn't even give their pet dog's life (*animam ... catellae*, VI.654) to save their husbands. The mythological examples which are being followed, then, are instead the crimes of assorted literary villainesses: the contemporary prominence of husbands being murdered by their wives makes it appear as if mythological husband-slayers such as the Danaids (allusively called the *Belides*, VI.655), Eripyle (VI.655), and even the infamous Clytemnestra (VI.656) have travelled forward in

⁷⁸ Courtney (1980) 283 notes that "the undignified comparison ridicules [Niobe's] pride, and so does the vocabulary"; Scott (1927) 62 uses Cicero's phrase *similitudo turpioris* for this degrading comparison.

⁷⁹ Toohey (1992) 121 paraphrases that "the audience has swung more to Dido".

⁸⁰ Both Duff (1970) 244 and Gifford (1992) 73 consider Andromache's height to be purely based on her existence in "the heroic age".

⁸¹ Smith (1989a) 818.

⁸² Anderson (1956) 92.

⁸³ Smith (1989a) 817-8 clarifies this point with detailed descriptions of all the relevant stories.

time⁸⁴. Clytemnestra's role is also slightly subverted here, as her rather unsubtle murder-weapon, an axe (*bipennem*, VI.657), has been replaced in modern times by frog-poison (*rubetae*, VI.659). Whereas other satires have exploited epic examples as a contrast to modern faults, the sixth satire has instead updated mythological references in order to symbolise contemporary women's flaws; this commonality of modern 'villainesses' (and contrasting rarity of modern 'heroines') in Juvenal's society therefore subverts the usual point of mythology acting as a moral fable.

Juvenal's tenth satire also brings both mythological and historical epic characters forward in time, as poor *exempla* for contemporary people to aspire to in their wishes, with the result that reality impinges upon the usual details of their stories in a comic manner; this particularly holds true for the female characters, who are introduced into Juvenal's discussion on beauty. Lucretia (X.293) is the first historical heroine whose beauty is shown to have been harmful to her, because her rape by Sextus Tarquinius led to her suicide, key incidents in the institution of the Roman Republic; similarly, Verginia (X.294) was another woman from that time period whose death was caused by her beauty, although she actually died in order to prevent her being raped by Appius Claudius⁸⁵. Although these events were a matter of historical fact, Juvenal subverts their presence in historical epic by applying the stereotypically epic value of immense beauty to the women: the heroines are then wittily shown shunning this beauty - Verginia is even mockingly pictured desiring to become a hunchback (*gibbum*, 294) - in an effort to avoid their fate. Two mythological heroines are then brought into the real world as a response to the objection that "beauty is not harmful to the chaste" (*sed casto quid forma nocet*, X.324), although again the details are amusingly subverted. Stheneboea (X.327) and Phaedra (alluded to as *Cressa*, X.327) are the beautiful heroines in this case; however, the victims of this beauty were in fact the respective mythological heroes Bellerophon (X.325) and Hippolytus (X.325), who were unfairly punished for alleged sexual misconduct⁸⁶. These tragic acts of vengeance for the men supposedly scorning the women's beauty are reported accurately, but have now become, in the satiric context of the real, contemporary world, the somewhat deflated acts of homicidal vanity by two immature heroines who could not cope with rejection.

When Petronius exploits historical and mythological heroines in the *Satyricon*, it is typically for the sake of a joke: however, the target of such jokes is, as always, the central 'heroes' and characters of Petronius' satiric world, who seem unable to deal with any kind

⁸⁴ Morford (1972) 198 rightly elaborates here that "Juvenal has subsumed satire into tragedy as well as epic" by his exploitation of these traditionally tragic female characters.

⁸⁵ Both Barr (1991) 211 and Duff (1970) 349 provide concise details of the tales of Lucretia and Verginia.

⁸⁶ Wilson (1903) 109 cites Hippolytus and Bellerophon as "ancient types of chastity under severe temptation", highlighting that both men "were falsely accused by the guilty women".

of women appropriately, let alone epic heroines. Although one of the key motifs in the *Satyricon* is the desire of Encolpius and his friends to be (inappropriately) viewed as epic heroes (see chapter eight, pp. 184-6), an early example of this metaphor actually sees these effeminate characters being more aptly compared with epic heroines: a potential act of sodomy by Ascyltos upon Giton is mockingly elevated by Ascyltos' fantasy that Giton has become Lucretia, while Ascyltos himself has become Sextus Tarquinius ('*si Lucretia es ... Tarquinium invenisti*', 9.5). The importance of Lucretia's rape by Tarquinius in helping to create the Roman Republic is crudely juxtaposed with Ascyltos' simple homosexual lust; of course, the deflation of the historical legend here is not as important to the overall mock-epic tone of the *Satyricon* as the ridicule created by Ascyltos' inappropriate adoption of the 'heroic' role alongside Giton's transformation into a new 'heroine'. Later, Encolpius' unrealisable desire to act out Odysseus' adventures is mirrored in Circe's actions (126ff.), where she seems to only want to seduce the initially unresponsive 'Polyaenus' / Encolpius because that is what her epic namesake did in Homer's tale (see chapter seven, p. 161, for more on Circe). It is not just the effeminate heroes who are mocked by their responses to legendary females, however: the ignorant braggart Trimalchio, so often the unwitting butt of mythically inspired jokes, many of which involve incorrect interpretations of tales featuring mythological heroines (see pp. 133-4 below), is also ridiculed by his brief anecdote about a supposed meeting with the famed Sibyl of Cumae. Her imprisonment in a jar, wishing for a final death (*ἀποθανεῖν θέλω*, 48.8) may poke fun at the realisation of the mythological concept of immortality, but the bigger targets here are Trimalchio's ego and his lack of literary sensibilities.

Epic Creatures and Monsters

The various monsters which populate the epic realm are exploited in the satiric genre by two related methods: first, these creatures are portrayed as a key element of the epic realm; but then, furthermore, they are also seen as perhaps the key unrealistic element of the epic realm. Lucilius is first to mention the issue of realism regarding epic monsters, in a passage that actually discusses the conflicts between reason (represented by philosophy and science) and irrationality (typified as superstitious beliefs). The *portenta* and *monstra* (520-1W / 480-1M) which constitute the latter irrational superstition in some people are mocked via a humorous portrait of their most prominent (*in primis*, 521W / 481M) figure, the Cyclops Polyphemus (most vividly used in the epic genre as Odysseus' opponent in *Odyssey* IX). Lucilius' image of the two hundred feet tall monster with a walking stick bigger than a ship's mast (see chapter two, pp. 21-2) features exactly the kind of realistic

details which cause this superstitious terror, and he makes a point of robbing such images of their realism by referring to “an artist’s gallery” (*pergula pictorum*, 529W / *pergula fictorum*, 489M) from which Homer and others drew their fictive scenes. Although Lucilius’ main target here is those superstitious types whose imagination causes them to believe everything that they read, both the monster and its author are also deflated.

The exploitation of two different types of female monster in Horace’s second book of satires is merely intended to add a slight degree of epic grandeur to certain satiric scenes. In his second satire, for example, a greedy man is compared to the greedy Harpies found in Apollonius’ *Argonautica* II, Valerius Flaccus’ *Argonautica* IV and Virgil’s *Aeneid* III: “‘I would like to see a heap of food stretched out on a big dish’ says the palate worthy of the snatching Harpies” (*porrectum magno magnum spectare catino | vellem’ ait Harpyiis gula digna rapacibus*, ii.II.39-40). The “grandiose”⁸⁷ repetition of *magno magnum* accompanies this epic simile with the Harpies to create an exaggerated level of elevation for this greedy man; however, the Harpies are also somewhat deflated, both by their connection with this stock satiric character of a glutton, and by their essential singularity as an obvious epic reference in this satire. The third satire features a further comparison between the satiric realm and an epic monster, as the abstract concept of Laziness is personified as a mythical siren (*improba Siren | Desidia*, ii.III.14-5): these mythical mermaids lured sailors to their doom with their sweet singing, a subtle piece of elevated imagery to describe the simple allure of idleness in the real world. Like Lucilius, Horace is not specifically targeting these monsters themselves; instead he is exploiting the creatures as appropriate allegories for his true targets of satiric excess (in these cases, greed and laziness respectively) - nevertheless, the Harpies and the Sirens are slightly belittled by their connection with human sins.

Juvenal’s exploitation of epic monsters is intentionally subversive throughout his satires: the creatures are usually introduced in the most derisive manner or context available, objects of Juvenal’s constant indignation alongside the more common satiric targets. In his first satire, for example, monsters are brought into Juvenal’s argument as extreme examples of hackneyed epic themes: this is represented by the image of the Centaur Monychus hurling huge ash-trees (*quantas ... ornos*, I.11) during the epic battle with the Lapiths⁸⁸. Later in the same satire, Juvenal uses “three crisp phrases” in order to “dispose of the venerable legend”⁸⁹ of the monstrous Minotaur, alongside the related myth

⁸⁷ Muecke (1993) 121; he cites a similar example at *Aen.* X.842: *ingentem atque ingenti*.

⁸⁸ Courtney (1980) 86 cites the battle’s epic appearances at *Met.* XII.210-535 and *BC* VI.386-396; although Braund (1996) 77 points out that this battle also appeared in a painting on the Argo’s bows in Valerius Flaccus’ *Argonautica*, Courtney (1980) 85 is unsure whether so many Argonaut comments in this passage (see pp. 128-9 below for the other Argonaut references) were intended to specifically mock this epic work.

⁸⁹ Both quotations are from Barr (1991) 143.

of Daedalus and Icarus: the monster is itself simply written off as the “mooing” (*mugitum*, I.53) from the Labyrinth; Icarus’ tragic demise is then wickedly portrayed as “the sea being struck by a boy” (*mare percussum puero*, I.54); and Daedalus is finally shown as being little more than a joiner, albeit one who could fly (*fabrumque volantem*, I.54)⁹⁰. The juxtaposed material that Juvenal then claims to be better subject matter - a pimp (*leno*, I.55) - acts as a further deflation of these mythological tales.

Even in a simple periphrasis, Juvenal can be quite scathing towards the creatures of the epic realm: in his third satire, the hometown of a murderous Greek teacher is built up as the place “where a feather fell from Pegasus’ wing” (*Gorgonei delapsa est pinna caballi*, III.118)⁹¹, although the mood is also humorously deflated by Pegasus’ description as the “Gorgon’s nag”. The mockery of this Greek myth is undoubtedly connected to the surrounding anti-Greek invective spouted by Umbricius, but we should also note that the actual joke of labelling Pegasus as a “nag” (*caballi*) had been used in satire before. Persius’ one mocking exploitation of an epic creature comes in his Prologue, as he dismisses the inspirational poetic source of the Hippocrene spring of the Muses as the “nag’s spring” (*fonte caballino*, Prol. 1), so-called because it had spread forth from beneath Pegasus’ hoof⁹². The pejorative sense of *caballino* in describing Pegasus intensifies the general mood of ‘epic-bashing’ which Persius is trying to create here: he is not just mocking bad epic poets, but the aspects of their realm which they held most highly too.

Juvenal occasionally piles his epic references together, so that any mockery he lays on one of these mythological characters will be redoubled by the associated reference, and then echo twice as strongly onto the satiric context into which they have been placed. The aforementioned mockery of Niobe in Juvenal’s sixth satire (see pp. 114-5 above) uses this technique. First, Niobe is mocked by her comparison with a pig, even if it is a specifically epic pig; the creature itself, the white sow of Alba (*eadem scrofa ... alba*, VI.177), is then belittled⁹³ because it is not introduced in its epic context of heralding the future site of Rome, but simply as an example of productivity, since its appearance at *Aen.* VIII.45-81 is with its litter of thirty piglets; this mockery is then reflected onto the general context of feminine intolerance and pride, further showing Juvenal’s misogynist scorn.

Juvenal’s later images of the monsters of mythology are all subversive, but in different ways. Horace’s earlier comparison between a greedy person and a Harpy (see p.

⁹⁰ Scott (1927) 59 points out that Juvenal intentionally “makes his mention of Daedalus ludicrous”.

⁹¹ Hardy (1951) 144 notes that the usual myth has a hoof falling from the flying horse.

⁹² Morford (1984) 26-7 explains the myth and its etymology; Witke (1970) 82 notes that the adjective form *caballinus* only appears in Persius’ Prologue (Juvenal uses the more common noun form *caballus*).

⁹³ Courtney (1980) 284 considers *scrofa* to be “a word of the farmyard”, while Barr (1991) 174 notes that the language of the mythological reference is “as coarse as it sounds”.

118 above) is borrowed and subtly altered by Juvenal for his eighth satire: rather than a shared trait of gluttony for food upon which Horace based his comparison, the reason for Juvenal's metaphorical connection between a wife and a Harpy is monetary greed (*nummos raptura Celaeno*, VIII.130)⁹⁴, which therefore deflates the Harpy's hunger to a mercenary level. Any epic images inserted into the ninth satire will undoubtedly suffer from the contrast with the satiric theme of homosexual prostitution. The most blatant example of this juxtaposition comes in Juvenal's immediate description of the gigolo Naevolus as "perpetually scowling" (*totiens ... tristis*, IX.1), his gloomy countenance being likened to that of the Centaur Marsyas as Apollo was giving him a lashing, after the god had beaten him in a musical contest (*Marsya victus*, IX.2)⁹⁵. This elevated reference is immediately deflated (and Naevolus' career introduced) by the further similarity between this scowl and the look on Ravola's face while being punished for performing oral sex on Rhodope (IX.4-5): the parallel between the two scenes of punishment, one a grand image from art and poetry referring to gods and monsters, the other a crude sexual scene of unknowns, is particularly degrading to the legendary figures⁹⁶. Juvenal goes on to highlight the solitude of Naevolus' one affordable slave with a monstrous epic image: the slave is likened to Polyphemus' one eye (*Polyphemi | ... acies*, IX.64-5). This is a humorous image in itself, but it is compounded by being doubly applicable: not only are the slave and the eye alike in their solitude, but they are also deemed as being unsatisfactory to their masters' needs (*hic non sufficit*, IX.66) - Naevolus' slave is insufficient for all of the jobs that Naevolus requires him to do, while Polyphemus' eye was not enough to capture Odysseus because the epic hero escaped by blinding it⁹⁷. Although it is the homosexual gigolo Naevolus who is targeted here, Polyphemus is also belittled by this mocking simile, due to the inappropriate connection between the epic giant and the perverse, homosexual gigolo. This satire then concludes with a further metaphorical image based on Odysseus' travels: the goddess Fortune is said to be deaf to all of Naevolus' previous prayers and desires, because she has blocked her ears with the very wax (*ceras*, IX.149) that was similarly used on Odysseus' "deaf oarsmen" (*remige surda*, IX.150) in order to prevent them from hearing the alluring Sirens' song⁹⁸. This juxtaposition between the satiric realm, represented by the

⁹⁴ Braund (1988) 116 calls the presence of Celaeno (a Harpy in *Aeneid* III) an "out-of-place Virgilian touch".

⁹⁵ Barr (1991) 200 explains that Juvenal's original Roman audience would understand the joke about Marsyas' expression, because it "would be well known from his statue in the Forum"; Pollmann (1996) 48 cites this as an example of "mythologische Vergleiche".

⁹⁶ Henderson (1989) 123 marks the various levels of contrast here well: "from Greek myth to Latin 'reality', gods to whores, pain to farce, music to sex, the Satyr's blowing cheeks to the Roman's dripping chin".

⁹⁷ Courtney (1980) 435 helpfully explains that "Ulysses would not have escaped if Polyphemus had had two eyes"; Pollmann (1996) 484 simply cites this as an example of "mythologische Vergleiche".

⁹⁸ Hight (1954) 118 calls the parodic metaphors at IX.64-5 and IX.149-50 (alongside other epic references) "brilliant"; Braund (1988) 147 states that Juvenal "reinforces Naevolus' baseness" with the two epic scenes.

gigolo Naevolus' wishful prayers (IX.147-8), and the epic realm, represented by the singing of the Sicilian Sirens (*Siculos cantus*, IX.150), epitomises the incongruity between elevated reminiscence and depraved reality that Juvenal regularly exploits throughout his satires.

Juvenal's twelfth satire again exploits the *Aeneid's* white sow (*candida ... | scrofa*, XII.72-3), within a deflating context that has a wider intention than simply mocking the creature itself. The mythological pig is initially brought in alongside a handful of other Virgilian references (XII.70-1 - see chapter three, p. 44), in order to establish Catullus' landing place as Alba (which was so called after this "white" pig). The creature is then mocked, as Juvenal describes her thirty teats as never having been seen (*numquam visis*, XII.74): this phrase is a *double entendre*, referring not only to the fact that the teats were constantly in the mouths of her thirty suckling piglets (as shown at *Aen.* VIII.45), but also implying a further degree of unreality and unreliability in the epic genre, as Virgil seems to be the only author to attest to this omen's occurrence⁹⁹. Beyond this mockery, however, is the wider combination in this passage of several epic references (specifically, mentions of Ascanius / Iulus and Lavinium alongside the white sow itself) which brings the return of Catullus into close association with the arrival in Italy of Aeneas, his epic forebear (the parallel is dealt with more closely at chapter eight, pp. 182-3); the white sow's presence hence expands the epic framework of the satire, while also mocking the perpetrators of such epic details, a typical Juvenalian double-edged sword.

Mythological monsters are also regularly brought into Juvenal's fourteenth satire on the sins of parents, as sources of comparison for the depravity of the parents' deeds. The contemporary example of Rutilus (XIV.18) uses this metaphorical connection in two ways: firstly, his perverse temperament makes him more favourable towards the actual sound of a punishing whip-crack than the metaphorical sound of the song of the Sirens (*nullam Sirena flagellis | comparat*, XIV.19-20); and secondly, he is so severe that he actually seems to mutate into the *Odyssey's* cannibalistic giants, *Antiphates* and *Polyphemus* (XIV.20)¹⁰⁰, the epic epitomes of evil and harshness. In the latter instance, the satiric character's depravity is seen as being directly comparable to the evil acts of an epic monster; whereas the former reference shows the satiric character's evil traits to be even worse than a mythological creature's fatal deeds. The thriftiness of a miser is then brought into association with further epic monsters: this stock satiric figure is seen as more attentive over his money than the snakes of both the Hesperides and of Pontus (*Hesperidum serpens aut Ponticus*,

⁹⁹ Scott (1927) 60 labels Juvenal's depiction of the scene as "intentionally ridiculous", and later (p. 87) notes that the satirist "frankly parodies *Aen.* VIII.81-93"; Smith (1989b) 294 considers this scene as one of several moments in Juvenal's satires where "heroic references are introduced comically".

¹⁰⁰ Courtney (1980) 564 elaborates that Juvenal is "carrying on the Odyssean allusion" from *Sirena* (XIV.19).

XIV.114) were in their respective protection of the Golden Apples and the Golden Fleece - Juvenal has again exploited a certain aspect of the epic monsters in this satire in order to elevate his satiric target (miserliness) as being worse in comparison¹⁰¹.

The exploitation of epic monsters by both Seneca and Petronius in their satiric works is usually intended as supplementary to their overall epic structure, and the creatures themselves are rarely mocked. Seneca's only monstrous detail is the gods' initial impression of Claudius himself, especially in the way that he is envisaged by Hercules as a thirteenth Labour (see p. 127 below): ultimately, the subject of Seneca's mockery in the *Apocolocyntosis* is always to be seen as Claudius. Similarly, we should view Petronius' occasional images of mythological monsters within the wider framework of his general epic structure: when the *faux*-heroic characters of the *Satyricon* encounter any situation which might bear some resemblance to an actual heroic meeting with an epic creature, it is their inappropriate actions within the scene, alongside their pretentious and ridiculous wishes to be seen as epic heroes, that are the object of the author's laughter, and not the creatures themselves. So, the two 'Cerberus' dogs which are encountered in chapters 29 and 72 exacerbate Encolpius' desires to view Trimalchio's house as a *quasi*-Underworld (see chapter four, pp. 78-9), while also comically mocking their complete lack of heroism in their fear of these dogs; similarly, when the villain Lichas is twice labelled by Encolpius as the Cyclops (101.5 and 101.7), it is just another attempt to portray his 'heroic' exploits within an epic framework (see chapter eight, pp. 184-6, for more on this motif).

Mythological Miscellany

The satirists also exploit various other mythological characters who cannot be so easily categorised as above; furthermore, while several of these characters do feature briefly within the epic genre, others might be more closely associated with a different genre, such as tragedy, or may even have been considered as simply traditional and axiomatic legends in ancient times. Such 'mythological miscellany' are included here because there is always a degree of subversion and deflation in their exploitation: whether it is outright mockery of the mythic characters, contextually inappropriate juxtapositions of mythological and satiric material, or simply passing mythical references exploited for the purpose of creating a grand mood, the satirists are constantly diminishing the stereotypical areas of the epic realm in their satires.

¹⁰¹ Hardy (1951) 295 mentions that Juvenal had already borrowed the Hesperides from *Aen.* IV.484 during the pretentious banquet at V.152 (see pp. 126-8 below on Hercules' labours); Ferguson (1979) 308 also notes that the conclusion to this line, *adde quod hunc de* (XIV.114), is "a broken prosaic ending in contrast with the preceding mock-epic".

Achilles: The central figure of the *Iliad* is often brought into the satires in his heroic role, but the overall satiric context usually proves deflating to his status. In the seventh satire of Horace's first book, for example, Achilles is brought in as one of a handful of elevated comparisons for the poem's main characters, a pair of quarrelling litigants. The first hint of the aggrandisement of this disagreement is its depiction as "a hostile battle" (*adversum bellum*, i.VII.10): the implication that the two contemporary enemies were therefore analogous to ancient warriors is soon expanded upon. Achilles is brought in as the first comparison, alongside his epic nemesis Hector (i.VII.11): the comment that their conflict was so furious "that only death could finally separate them" (*ut ultima divideret mors*, i.VII.13) is an incongruous contrast to the base nature of the real opponents. The mood is then heightened by the second inappropriate heroic comparison between the satiric litigants and the epic warriors Diomedes and Glaucus (i.VII.15-8 - see chapter seven, p. 155), before the ironic anticlimax of the third (still somewhat unsuitable) comparison with the lowly gladiators Bacchius and Bithus (i.VII.20 - see chapter three, p. 58)¹⁰².

Juvenal brings Achilles into four different satires, each time with a slightly differing subversive intention. In the conclusion to his first satire, Juvenal discusses one of the differences between the satiric and epic genres: the famous names in satire might be able to fight back over their literary presentation (I.162-7). The satirist mentions three epic characters here (Turnus, Achilles, and Hylas) who would not be able to attack their authors, wittily ignoring the obvious reasons of their being either fictional or long-dead in order to produce some rather more deflating excuses: Turnus, the "ferocious Rutulian" (*Rutulumque ferocem*, I.162), poses no threat because he will always be beaten by his literary foe Aeneas (*Aenean*, I.162); Achilles, meanwhile, is pictured with the famous wound (*percussus Achilles*, I.163) in his heel, although this has now been subverted as the reason why he poses no threat (*nulli gravis*, I.163) to his author (see p. 128 below for the subsequent deflation of Hercules' companion, Hylas). Achilles' appearance in the seventh satire holds a further twist on reality creeping into a legendary tale: the satire's general theme of the plight of the *rhetor* allows Juvenal to insert a humorous image of a mythological lesson. Achilles, although described by the bold epithet *grandis* (VII.210)¹⁰³, is comically pictured during a music lesson as being "in fear of the cane" (*metuens virgae*, VII.210) lest he laugh at his master's tail (*cauda*, VII.212)¹⁰⁴; the Greek hero is therefore subversively turned into an impudent and fearful schoolboy, a realistic image within this mythological scene.

¹⁰² McGann (1973) 88 labels the grand images of i.VII.10-18 as a digression that was "written in an elaborate epic style to delay the beginnings of the narrative"; Fraenkel (1957) 120 seems to practice what he preaches in describing the passage as "glittering in its epic pomp".

¹⁰³ Duff (1970) 285 considers this epithet of Achilles to be particularly relevant to his musical ability.

¹⁰⁴ Achilles' music teacher was the Centaur, Chiron (as noted by Barr (1991) 189).

Juvenal's exploitation of Achilles in his eighth satire is actually quite vital to the poem's moral points on family trees. The hero appears alongside another epic figure, Thersites¹⁰⁵, in order to summarise the differences between morality and sin in the past and present: Juvenal states that it is better to be like the highly moral epic hero Achilles, with a man like Thersites as one's father, than to have somebody like Achilles as one's father while acting like epic's most base character Thersites (VIII.269-71). This pithy statement does nevertheless hold a small degree of ridicule: while Thersites is simply named (VIII.269), Achilles is initially alluded to by two periphrases, first as *Aeacidae* ("belonging to Aeacus' family", VIII.270 - he was actually Aeacus' grandson)¹⁰⁶, and then by his weapons forged by Hephaestus (*Volcaniaque arma*, VIII.270)¹⁰⁷, before being actually named at VIII.271 anyway, apparently rendering Juvenal's allusive references irrelevant (see chapter three, footnote 57, on this type of Juvenalian joke). Achilles' final satiric appearance, in Juvenal's fourteenth satire, is alongside his father, Peleus, as one of two mythological examples (see pp. 125-6 below on Ajax's similar appearance alongside his father, Telamon) of a child surpassing his parent (*ut Pelea vicit Achilles*, XIV.214)¹⁰⁸: Juvenal creates a contextually deflating juxtaposition here, since Achilles' empowering deeds that established his superiority over Peleus were glorious martial acts, whereas the satirist predicts that the contemporary youth of Rome will eventually eclipse their immoral parents, the satire's main subject, with their own sinful actions (XIV.216-24).

Agamemnon: Horace first exploits Agamemnon in the third satire of his second book, passing judgement on his infanticide as one of that poem's acts of madness; Agamemnon is actually used as a narrating persona in whose voice Horace can then subtly tell the contrasting tale of Ajax's madness (ii.III.187-213)¹⁰⁹. Horace concludes that Agamemnon should actually be considered the more insane person: for while Ajax did lose his mind, the only victims of his rage were sheep (even though Ajax believed otherwise - see p. 125 below on Ajax's deflation here); Agamemnon, on the other hand, slaughtered his own offspring, Iphigenia, even though he had the apparent moral justification that it was for the greater good of his people (ii.III.207ff.). The argument over justified murder and insanity would have been common in both rhetorical debates and tragic accounts of the

¹⁰⁵ Ferguson (1979) 246 labels Thersites as "the foul-mouthed butt of the Homeric heroes"; Duff (1970) 319-20 sees him as "the mean and ignoble figure" in contrast to "the hero", Achilles.

¹⁰⁶ Pearson & Strong (1892) 164 mention that this patronymic also appeared at *Il.* XVIII.221.

¹⁰⁷ Both Scott (1927) 66 and Courtney (1980) 423 mention that this phrase was also used to describe Aeneas' weapons (e.g. at *Aen.* VIII.535).

¹⁰⁸ Scott (1927) 98, Courtney (1980) 580 and Pollmann (1996) 484 all suggest that this theme of comparison between father and son was taken from Augustus' surpassing of Julius Caesar at *Met.* XV.848ff.

¹⁰⁹ McGann (1973) 78 notes the difference that Horace "contrasts ... two events connected with the Trojan War" at ii.III.187-213, whereas the earlier references to Orestes' madness at ii.III.132-141 (see p. 129 below) has been used to "juxtapose past and present".

myths, but its presentation here, scattered among lesser tales of insanity among misers, spendthrifts, and wastrels, diminishes the mythological status, presenting the ‘heroes’ of old as mere humans, subject to the same insecurities and flaws.

Juvenal then brings Agamemnon into two of his satires, each time with an element of wry humour. In the fourth satire, the Emperor Domitian is associated with Agamemnon when he is referred to by the patronymic name *Atriden* (IV.65), an appropriate epithet for the Greek leader: however, the generally poor impression given of this Emperor as being a petty serial murderer (see pp. 100-1 above) makes the comparison to Agamemnon (whose murder of Iphigenia was at least semi-justifiable) quite inappropriate¹¹⁰. The twelfth satire also finds Agamemnon’s name being invoked, this time in connection with the great fleet of ships that he led to Troy: Juvenal’s context for these thousand ships (*mille rates*, XII.122), however, is their insignificance compared to a will (*testamento*, XII.121), an ironic elevation of legacy-hunting above the lofty realms of epic and tragic mythology¹¹¹.

Ajax: Horace’s discussion of Ajax’s madness in the third satire of his second book, as discussed above, is actually used to bring Agamemnon’s own act of insanity into clearer focus: however, this does not mean that Ajax gets off lightly. The manner in which Horace elevates the madness of Agamemnon’s supposedly justified infanticide is by deflating the details of Ajax’s legendary insanity in contrast (ii.III.187ff.): although the satirist does not change any of these details, the satirical context in which Ajax’s story now stands does make the warrior look slightly foolish as a mere murderer of livestock (*cum stravit ferro pecus*, ii.III.202). Juvenal also exploits the details of Ajax’s mad slaughter in his tenth satire, creating an elevated analogy in which the Emperor Tiberius, following Sejanus’ rebellion, becomes the defeated Ajax (*victus ... Aias*, X.84), vengefully punishing the innocent after an act of betrayal (see pp. 101-2 above); therefore, this epic comparison is obviously intended to criticise the Emperor, rather than the hero. Juvenal goes on to mention Ajax twice in his fourteenth satire, in two thematically different, yet equally deflating, contexts. First, as an example of his *caveat* that “the pupil will always surpass their teacher” (*melioem praesto magistro | discipulum*, XIV.212-3), Juvenal mentions Ajax becoming greater than his father, Telamon (*ut Aiax | praeteriit Telamonem*, XIV.213-4); although this mythological example simply refers to Ajax’s immense bodily size, the analogous act of superiority in the children of Juvenal’s contemporary society is to surpass their parents’ evilness with their own amoral deeds (XIV.216-224), and so, just as with the

¹¹⁰ Ferguson (1979) 164 considers the line’s “double antonomasia, the patronymic for the name, and the mythological for the real person” to be “mock-epic”, while Braund (1996) 249 suggests that the word *Atrides* for the Emperor “may also evoke the portrayal of the fall of Agamemnon in tragedy”.

¹¹¹ Smith (1989b) 297 paraphrases that “the up-to-date Roman will not seek booty by launching a new Trojan expedition”, which seems to further imply that Agamemnon was only greedily looking for the spoils of war.

similar exploitation of Achilles' greater military accomplishments than his father (see p. 124 above), the hero's presence here subverts his usual glory. Later in the same satire, the madness of these evil parents is exemplified by comparison with two mythological examples of insanity, one of whom is Ajax (the other is Orestes - see p. 130 below): it is not so much the contrast between heroes and evil parents that diminishes the former as the dismissive phrasing that Juvenal uses. Ajax is alluded to only with a demonstrative pronoun (*hic*, XIV.286), as the man who slaughtered the cattle (*bove percusso*, XIV.286) which he believed to be the Ithacan Odysseus (*Ithacum*, XIV.287) and Agamemnon (XIV.286 - he is the only mythological character to be actually named in these lines) in disguise¹¹²: this is a further example of the details of Ajax's story being related correctly, but then becoming contextually humorous because of the comical manner of their phrasing.

Ganymede: Juvenal twice brings the name of this epic cup-bearer to the gods (found at *Il.* XX.230ff. and *Met.* X.155ff.) into his satires, in each instance using the mythological figure as a metaphor for great beauty: although there is a suggestion that Ganymede had therefore become an idiomatic figure in classical times for comparisons of beauty¹¹³, both of Juvenal's invocations to his prettiness have additional, slightly mocking contexts. In the fifth satire, the pretentious host has a personal cup-bearer who is called "an African Ganymede" (*Gaetulum Ganymedem*, V.59)¹¹⁴: while this metaphor is a further suggestion of the host's aspersions of kingship, as he is allusively compared with Jupiter, there may be a hint of a homosexual relationship between the master and his slave, since "Zeus and Ganymede were [actually] the first instance of homosexual love"¹¹⁵. This homosexual connection is made more apparent when Ganymede is allusively mentioned in the ninth satire: effeminate misers are said to consider themselves tender (*tenerum*, IX.46) and beautiful (*pulchrum*, IX.47), in short a second Ganymede (*cyatho caeloque*, IX.47 - literally, "heaven's wine-ladler"). This comparison between satire's misers and epic's cup-bearer may be appropriate regarding their effeminacy, but Juvenal undoubtedly intends the comparison between the true beauty of a legendary figure and the implied ugliness of the vain satiric figures to be inappropriate and hence comically deflating to both.

Hercules: Juvenal brings Hercules into his satires on several occasions, and he is usually exploited as a source of grand comparison for some inappropriate satiric aspect, a context which therefore diminishes the hero in contrast. In the third satire, for example, a weak-necked cripple (*invalidi*, III.86) is likened to Hercules as the hero lifts the giant

¹¹² Both Duff (1970) 430-1 and Courtney (1980) 586 make these identifications.

¹¹³ Courtney (1980) 238 and Barr (1991) 166 both consider this a possibility.

¹¹⁴ Ferguson (1979) 177 notes the juxtaposition in this "striking phrase", whereby "'barbarian' Africa" is mockingly placed directly "alongside Greek mythology".

¹¹⁵ Courtney (1980) 432, in relation to Ganymede's subsequent appearance in the ninth satire.

Antaeus from the ground (*Herculis Antaeum procul a tellure tenentis*, III.89)¹¹⁶: this ridiculous comparison is made by a Greek flatterer, and while these hyperbolic foreign sycophants are Juvenal's real target in the poem, Hercules' reputation is also tarnished by the inappropriate nature of the comparison. Another Herculean episode is brought into the pretentious banquet of the fifth satire, as any freedman who attempts to join in the conversation of his supposed superiors at the table will be dragged outside on his heels "like Cacus was when he was beaten by Hercules" (*velut ictus ab Hercule Cacus*, V.125)¹¹⁷. This humorous connection between the presumptuous freedman and the monster Cacus, as well as the intolerant host and the punisher Hercules, does not then escalate into Virgil's violent scene, but instead leaves the fate of the ejected freedman to the reader's imagination. One of Hercules' Labours is exploited later in the same satire as a typically grand flourish by the host: the apples that are served at his table are said to have been "stolen from the African sisters" (*subrepta sororibus Afris*, V.152), alluding to Hercules' Labour of taking the golden apples from the Hesperides¹¹⁸ (Juvenal goes on to exploit the Hesperides at XIV.114 - see pp. 121-2 above). Hercules' Labours also feature briefly in Juvenal's tenth satire (*Herculis ... labores*, X.361), where they are considered insignificant against the extravagant luxury of "banquets and cushions" (*et cenis et pluma*, X.362): however, this deflation is merely intended to further elevate the preceding, more preferable moral of "a healthy mind in a healthy body" (*mens sana in corpore sano*, X.356), rather than to specifically mock the hero's great tasks.

Seneca's exploitation of Hercules, who acts as one of the main figures in the *Apocolocyntosis*, is also somewhat derogatory towards the hero, although his companionship and sponsorship of the unworthy Claudius in the heavenly court are probably to be considered the most subversive elements against his judgement. Hercules is initially chosen to meet Claudius at the gates of heaven, because he had had the most experience of the world's other races from his legendary journeys (*totum orbem terrarum pererraverat*, V.3). This experience was deemed necessary in the face of Claudius' speech impediment, which masked his Latin tongue; however, when this impediment is combined with the Emperor's club foot, Hercules becomes afraid that this new monster is actually a thirteenth Labour for him to perform (*tertium decimum laborem*, V.3)! This derogatory

¹¹⁶ Duff (1970) 137 believes that Juvenal "may often have seen representations of this feat in sculpture or painting", media in which Braund (1996) 190 notes that "Hercules was generally portrayed with a short, thick neck" (and hence is truly an inappropriate comparison for the *invalidi*).

¹¹⁷ *Aen.* VIII.264 (also cited by both Duff (1970) 196 and Ferguson (1979) 181); Braund (1996) 297 notes that this single association between our narrator, Trebius, and the mythological realm is suitably inglorious.

¹¹⁸ Scott (1927) 82 and Braund (1996) 300 both notice this obvious mythological allusion; Pollmann (1996) 483 cites both the Phaeacian apples (see chapter three, p. 49) and the apples of the Hesperides under "mythologischen Personen", as well as "mythologische Vergleiche" at p. 484.

image of the warrior-hero's fear is matched by the comic image of a sluggish Hercules (*vafro*, VI.1) being taken in by Claudius' alleged quick wit and his resort to epic quotation (see chapter six, p. 138). A final joke at Hercules' expense comes in Claudius' attempts to gain Hercules' allegiance prior to the heavenly debate: the Emperor tries to persuade the god with his reminder of all the trials held in Hercules' temple (which Claudius would have presided over as judge). Claudius ironically likens his tribulations in overseeing such trials to Hercules' sixth Labour of cleaning the Augean stables: the punch-line is that both acts involved dealing (either literally or metaphorically) with bullshit (*stercoris*, VII.5).

Jason and the Argonauts: The epic hero Jason, and his followers on the crew of the *Argo*, are occasionally brought into the satiric realm and, furthermore, into an inappropriate context. Horace uses one such crewman named Lynceus in the second satire of his first book, while pointing out the tendency of men to ignore their beloved's flaws in favour of their good points (*optima*, i.II.90). This Argonaut, or rather his eyes (*Lyncei | ... oculis*, i.II.90-1), is exploited here because the sailor was famed for his acute eyesight (as shown at Valerius Flaccus *Argonautica* I.462ff.); however, the two combined facts that this epic metaphor for accurate vision is, firstly, being used in the sexual arena to ogle a woman's best features, and, secondly, is then juxtaposed with the contrasting opinion that a woman's flaws should not be viewed by eyes blinder than Hypsaea's (i.II.91-2 - presumably an unknown, base contemporary reference), do somewhat diminish the character's grandeur as an epic figure. Juvenal also mocks the legend of the Argonauts on several occasions; the first such instance occurs almost immediately in his first satire, as the satirist refers to the mythological cliché of the grove (*lucus | Martis*, I.7-8) that held the Golden Fleece, one of the trite areas of epic about which this programmatic satire complains. This hackneyed story appears again only a few lines later, as Juvenal mentions the place "from which somebody carried off the gold of a stolen skin" (*unde alius furtivae devehat aurum | pelliculae*, I.10-11): the mockery in this phrase is extensive, from the intentional failure to recognise *alius* as the hero Jason, through the comparison of this legendary story to a simple act of theft implicit in *furtivae*, to the anticlimactic diminutive *pelliculae* for the Golden Fleece itself¹¹⁹. This satire's later comments on epic characters who would not be able to attack their author (see p. 123 above) brings in the Argonaut Hylas as the third such figure: Juvenal's subversive reason for Hylas not being able to fight back is that he has gone to find a bucket of water (*Hylas urnamque secutus*, I.164)¹²⁰.

¹¹⁹ Braund (1996) 77 and Courtney (1980) 86 both cite these mocking elements.

¹²⁰ While Juvenal's story details are essentially correct (as taken from Apollonius' *Argonautica* I.1207ff. and Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* III.555ff.), the actual Latin text seems to suggest that Hylas has literally followed (*secutus*) the bucket down a well - as Barr (1991) 146 puts it: "Juvenal deftly contrives again to take the bloom off a charming story".

Juvenal's earlier image of Jason as a thief is twisted into an equally deflating role in the sixth satire, namely a greedy market-trader (*mercator Iason*, VI.153): the satiric context here is the frenzy in the marketplace caused by women's voracious desires to 'keep up with the Joneses' (VI.136-160); Juvenal therefore subverts Jason's heroic mission as simply a tradesman's journey to procure valuable wares for his female customers¹²¹.

Orestes: Orestes' madness after he took revenge on Clytemnestra for her murder of his father Agamemnon is, traditionally, the subject of several Greek tragedies (such as Euripides' *Orestes* and *Electra*, and Aeschylus' *Choephorae* and *Eumenides*); however, I include him here as merely a grand mythological character, whose presence in the satires is occasionally subverted (besides, his satiric presence, alongside other tragic figures, could even be seen as a deflation of *tragedy's* trite subject matters in favour of the more preferable satiric genre). Orestes' initial satirical appearance, as the first mythological character whose insanity is discussed in the third satire of Horace's second book (ii.III.132-141), is used to cleverly illustrate a rhetorical point. Horace's overall theory in this satire is that madness is sometimes seen where none exists, yet not recognised when present: Orestes acts as an ideal mythological exemplum, as his actual madness only occurred *after* his supposedly insane act of matricide (which was usually taken to be completely justifiable), and he subsequently does not do anything wrong while in this frenzy. Horace attempts to replicate the grandeur of this tale's previous representations by filling this passage with many appropriately grand touches, such as the high word *genetricem* ("mother", ii.III.133)¹²², and the graphic phrase *in matris iugulo ferrum tepefecit acutum* ("he warmed up his sharp sword in his mother's throat", ii.III.136)¹²³; his subtle dissection of the legend actually warrants such grand moments, since he is not really trying to mock Orestes at all. Persius' exploitation of Orestes' legend in his third satire is in juxtaposition with contemporary insanity; Orestes' madness is therefore deflated as being insignificant in comparison with the preceding insanity displayed by the wastrel's selfish acts throughout the poem, a belittlement that is aided by the derisive phrasing of "mad Orestes" (*non sanus ... Orestes*, III.118). Orestes' first appearance in Juvenal's satires has already been discussed: while the main target of the eighth satire's subtle comparison between Orestes

¹²¹ Ferguson (1979) 191 explains that "Juvenal debunks the myth: Jason was not an epic hero but a money-grabbing merchant"; while Courtney (1980) 281 notes the two conflicting motifs ("rationalising and deflating") within the image. Duff (1970) 213-4 explains further that Jason would be "a prominent figure in the frescoes" on the *porticus Agrippae*, the site of the Sigillarian fair which would occur during the *mense quidem brumae* (VI.153 - specifically, between the 17th and 19th of December that also covered the Saturnalia holiday), and hence the reason for Jason to be "covered up" (*clausus*, VI.154) by market stalls (Ferguson (1979) 191 and Gifford (1992) 57 also note this connection).

¹²² Muecke (1993) 146 considers *genetrix* to be a word appropriate to both the epic and tragic genres, whose presence "is used here to underline the enormity of the deed".

¹²³ Muecke (1993) 147 bluntly states that "the diction is epic".

and Nero (VIII.215-221) was clearly the artistically-pretentious, family-murdering Emperor (see pp. 99-100 above) the mythological figure does also suffer slightly from the connection (although, ironically, this is entirely due to the points about poetry and acting, rather than serial murder). Juvenal's other brief exploitation of Orestes comes in the fourteenth satire, as the first of two mythological examples of madness juxtaposed with the contemporary insanity displayed by the evil parents (the other is Ajax - see pp. 125-6 above): Juvenal's diminishment of Orestes here comes from the dismissive manner in which the mythological character is introduced with an anonymous demonstrative pronoun (*ille*, XIV.284), alongside the equally dismissive reference to his sister (*sororis*, XIV.284 - i.e. Electra) which then allows him to be recognised.

Priam and Nestor: The two opposing leaders from the Trojan war are both regularly brought into Juvenal's satires (usually together) as metaphorical examples of old age; however, the manner of the satirist's exploitation of this undoubtedly common mythological idiom often pokes fun at the little details of these grand characters' senility. In the sixth satire, for example, the metaphor takes on a crude sexual twist as Priam is aggrandised by the allusive patronymic epithet *Laomedontides* (VI.326), but then has this heroic name diminished by the context that his old age has made him sexually impotent (*frigidus*, VI.325)¹²⁴. The pair's most subversive appearance, however, is in the tenth satire, where the reality of their metaphorical old age is discussed in mocking detail as a warning to those people who would wish for an equally long life. Nestor is introduced first, with a grand allusion as the "king of Pylos" (*rex Pylius*, X.246) whose life was extremely long: Juvenal manages to deflate the entire epic genre with his subsequent caveat that Nestor's grand age was actually only attested to by 'great' Homer, "if you can believe anything he says" (*magno si quicquam credis Homero*, X.246 - see chapter two, p. 27). A more direct attack on Nestor himself comes with Juvenal's explanation behind the king's undoubtedly happy life (*felix nimirum*, X.248): Nestor is belittled by all the wine that he was able to drink at each new harvest (*novum totiens mustum bibit*, X.250), thereby turning the respected king into an ageing drunk. Juvenal then really turns this happiness on its head, as Nestor is pictured as being disgruntled at the length of his life, itself elevated as the thread (*stamine*, X.252) on the Fates' loom: the reason for this dissatisfaction is the death of his son Antilochus, and Nestor is pictured at the funeral, mourning that it had to occur before his own demise (X.252-5)¹²⁵. Juvenal then expands on this humbling image of great men

¹²⁴ Scott (1927) 65 calls the line a moment of "incongruous loftiness", whereas Ferguson (1979) 198 and Courtney (1980) 299 both simply label the line as "mock-epic".

¹²⁵ Blakeney (1925) 46, Duff (1970) 345 and Ferguson (1979) 269 all note that this scene does not feature in Homer's works, although Nestor does mention his son's death at *Od.* III.111ff.

having to suffer in their dotage from the death of their offspring by bringing in first Peleus, upset over Achilles' demise (*Peleus, ... cum luget Achilles, X.256*)¹²⁶, and then Laertes, mourning over Odysseus: both of these latter figures are mentioned allusively, Laertes with the dismissive adjective *alius* (X.257) in apposition to Peleus, and Odysseus as the "Ithacan swimmer" (*Ithacum ... natantem, X.257*), which identifies both men¹²⁷. These minor mocking images at the expense of other mythological figures are merely used as a bridge to take us from the deflating reality of Nestor's situation as a suicidal, depressed alcoholic, to the even greater mockery at the expense of his counterpart Priam. It is the suffering caused by war and devastation (*omnia ... | eversa, X.265-6*) that mars the Trojan king's extended life, so that his eventual death at the hands of Pyrrha (the epic sources for which will be noted at chapter seven, pp. 164-5) is seen as a blessing; Priam's depiction during this duel is also subversively comical, since he is unflatteringly likened to an aged bull (*ut vetulus bos, X.268* - see chapter three, p. 56) being slaughtered before the altar (*ante aram, X.268*). Priam's demise may also be alluded to in Juvenal's thirteenth satire: when the aggrieved Calvinus wishes for vengeance against his perceived foe, the violent imagery of a headless corpse (*corpore trunco, XIII.178*) may be intended to evoke Priam's epic fate (and possibly even Pompey's similar decapitation)¹²⁸; the point of such an allusion would be the aggrandisement of Calvinus' vengeful desires, although the contextual con-man would, of course, not actually be deserving of such a grandly-evoked fate.

Parcae: Persius briefly mentions the Three Fates (*Parcae*) in his fifth satire, although their appearance as holding the lot of both Persius and his friend Cornutus on a set of scales (*nostra vel aequali suspendit tempora Libra | Parca, V.47-8*)¹²⁹ is not intended subversively, but simply serves to unite the friends' destinies. Juvenal's exploitation of the Fates in his ninth satire, on the other hand, is subversive, as the overall sexual context of the satire is a mocking juxtaposition for the Parcae. The metonymy of *Clotho* (IX.135) and *Lachesis* (IX.136) to stand for fortune and destiny is an intentional deflation of these characters' dignity, since they are pictured as prospering on behalf of a gigolo whenever his exploitation of his groin provides enough money to satisfy his hungry stomach (*si pascitur inguine venter, IX.136*). Juvenal also utilises the help of the Parcae (XII.64) as a stereotypical ending to his stereotypical description of the epic storm in his twelfth

¹²⁶ Pearson & Strong (1892) 203 cite three references in the *Iliad* for Peleus' grief and old age: *Il.* IX.410ff., XVIII.434ff., and XXIV.534ff.

¹²⁷ The periphrases for these two characters are explained by Wilson (1903) 106, Blakeney (1925) 47 and Hardy (1951) 244, among others.

¹²⁸ Ferguson (1979) 302 points out the epic references for both Priam's decapitation (*Aen.* II.557-8) and Pompey's (*BC* VIII.663ff.).

¹²⁹ Harvey (1981) 140 mentions the possibility that this image was actually copied from Roman art.

satire¹³⁰. The Fates are naturally pictured at their loom, holding the “white woollen thread” (*staminis albi | lanificae*, XII.65-6) of Catullus’ life before them: their decision to extend it by quelling the exaggerated excesses of the storm serves to heighten the mythological subtext that Juvenal intended for this storm (see chapter four, pp. 86-8).

Although Seneca’s general mythological exploitation is at the expense of Claudius, his use of the Fates in the *Apocolocyntosis* is perhaps more subversive towards the Parcae themselves, because they are not merely figurative characters, but are instead extensively involved in the plot (III-IV). Their introduction comes as Mercury is seen to criticise their extension of the thread of Claudius’ life: one of the Fates, Clotho, explains that they were merely allowing him extra time to ‘Romanise’ some more foreigners (III.3), a slightly deflating interest in human affairs by these supernatural beings. The spindle of Claudius’ life is then brought onto the loom, alongside those of the apparent lowlifes Augurinus and Baba (III.4): Claudius’ presence as the third figure is a deflating anticlimax for the Emperor, which also perhaps suggests that the Fates chose their victims alphabetically¹³¹. Claudius’ life-thread is then snapped by the Fates in just two lines (IV.1.1-2), while Nero’s already quite lengthy lifetime (as shown by the favourable comparisons with Tithonis and Nestor at IV.1.14)¹³² is then extended further by Lachesis, using some of her own life-thread (*Neroni multos annos de suo donat*, IV.2): ironically, her interest in Nero’s long life is not politically motivated, but is rather due to his attractiveness (*formosissimo*, IV.2), deflating Lachesis’ femininity by such human levels of lust.

Teiresias: The epic seer Teiresias is exploited most extensively in the fifth satire of Horace’s second book, where he prophetically discusses legacy-hunting with Odysseus in the Underworld (this invented ‘epic’ scene will be discussed in greater detail in chapter seven, pp. 157-8); however, he does make a handful of other satiric appearances, with the deflating twist that his specific epic skills of augury and fortune-telling are not actually mentioned then. For example, Teiresias appears in Lucilius’ satires on two occasions (228-9W / 1107-8M and 230-1W / 226-7M), each time as a metaphorical example of extreme old age: Teiresias’ appearance in the *Odyssey* is as a ghost in the Underworld, suggesting that Lucilius’ appeal to his longevity rather than his prophetic abilities is intended ironically. These prescient talents are also ignored by Juvenal at the conclusion to his thirteenth satire: his final judgement that the gods are always fair, and are not to be likened to Teiresias (*Teresian*, XIII.249), alludes to the ironic blindness suffered by the ‘seer’.

¹³⁰ Pollmann (1996) 483 simply cites this as an example of “Ende und Verlängerung des lebens”.

¹³¹ Roth (1988) 20 notes Claudius’ apparent interest in the alphabet.

¹³² Roth (1988) 22 discusses the longevity of these mythological characters.

Trimalchio: Much of Petronius' irreverent treatment of epic characters actually comes at the expense of Trimalchio: this character's main humorous traits are his arrogant superstition and his ignorant learning. The former trait can be seen in the mural outside of Trimalchio's house, upon which the Fates, the goddesses Fortuna and Minerva, and the god of money, Mercury, are all seen attending to the egotistical and heavily superstitious Trimalchio's upward spiral of fortune (29): these mythological beings are actually diminished in the picture, because it is Trimalchio himself who is the central figure there. It is the latter trait, however, that creates several subversive images towards epic mythology, as Trimalchio attempts to display his literary knowledge at several points throughout his meal: his increased inebriation over the course of the banquet is probably only partially responsible for the completely inept 'knowledge' that Trimalchio actually displays. After first bragging to Agamemnon of his two libraries (48.5), Trimalchio turns the conversation to mythological matters: however, his literary pretensions cannot hide the ignorant twists of his story's facts - Homer did not cover Hercules' Labours in any great depth, as he claims, and nowhere does the encounter between Odysseus and Polyphemus mention the Cyclops' thumb being tortured (*pollicem extorsit*, 48.7). The legends then start to become even more mixed up once alcohol enters the equation. His educated facade crumbles during his story of the origins of his Corinthian bronze dishes: he somehow brings the Trojan War and the Carthaginian general Hannibal together as contemporaries (*cum Ilium captum est, Hannibal*, 50.5), despite the presumable difference of several centuries¹³³. This digression regarding tableware brings up the opportunity for Trimalchio to brag about his ownership of a hundred goblets, engraved with the otherwise unknown tale of Cassandra killing her sons (*Cassandra occidit suos filios*, 52.1)¹³⁴. Perhaps the most humorous confused allusion is the image engraved on Trimalchio's thousand jugs, supposedly showing Daedalus enclosing Niobe in the Trojan Horse (*Daedalus Niobam in equum Troianum includit*, 52.2). The amalgamation of the otherwise unrelated tales of Daedalus shutting Pasiphae into a wooden cow, the vain Queen Niobe of Thebes, and the Trojan Horse, mainly acts to deflate Trimalchio himself¹³⁵, even though the myths are also themselves subverted. As if a further anticlimax were needed, Trimalchio's lowly love of gladiators is appended to his literary tastes, as he overly praises the cups engraved with his favourite fighters (52.2).

¹³³ Slater (1990) 208 cites a suggestion made by Baldwin that Petronius is actually parodying "misremembered schoolboy texts" here.

¹³⁴ A probable explanation for this phrase is that Cassandra has been "obviously confused with Medea" (Conte (1996) 173), a further example of a 'mixed-up myth' on Trimalchio's part.

¹³⁵ Walsh (1970) 127 labels these lines as "instantly recognisable ... howlers"; Slater (1990) 217 actually considers that to "mistake a cow for a horse" is "rather extreme even for [Trimalchio]".

Finally, as his servants read out a Greek drama, Trimalchio explains in Latin the supposed details of the story, but with even more blatant errors - Diomedes, Ganymede and Helen were not related as siblings (*fratres ... soror*, 59.4 - they were not even of the same race!); Paris' abduction of Helen is confused with his enemy Agamemnon's sacrifice of Iphigenia, the occasion on which Diana actually replaced a heroine with a deer (*Dianae cervam subiecit*, 59.4); and Ajax was actually mad with jealousy over the arms of Achilles, not the wife (*uxorem*, 59.5) of Achilles (who wasn't Iphigenia anyway)¹³⁶. The only detail that Trimalchio does seem to correctly report is Ajax's subsequent insane attack on the cows which he thought were his enemies in disguise (59.5): however, this mythological event is soon presented in a subversive manner too. Trimalchio chooses for Ajax's mad slaughter to be acted out by his slaves in one of his circus-style performances: however, the *quasi-Ajax* is actually a chef, and the calf, clad in a helmet (*galeatus*, 59.6) to signify the supposed soldier hidden within, is to be served up in slices (*frusta*, 59.7) as the next course: Trimalchio's tendencies towards subterfuge and showmanship are therefore to be considered the main targets of Petronius' subversive exploitation of mythology here¹³⁷.

¹³⁶ Slater (1990) 72 concisely labels this as a "vegetative version of Trojan myth", while Conte (1996) 127 simply takes the tale as a further example of Trimalchio's "monstrously absurd" literary awareness.

¹³⁷ Conte (1996) 131 explains Trimalchio's literary game here: "[he] prepares his guests for the sublime exaltations of heroic delirium, but degrades them to mere food".

Chapter 6 – Epic (Mis)Quotations

There are certain words and phrases within the various satires that were not originally written by the satirists themselves, but rather are quotations, translations, or precise verbal reminiscences, of earlier authors' works: in fact, the vast majority of these phrases seem to have been taken from the epic genre. This essentially allows the satirist to show off his literary knowledge (while hopefully appealing to a similar level of knowledge among his audience), as well as providing a further allusion to a specific moment within the epic world, thereby once again momentarily equating the satiric and epic realms. As we have seen so often, however, this elevation of the satiric elements is balanced by a deflation of the grand, epic elements: in the case of quotation, this can be seen to occur in two different ways. First, typically, the new satiric context into which the epic words have been placed will provide a jarring contrast: while the satiric and epic scenes in question will be comparable and appropriate on a certain level, it is the other inappropriate levels of disparity that provide the simultaneous elevating and deflating effects. Secondly, and perhaps more subversively towards the epic realm, is the occasional, deliberate misquotation made by a satirist: the epicist's original words are altered very slightly so that they become more suited to their new satiric context, completely twisting any grandeur or reverence in the epic text. While Juvenal makes the most use of epic quotation in his satires, it can also be found to a lesser extent in other satiric works; besides the fact that Juvenal seems to have been the biggest satiric exploiter of the epic realm generally, the contemporary nature of the epic and satiric genres is also partly responsible here. Juvenal lived at a much later date than the other satirists, and therefore had a greater library from which to quote; so, while Homer's work was open to all authors, the *Aeneid*, for example, could not have been read, and therefore referenced either in quotation or in specific scene re-enactment (covered in chapter seven), by any satirist earlier than Persius. Despite this unevenness, we shall see that the two aspects of deflation and elevation will apply to the exploitation of epic quotation, regardless of the satirist or epicist in question.

Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*

The earliest surviving example of an epic quotation in a satire is a fragment of Lucilius' work which features a brief, interpolated quote from Homer's *Iliad*: *nil ut discrepet ac τὸν δ' ἐξήραξεν Ἀπόλλων | fiat* ("so may nothing differ and may it happen that 'Apollo thus rescued him'", 267-8W / 231-2M / Greek citation from *Il.* XX.443). The epic scene to which the Greek words allude is the conclusion to Achilles' initial onslaught against Hector - the god Apollo momentarily rescues his favourite hero from Achilles'

vengeful wrath. The satiric scene into which Lucilius has brought this allusion, however, is the conclusion to a buffoon's initial onslaught against Scipio Aemilianus – so, just as in the original epic scene, the god is again brought into the action as a *deus ex machina* who delivers the 'hero' to safety¹. Since we are lacking the majority of this poem, we cannot be sure what was the true nature and status of Scipio's deliverer (although it is unlikely to have been an actual god); however, the comparison created between the buffoon's apparent pestering and the earlier heroic combat is enough to suggest that the scene is an intentional parody, which deflates Homer's original scene while simultaneously exaggerating the satiric re-enactment with overly grand hyperbole.

This line of reasoning is also helped by the fact that Horace created his own version of the joke in the ninth satire of his first book; however, rather than simply using the original Greek phrase, Horace actually translates and adapts the comment into Latin²: *sic me servavit Apollo* ("Apollo thus rescued me", i.IX.78). Horace's persona in this satire is saved from his pest's harassment by the intervention of one of the pest's creditors (*adversarius*, i.IX.75): the combination of the pest's military-style attacks (see chapter three, pp. 58-9) and this mock-divine intervention is again intended to elevate the satiric context at the expense of the original epic context (although Apollo's appearance is vaguely appropriate as the patron god of poets, saving Horace's poet persona through his divine agent, the *adversarius*). A further apparent Homeric translation occurs in the fifth satire of Horace's second book, during a slightly more traditional epic scene between Odysseus and Teiresias (see chapter seven, pp. 157-8, on Horace's version of Odysseus' visit to the Underworld). Upon hearing Teiresias' advice to acknowledge another man as his superior in order to benefit financially, Odysseus claims that he could do this, since *et quondam maiora tuli* ("for once upon a time, I bore worse things", ii.V.21) - this appears to be a translation of Homer's phrase καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο ποτ' ἔτλης (*Od.* XX.18). The "worse things" that Odysseus suffered in both cases are his tribulations at the hands of the Cyclops³; however, the irony comes from the altered context of the new harsh trial, from having to endure his wife's suitors while he is still incognito in the *Odyssey*, to acting like a greedy sycophant in Horace's satire.

¹ This context is not clear in the surviving text, but is evident from Festus' inclusion of this fragment at 418.17 (cited by Warmington (1938) 80-1) regarding the derivation of the word *scurra* ("buffoon").

² Buchheit (1968) 533 comments on the link between the scenes as presented by Lucilius and Horace: "Horaz und Lucilius stimmen in ihrer parodischen Tendenz insofern überein, als beide ein hohes episches Geschehen auf eine nicht nur verschiedene, sondern niedrigere Ebene transponieren, ein der antiken Homerparodie gelaüfiges Verfahren"; he further suggests on the same page that Horace's decision to effectively translate the Greek phrase into Latin, rather than following Lucilius' example by simply quoting Homer's words in their original Greek form, may actually reflect the "Kritik an Lucilius" that Horace makes at i.IX.20ff., regarding the use of Greek words in an inappropriate (in Horace's opinion, at least) literary genre (Anderson (1982) 85 also agrees with this suggestion).

³ Muecke (1993) 182 explains the overall context of the phrase as "Ulysses' famous address to his heart" (Petronius would later allude to this scene directly at *Satyricon* 132.13 - see chapter three, footnote 153).

Juvenal's first Homeric 'quotation', in his third satire, has also been translated from the original Greek into Latin, with the similar intention of subversively equating two contextually different scenes. The epic scene in question is "the night of Achilles" (*noctem ... | Pelidae*, III.279-80), referring to the grief suffered by the Greek hero after the death of his friend Patroclus in *Iliad* XXIV; Juvenal's Latin line *cubat in faciem, mox deinde supinus* (III.280) directly correlates to Homer's own depiction of the scene, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε | ὕπιος, ἄλλοτε δὲ πρηνής (*Il.* XXIV.10-11), both phrases having essentially the same English translation, "lying alternately on his face and back"⁴. The identity of Juvenal's grief-stricken 'hero', however, shows the satirist's subversive intentions in misapplying the quotation here: the satire's drunken thug (*ebrius ac petulans*, III.278) has undoubtedly adopted this specifically epic pose due to his drunken stupor rather than any heroic grief, thereby belittling Achilles's similar actions (see chapter seven, p. 156, for an alternative, but equally subversive, explanation for the thug's grief).

Perhaps the most intentionally subversive exploitation of any epic quotation in a work of satire comes in Juvenal's ninth poem. Rather than following his previous example of translating a Homeric phrase into Latin, Juvenal instead chooses here to actually quote the original Greek: αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα ... ("the ... itself leads a man on", IX.37). This phrase appears twice in the *Odyssey* (at XVI.294 and XIX.13), and on each occasion has the subject σίδηρος ("sword") appearing at the end of the phrase; Homer therefore shows that the surrounding fighting and bloodshed on the battlefield are enough to spur a warrior on in his own contests. Juvenal's subject, however, comes as a surprising anticlimax at the line's end, turning the phrase into a deliberate misquotation, since he changes the word σίδηρος for the metrically similar Greek word κίναϊδος ("effeminate") instead, an obviously more appropriate subject for the ninth satire's overall context of sexual perversion⁵; Juvenal's line therefore shows that the open acts of sodomy and effeminacy in Rome can only act as a catalyst to incite and tempt others into similar behaviour. Homer's original words have been deflated by being literally changed, and having their heroic meaning twisted into a strikingly non-epic context; conversely, Juvenal's satiric point about society's rampant perversity has been granted some elevated authority by this exploitation of his audience's literary knowledge⁶.

⁴ Scott (1927) 54 considers the Latin phrase to be "almost a direct translation" of the Greek, while Braund (1996) 222 simply notes that Juvenal "reworks" Homer's scene.

⁵ Ferguson (1979) 250 acknowledges "the device of the twist ending", and Scott (1927) 53 explains Juvenal's dual tactics of "changing the last word to suit his context and to make the line ridiculous"; Courtney (1980) 431 notes that an ancient audience would probably have recognised the quotation, since the idea had been directly conveyed in Valerius Flaccus' translation of the *Odyssey* (V.541).

⁶ Friedlander (cited at Martyn (1969) 46) labels the misquote as a "travesty of Homeric expressions", while Hight (1954) 118 simply calls this parody (among others) "brilliant"; the use of the word "sarcastic" by Braund (1988) 133 in describing the quotation is confusing, since surely Juvenal's point is that times have changed, and he sincerely believes that effeminacy is just as influential now as warfare was in the epic past.

Seneca quotes from both of Homer's works during the *Apocolocyntosis*' supernatural scenes in both Heaven and the Underworld; while this practice of quotation may be taken as a tradition of the Menippean satire sub-genre⁷, this does not negate the fact that Seneca makes use of epic quotations both to inject some appropriate grandeur into the proceedings (as seen in his epic exploitation elsewhere), and to make an occasionally witty and subversive joke at the expense of his characters. Seneca's first Homeric quotations, an impressively interconnected series of three direct quotations from the *Odyssey* during Claudius' meeting with Hercules at heaven's gates, are probably the closest satiric rival to Juvenal's above misapplication of a Homeric quotation; however, Claudius himself is, as always, to be taken as Seneca's biggest target of satiric and parodic ridicule, rather than the interpolated epic elements themselves. Hercules' opening gambit in his interrogation of the former Emperor is taken from *Od.* I.170: τίς πόθεν εἶς ἀνδρῶν, πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες ("who are you, and what is your race? Who are your parents, where is your home?", V.4); the epic context has Telemachus asking the disguised goddess of wisdom Athene's identity, but ironically the roles are reversed here as the god Hercules makes the inquiry of a 'disguised' (and not particularly wise!) Claudius. This mild irony is turned against Claudius when he recognises Hercules' epic quotation, and decides to match it with his own attempt at displaying his literary knowledge: Ἰλιόθεν με φέρων ἄνεμος Κικόνεσσι πέλασσεν ("winds blew me from Ilion toward the Ciconian land", V.4 / *Od.* IX.39). The epic context (the stormy winds which blew Odysseus from Troy onto King Alcinous' shores) and Claudius' own circumstances (he was propelled from 'Trojan' Rome to heaven by his flatulent wind on his deathbed) are ridiculously connected by the differing 'winds' which mock Claudius' comical demise; but the contexts are even more ridiculously disconnected by the incongruous contrast between Claudius' and Odysseus' respective destinations of heaven and the savage lands of the barbarian Cicones, making the quotation appear somewhat tactless on the ignorant Claudius' part. The true aptness of this verse, however, comes from the third quotation, an aside from Seneca himself that it would have been more appropriate for Claudius to have carried the quotation on to the following line: ἔνθα δ' ἐγὼ πόλιν ἔπραθον, ὄλεσα δ' αὐτούς ("from there, I sacked a city, and killed all of its people", V.4 / *Od.* IX.40 - note that Seneca has omitted the original first word Ἰσμάρω, referring to Odysseus' destination of Ismarus). Claudius' true nature is finally revealed here, as the murderous excess of his 'destruction' of Rome is humorously compared to Odysseus' role in the fall of Troy, although without any heroic aspects since the victims were not his enemies, but rather his own subjects⁸.

⁷ De Smet (1996) 51 attributes epic quotation in Menippean satire to Menippus himself, while Coffey (1976) 163 mentions Varro's further utilisation of literary quotations.

⁸ Eden (1984) 85-7, Roth (1987) 806-7 and Roth (1988) 26 discuss these Homeric scenes in greater detail.

The above Odyssean quotations are followed up in later scenes by a handful of quotations from the *Iliad* which create somewhat less subversive comical images. During the heavenly debate regarding Claudius' fate, the god Janus is afforded the epic description "he looks forward and backward at the same time" (ἄμα πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω, IX.2 / *Il.* I.343)⁹: Seneca wittily applies a double-entendre here, since the phrase's normal epic context of a person's wisdom and circumspect nature is joined by a more literal meaning regarding the god's physical appearance (i.e. his two faces). In his subsequent speech calling for the abolition of the deification of humans, Janus elevates humanity with a further Homeric description, ἀρούρης καρπὸν ἔδουσιν ("they eat the fruit of the soil", IX.3 / *Il.* VI.142)¹⁰; the elevation is momentary, though, since Janus' true, scornful opinion of humanity immediately comes into play, namely that they are merely gladiators for the gods' own amusement. In the satiric work's conclusion, several charges are read out in the Underworld's own court on Claudius' fate: one such charge sees the immense number of plebeian casualties to the Emperor's murderous ire being elevated by the Homeric simile ὅσα ψάμαθός τε κόνις τε ("as many as grains of sand or specks of dust", XIV.1 / *Il.* IX.385)¹¹. Seneca's satiric context of Claudius' countless victims is an incongruous contrast to the quotation's original epic context of Achilles refusing to accept the innumerable gifts that were intended to persuade him to return to the fray (although, again, it is Claudius who is the main target of Seneca's epic exploitation here).

Ennius' *Annales*

Horace quotes from Ennius' *Annales* twice in his first book, but with the intention of making two very different jokes. In the second satire, Horace moves swiftly from the sexual language of *venas* (i.II.33), *permolere* (i.II.35) and *cunni* (i.II.36) to the grander style of the epic quotation *audire est operae pretium, procedere recte | qui ... vultis* ("to hear is worth your while, all you who wish for ... to proceed correctly", i.II.37-8 / *Ann.* 471-2S). Ennius' original context of an apparent lack of patriotism in his own time was clear from the object inserted into this phrase, *rem Romanam Latiumque augescere* ("[all you who wish for] the Roman state [to proceed correctly] and for Latium to increase", *Ann.* 472S); Horace's joke, however, is to apply the same thought to his satiric context of sexual immorality, by inserting his own object into the misquotation, *moechis non* ("[all you who wish for] nothing [to proceed correctly] for adulterers", i.II.38). Ennius' appeal for the

⁹ The cited example refers to Agamemnon - Eden (1984) 108 explains that the phrase had been used elsewhere by Homer to describe such figures as Priam (*Il.* III.309; also mentioned at Roth (1998) 35), Polydamas (*Il.* XVIII.250), and Halitherses (*Od.* XXIV.452).

¹⁰ Roth (1988) 35 labels this phrase "an Homeric formula", and suggests that it may have a further contextual connection to the just-mentioned "bean farce" (*Fabam mimum*, IX.3).

¹¹ Both Eden (1984) 145 and Roth (1988) 48 briefly mention this quotation.

patriotic minority in his time to stand up to their opposing majority of non-patriots, is wittily subverted into Horace's parallel appeal for the moral minority in his own time to stand up to their opposing majority of shameless adulterers, with the implicit connection that both patriotism and sexual desire are inherently Roman traits¹².

Horace's second Ennian quotation, however, in his fourth satire, is not only quoted correctly, but is also superficially treated with a kind of reverence that is rare among the satirists regarding their quotations. Horace's contextual point is that his current, satiric poetry should be considered as separate from grander types of poetry: Ennius' line, *postquam Discordia taetra | Belli ferratos postis portasque refregit* ("after foul Discord broke open the ironclad gates and door-posts of War", i.IV.60-1 / *Ann.* 258-9S), is said to carry the trace of "a poet's limbs" (*membra poetae*, i.IV.62), even when it is separated from its wider epic context, whereas Horace's satires could not be said to have any such poeticism. Horace's self-deprecating claims alongside his apparent awe for Ennius' verse actually hide two subtle negative comments against epic poetry as a whole: first, the language of the chosen quotation is perhaps not that different from Horace's own language in the satires¹³, meaning that the real signs of the "poet's limbs" within the quotation would be either the trite subject matter of 'the gates of war', a sly joke at the expense of epic poets (including Ennius) who must resort to clichés, or the very metre itself, whose removal would render epic's enforced word order as meaningless; and second, Horace's point that his own subjects of vice and corruption will always be seen as unsuitable for consideration as real poetry, is a telling criticism of the Roman literary audience, who would rather have the above epic clichés regurgitated than appreciate any other genres.

Persius' one quotation from Ennius' *Annales*, in his sixth satire, attributes a similar sense of grandeur to the epicist's words, although this is soon subverted for the sake of a joke at the author's expense. The satirist tells of his own apparent situation on the coast of Liguria (*Ligus*, VI.6), using words that he attributes to Ennius in order to authoritatively explain the beauty of the surrounding area: *Lunai portum, est operae, cognoscite, cives* ("citizens, learn of Luna's port, you must", VI.9)¹⁴. However, Persius then immediately follows up this apparent quotation with a mocking depiction of Ennius' deluded dreams about visitations from the ghost of Homer, and transformations into peacocks (VI.10-1 – see chapters two, p. 27, and four, pp. 81-2): this juxtaposition therefore serves to rob the

¹² Rudd (1986) 197 calls this a "stately parody".

¹³ The first four of the eight words in this Ennian quotation actually appear on a total of twenty other occasions throughout Horace's eighteen satires; however, this quotation is also the only occurrence of the remaining four words, so the argument can be made either way.

¹⁴ The exact assignation of the line to the *Annales* is actually uncertain - although Barr (1987) 158 follows Vahlen's reasoning that such an authoritative comment must be taken from Ennius' *Annales*, both Housman (1972) 1232-3 and Harvey (1981) 185 would prefer the line to come from his *Satires*; Skutsch (1985) 750 does not place the fragment at any specific part of the *Annales*, but argues that it might be part of a Prologue.

preceding quotation of both its epic authority and indeed its veracity, since the speaker of the sentiment has been made to look like a fanciful buffoon.

Virgil's *Aeneid*

Virgil's reputation as the primary Roman epicist seems cemented by the fact that the *Aeneid* is not only quoted by all of the satirists who lived subsequent to its publication, but, in fact, is also quoted to the greatest extent of all the epic works; the first surviving satirist who could have quoted Virgil's work, Persius, does so on two apparent occasions, making Virgil the only author that he actually quotes more than once. The most obvious of these epic quotations comes in his first satire, as Persius uses the two-word phrase *Arma virum* ("Weapons and the Man", I.96 / *Aen.* I.1) as a reference to the whole *Aeneid*¹⁵; his intention in the following passage then becomes an ironic attack on the grand style of Virgil's work, memorably visualised as being "frothy and fat" (see chapter two, p. 28). Although the point of Persius' passage is mockery of Virgil's epic poem, this is done by other means, and the quotation itself is merely used as a pointer towards the specific work that Persius is attacking. Similarly, Persius' other quotation from the *Aeneid*, namely the appearance in his sixth satire of the Virgilian phrase *quartus | ... pater* ("grandfather's grandfather", VI.57-8)¹⁶, has no obvious negative effect, but is merely intended to add an extra element of grandeur to Persius' already quite high-flown linguistic style.

Juvenal's quotations from the *Aeneid*, however, usually possess some kind of humorous or subversive intention within their surrounding context - Juvenal's general expectations of literary familiarity within his audience, as shown by his regular quotations, are certainly a fair presumption when it comes to the *Aeneid*, since the book would have been a popular favourite in schools and at poetry recitals, and hence he plays off this knowledge for humorous effect. Often, Juvenal doesn't actually quote a phrase directly from Virgil's work, but rather uses a handful of connected words in a similar context, showing, perhaps, an overall stylistic and linguistic debt to the earlier poet; in his second satire, for example, Juvenal connects the words *caelum*, *mare* and *misceo* into a sentence that seems to paraphrase an earlier idea from the *Aeneid*, but with a slightly more inappropriate context. Virgil's phrase *maria omnia caelo | miscuit* ("she [Juno] mingled all the seas with the sky", *Aen.* V.790-1) refers to a literal storm caused by a deity¹⁷, whereas Juvenal's parallel line *caelum terris ... misceat et mare caelo* ("he turns the heavens, lands, and seas upside down", II.25) describes a more metaphorical 'storm', namely the overreaction of an effeminate hypocrite condemning his own crime in other people, an

¹⁵ See chapter two, footnote 33, for examples of the citation of a text's initial line as its title.

¹⁶ Harvey (1981) 198 notes that the phrase was first used as an elevated substitute for *abavus* at *Aen.* X.619.

¹⁷ Scott (1927) 49 even labels the phrase as "a common epic description of a storm".

apparent parody that simultaneously elevates the effeminate hypocrite and mocks Juno by their association with each other.

The second satire uses two further phrases that refer back to Virgil's work during the later 'rogues' gallery' of effeminate revellers, both phrases describing a mirror belonging to one of the most prominent of these hypocritical men. Initially, this mirror is granted a mock-epic status by the phrase *pathici gestamen Othonis* ("the tool of the passive Otho", II.99): this construction parallels the description of a shield in the *Aeneid* as "the tool of the great Abas" (*magni gestamen Abantis*, *Aen.* III.286), with the replacement of the 'masculine' word *magni* by the 'feminine' word *pathici* serving to deflate the epic character by association¹⁸. But the mirror is then granted full epic status by the exact quotation *Actoris Aurunci spolium* ("taken from the Auruncan, Actor", II.100 / *Aen.* XII.94), which now equates the mirror with Turnus' spear; the ironic phrase therefore fits alongside the parody of the previous line to show the innate morality of this satire which constantly contrasts its degraded satiric characters with more heroic images¹⁹ (see chapter five, p. 99, for a potential further reference to the Emperor Nero at II.100).

The various levels of connection between Juvenal's third satire and the *Aeneid* (as will be discussed in chapters seven, pp. 161-4, and eight, pp. 179-181) are actually first suggested by a blatant Virgilian quotation. During the satirist's depiction of a fire in the socially dysfunctional Rome, a character called Ucalegon demands water while trying to remove his possessions from the fire's path (*iam poscit aquam, iam frivola transfert* | *Ucalegon*, III.198-9); the name Ucalegon only occurs elsewhere in *Aeneid* II, also placed at the beginning of a line, in similar proximity to the word *iam* (*iam proximus ardet* | *Ucalegon*, *Aen.* II.311-2 – Juvenal also borrows the verb *ardebit* two lines later at III.201), and so the connection between the two works is at least made regarding this brief passage²⁰. Juvenal elevates his contemporary fire by placing this epic character inside it; Ucalegon himself is then deflated, because his shift into Roman reality has made him a slightly comical and greedy character, rather than a simple burn-victim. Later in the same satire, Juvenal adapts a Virgilian phrase in order to shift his audience's focus from the scene of an accident to the victim's ignorant family continuing their daily chores: while

¹⁸ Courtney (1980) 139 suggests that Otho is shown to be "as proud of his mirror as if it were a trophy of war", which the Virgilian description certainly evokes; Scott (1927) 54 and Braund (1996) 149 both discuss the phrases' metrical similarities and their placement at the beginning of a line.

¹⁹ Braund (1996) 150 considers the quotation to be "sarcastic and [it] emphasises the gulf between Virgil's martial heroes and effeminate such as Otho"; Courtney (1980) 139 simply comments that "Otho is implicitly contrasted with Virgilian heroes" here; while Lelièvre (1972) 458 explains Juvenal's reasons for using this recognisable Virgilian phrase as "neither simple comedy nor a form of literary criticism ... it asserts the validity of certain moral standards represented by and enshrined in Virgil's poetry".

²⁰ Lelièvre (1972) 458 and Estevez (1997) 281 both rightly use the Ucalegon link as the first hint of a connection between Troy and Rome; but Scott (1927) 46 merely explains that the Ucalegon reference appears "not particularly for the purpose of mock dignity but simply by way of surprise" to the alert reader of Juvenal who is suitably au fait with their *Aeneid*.

this dramatic device seems to be borrowed from a Homeric scene (see chapter seven, p. 156), the introductory phrase *domus interea* (“meanwhile, back at the house”, III.261) seems more likely to be taken from Virgil’s phrase *domus interior* (*Aen.* II.486), which had similarly been used to shift the scene from the battlefield to inside Priam’s palace²¹.

A phrase seemingly borrowed by Juvenal from *Aeneid* VI in his fourth satire seems to have been used in order to extend the poem’s mockery of the Emperor Domitian: the many victims of his homicidal tendencies are said to have now become “illustrious souls” (*inlustresque animas*, IV.152 / *Aen.* VI.758). The epic and satiric contexts of these words actually agree, since both authors are describing the inhabitants of the Underworld; however, the grandeur afforded to the murdered spirits by Juvenal’s exploitation of this epic phrase is not entirely appropriate given the implied judgement on the manner of their deaths²². The fifth satire also features an inappropriate application of a grand Virgilian phrase to a debased satirical context: Juvenal’s lines *nullus tibi parvulus aula | luserit Aeneas* (“no little Aeneas must play in your halls”, V.138-9) are a minor adaptation of Virgil’s *si quis mihi parvulus aula | luderit Aeneas* (“if a little Aeneas had played in my halls”, *Aen.* IV.328-9)²³. The epic context of the phrase was Dido’s lament that her affair with the Trojan leader did not produce a child; its satiric context, however, becomes a piece of advice to a legacy-hunter that his prospective victims should also be lacking any offspring who would then act as the more apt heirs²⁴. This misapplication of a line that would be immediately recognisable as a Virgilian adaptation into a lowly piece of advice subverts the epic melancholy into satiric greed, and raises the legacy-hunter’s self-image into more noble realms than reality. The feelings of the legacy-hunter towards his victim’s children are further coloured by Juvenal’s immediate adaptation of a further Virgilian idea, labelling them as “a chattering brood” (*loquaci | ... nido*, V.142-3); Virgil’s own “chattering brood” (*nidisque loquacibus*, *Aen.* XII.475)²⁵ were actually young birds, and so Juvenal’s transference of this phrase to squabbling human children is an ironically elevated metaphor. This imagery is then extended further by the transformation of the food required to quieten the epic birds (*Aen.* XII.474-5) into the legacy-hunter’s gifts (or more accurately bribes) of clothing and money in order to first win the favour of the children and so subsequently that of their rich parents too (V.143-4).

²¹ Braund (1989) 35 notes that “Juvenal guarantees a mock-epic effect with the mundane and unpoetical list of the household’s activities”; Powell (1999) 328 labels Juvenal’s vocabulary here as “homely and unpoetic”.

²² Flintoff (1990) 123 calls the use of the phrase “a slightly disconcerting allusion”; Braund (1996) 268-9 also considers it an intentional reference to the Virgilian phrase.

²³ Friedlander (cited at Martyn (1969) 46) labels the lines as “familiar epic verses”, Scott (1927) 46 as “a well-known epic phrase”; Ferguson (1979) 182 and Braund (1996) 298 also mention the epic reference.

²⁴ Courtney (1980) 247 observes that “legacy-hunting ... is not fully relevant” to this satire’s overall theme.

²⁵ Scott (1927) 51 notes that the image was actually part of a simile in the *Aeneid*, while Courtney (1980) 248 labels it as “another Vergilian reference”.

Juvenal ironically adapts a similar Virgilian phrase in the introduction to his sixth satire, when he pictures the gods leaving the Earth at the end of the Golden Age. The key trait of Juvenal's Golden Age in this satire was Chastity (see chapter four, pp. 71-2), and he suggests that mankind only had a few "traces of their former Chastity" (*Pudicitiae veteris vestigia*, VI.14) at that time, prior to the goddess Pudicitia's flight alongside Astraea at VI.19-20; Juvenal appears to have borrowed this idea from *Aeneid* IV, where Dido feels the "traces of her former flame [i.e. love]" (*veteris vestigia flammae*, *Aen.* IV.23)²⁶ being revitalised in Aeneas' presence. While the epic expression refers to Dido's burgeoning and innocent love for Aeneas, the satiric context has been completely twisted around and debauched to indicate the decline in this type of love, as it is replaced by crude sexual desire among contemporary women. This weakening of sexual morals is replicated in the ninth satire about male prostitution, and Juvenal again adapts a phrase from the *Aeneid* with subversive intentions. Aeneas advises his men in the first book of the *Aeneid* to "hold on and save yourselves for better things" (*durate et vosmet rebus servate secundis*, *Aen.* I.207), inspiring advice intended to stir them on in their arduous voyage; the gigolo Naevolus offers initially similar advice to his slaves in the ninth satire, to "hold on and wait for the crickets" in summertime (*durate atque expectate cicadas*, IX.69)²⁷. Although the point is similar in that both sets of addressees are being advised to endure a long haul (a voyage in epic, the winter in satire) in order to reap the benefits at the end, the fact that Naevolus' slaves must endure a winter without payment, because their master does not get the opportunity to provide as many sexual services in the cold (IX.66ff.), serves to deflate the apparent elevation of epic verbal similarities within this debauched satiric atmosphere.

In his tenth satire, Juvenal criticises the peers of the philosopher Democritus with a phrase that may be intended as a verbal reminiscence of the *Aeneid*: these people are seen as living in "a land of idiots" (*vervecum in patriam*, X.50), Democritus himself being the obvious exception. If this phrase is seen as a probable adaptation of Virgil's description for Aeolia, *nimborum in patriam* ("a land of clouds", *Aen.* I.51)²⁸, the grand phrase therefore becomes slightly debased by the insertion of the lowly word *vervecum*, satiric idiots replacing epic winds. A somewhat more incongruous juxtaposition of epic and satiric elements comes in Juvenal's thirteenth satire, where his contemporaries' grief for monetary loss is equated with a moment of epic grief at the loss of a mythological character. Juvenal's lines, *et maiore domus gemitu, maiore tumultu | planguntur nummi quam funera* ("money's loss is lamented with greater grief in the house, a commotion greater than at a

²⁶ Ferguson (1979) 186 considers Juvenal's context to be a "wicked parody" of the epic phrase.

²⁷ Braund (1988) 131 notes this parody, but is possibly going too far at p. 251 when she tries to connect this epic scene's earlier mention of *Cyclopiam saxa* (*Aen.* I.201) with Polyphemus' appearance at IX.64-5.

²⁸ Both Pearson & Strong (1892) 177 and Scott (1927) 101 make this connection, explaining further that Aeolia was the mythological home of the winds (or "clouds"), and naming Democritus' homeland as Abdera.

person's death", XIII.130-1), subtly paraphrase Virgil's own passage on the grievous uproar inside Priam's palace after the king's death: *at domus interior gemitu miseroque tumultu | miscetur, penitusque cavae plangoribus aedes | femineis ululant* ("inside the house were intermingled grief and a wretched commotion, and the building echoed deep within its vaults to women's laments", *Aen.* II.486-8). Juvenal's witty borrowing of several keywords from Virgil's epic scene (*domus*, *gemitu*, *tumultu*, and the verbal stem *plang...*) is juxtaposed against the anti-climactic, satiric word *nummi*, while Priam's contemporary replacement by money is a deflating twist on the epic scene²⁹.

The final two phrases from the *Aeneid* exploited by Juvenal come in his fourteenth satire, and again the new satiric context of these phrases act as a deflating juxtaposition against their original epic context. As Juvenal recommends that certain types of people, such as prostitutes and parasites, be disallowed from a family home, he echoes the pleas of "away, away!" (*procul, a procul*, XIV.45 / *procul, o procul*, *Aen.* VI.258) by the priestess who wished for Aeneas' men to leave the Underworld: the change of objects from the noble Trojan warriors to such ignoble Roman lowlifes is a typical satiric twist of a recognisable epic line³⁰. A similar twist also occurs when Juvenal seeks a "cause of such evil" (*causa mali tanti*, XIV.290), borrowing a phrase that Virgil uses twice (*Aen.* VI.93 and XI.480)³¹. Juvenal cleverly alters the context of both the *causa* (for Virgil, this refers to Aeneas' future bride Lavinia on both occasions) and the *mali tanti* (Lavinia is said to be the cause of the war in *Aeneid* VII-XII) in order to better suit his topic: now, money (*concisum argentum*, XIV.291 - literally, "silver cut into circles") is the cause, and the great evil of which it is the cause is the desire for greedy merchants to undertake dangerous epic-style voyages (XIV.287ff.). This mercenary imagery is ill-suited to the epic source material, and Lavinia is thoroughly deflated by the juxtaposition as being a mere prize.

Although Seneca uses several Homeric quotations in the *Apocolocyntosis* (see pp. 138-9 above), there only appears to be one reminiscence of the *Aeneid*; as with the Homeric quotations, however, the brunt of Seneca's joke is again Claudius. As the dead Emperor's *quasi*-epic journey begins, a witness is introduced to testify to Seneca's sceptical audience that he saw Claudius travelling on the road to heaven "with uneven footsteps" (*non passibus aequis*, I.2 / *Aen.* II.274). The epic context of this phrase is the fact that Iulus' strides are unequal to those of his father, Aeneas, because he is just a little boy; Seneca mocks the Emperor on two counts when he applies the phrase to him, first of all in the literal sense that Claudius' gait is uneven because he is physically impaired by

²⁹ Courtney (1980) 551 specifically marks the verbal parallels out as a parody.

³⁰ Courtney (1980) 566-7 sees a further verbal twist, since "we expect this [i.e. *procul, o procul*] to be followed by *profani* [as at *Aen.* VI.258] rather than *puellae*".

³¹ Courtney (1980) 586 also cites the two references to the *Aeneid*.

lameness in one foot³², but then also in the implied metaphorical sense that Claudius is an inadequate successor to his Imperial ancestors (see chapter five, p. 103).

Petronius quotes from the *Aeneid* on several occasions to differing effect. The first such quotation is attributed to Trimalchio in a rare instance of urbane wit (see chapter five, pp. 133-4, on his usual ignorance concerning the details of mythological incidents): *sic notus Ulixes?* (“is this the Ulysses you know?”, *Satyricon* 39.3 / *Aen.* II.44). The point that Trimalchio is making here is essentially ‘don’t you know me better than that?’, and so the rather unnecessary epic quotation seems to show Trimalchio’s tendency towards expressions of supposed learning; however, the fact that the original epic context was Laocoon’s warning about the trap of the Trojan Horse (undoubtedly, Odysseus’ greatest trick) combines with Trimalchio’s self-opinion as being a trickster on a par with the epic archetype, thereby adding a further implication about the deceit that will permeate this dinner-party³³ (see chapter four, pp. 79-80). Trimalchio’s dinner-party also holds a Virgilian quotation made by a slave: *interea medium Aeneas iam classe tenebat* (“now meanwhile Aeneas held the main with his fleet”, *Satyricon* 68.4 / *Aen.* V.1)³⁴. This recital is extended with the inclusion of lesser poetry, but Encolpius readily admits that, even without the juxtaposition of Virgil’s verses and these crude poems, the *Aeneid* is being butchered by the slave’s screeching: Trimalchio’s attempts at culture always end up with him being revealed as completely uncultured, and so no offence is intended towards Virgil’s poetry here (since their poor appearance here is Trimalchio’s fault).

The two Virgilian quotations cited above were both used by Petronius to mock Trimalchio, but this mockery did not attach itself to the author or genre of the original quotations, as we have seen happening in other satires: indeed, Petronius seems to invest a degree of authority in Virgil’s lines that should not be mocked, as two further quotations from the *Aeneid* prove. The tale of the Widow of Ephesus (111-2) is a simple fable of a grieving widow whose apparently insurmountable sorrow is finally overcome by a kindly soldier; Petronius places two related Virgilian quotations into the mouth of the widow’s concerned maid as she attempts to offset her mistress’ grief: *id cinerem aut manes credis sentire sepultos* (“do you believe that ashes or buried ghosts can feel this?”, *Satyricon* 111.12 / *Aen.* IV.34)³⁵ and *placitone etiam pugnabis amori? | nec venit in mentem, quorum consederis arvis?* (“will you even fight pleasing life? Or does it not come to your mind in

³² Coffey (1976) 263 cites Suetonius *Claudius* 30 as evidence for Claudius’ lameness; Eden (1984) 66 labels the subsequent appropriateness of the quotation as “an exquisitely malicious twist”.

³³ Cameron (1970) 400 explains that, in the *Satyricon*, Odysseus “is always the crafty Ulysses”.

³⁴ Slater (1990) 167 suggests that Trimalchio’s slave did not just recite the mentioned first line, but rather read out the entirety of *Aeneid* V; Saylor (1987) 594ff. rationalises the choice of this book by its depiction of funeral games, the connected subjects of death and frivolity being Trimalchio’s two biggest obsessions.

³⁵ Petronius’ minor alteration of *curare* to *sentire* does not alter the sense at all, and is probably more to do with a variant text than any intentional act of subversive misquotation.

whose lands you sit?”, *Satyricon* 112.2 / *Aen.* IV.38-9). Both of these quotations were originally put into the mouth of Dido’s sister in *Aeneid* IV as she advised the lovelorn queen against any potentially self-harming actions; this parallel between the widow’s fate and Dido’s fate therefore elevates the former to mythic levels, while treating Virgil’s account of the latter as an apparently wise source of analogous advice³⁶.

There are two final Virgilian quotations, however, which are utilised in a subversive manner, as Petronius places the epic lines in a distinctly unsuitable context; the point, though, is not to mock the cited epic moments, but rather to continue the recurring motif of Encolpius trying to elevate his bawdy life into the voyage of an epic hero (see chapter eight, pp. 184-6). In this instance, our ‘hero’ Encolpius has been stricken by impotence, and he berates his penis in hexameter verse for letting him down: his penis’ reaction humorously echoes a scene from *Aeneid* VI, as “it looked away with eyes fixed on the ground and at this unfinished speech its face was no more aroused than ...” (*illa solo fixos oculos avera tenebat, | nec magis incepto vultum sermone movetur | quam ...*, *Satyricon* 132.11 / *Aen.* VI.469-71). This reaction is credited in the *Aeneid* to Dido, as she bitterly avoids eye-contact with her betrayer Aeneas when they meet again in the Underworld; Petronius, however, equates Encolpius’ penis with the epic heroine by using the innuendoes implicit in *aversa* and *movetur* to turn Dido’s sorrow and bitterness into sexual frustration and impotence, a perverse anthropomorphism that again elevates Encolpius’ vulgar actions into the desired sphere of epic³⁷. The appropriateness of the quotation regarding these two innuendoes is made even funnier if we realise how Petronius has twisted the final comparative part of the sentence with a further reference to the *Aeneid*: while Dido’s face was originally as immovable as “harsh flint and Marpesian rock” (*si dura silex aut stet Marpesia cautes*, *Aen.* VI.471), this comparison would actually have given Encolpius very little to complain about in his then rocklike member! Hence, Encolpius’ penis is now said to be no more moved than “pliant willows” (*lenta salices*, 132.11) or “poppies with drooping necks” (*lassove papavera collo*, 132.11), which appear to be more appropriate images for a flaccidly impotent penis; however, the latter phrase has been borrowed verbatim from *Aen.* IX.436, where its context was as part of a simile describing Euryalus’ suicide, and hence Encolpius’ impotence is ironically elevated by a dual epic allusion to Virgilian images of death³⁸.

³⁶ Slater (1990) 169 notes that Petronius is taking advantage of “the assumption [by a classical audience] that a truth is somehow a higher and more perceptible truth because Virgil said it”.

³⁷ Slater (1990) 128 explains that Petronius has used this quotation here in order to “crystallize the gap between the world of heroes and the shadowy role-playing world of Encolpius”.

³⁸ Sullivan (1968) 218 considers that the combined epic quotations have enhanced the “piquancy of the wit”.

Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

My criteria for including Ovid as an epic poet in my analysis has been discussed elsewhere (see chapter one, p. 7); it is apparent that his *Metamorphoses* was known to both Juvenal and Seneca, and they both saw fit to reference the poem in different ways. Seneca merely names the work at IX.5 (see chapter two, p. 30, on this reference); Juvenal's debt to the *Metamorphoses* stretches to his own accounts of specifically Ovidian scenes (as will be covered at chapter seven, pp. 169-70), as well as a handful of verbal reminiscences with wider, humorous contexts. A good example of a sustained linguistic parallel between a satiric scene and a corresponding earlier epic scene comes in Juvenal's third satire, as the satirist takes certain ideas from Ovid's description of a flourishing sacred grove to Diana at *Met.* III.157ff., and applies them to the abandoned temple of Egeria where Umbricius' tirade takes place (III.17-20)³⁹; this serves to simultaneously show the former glory of the abandoned site (which echoes the wider context of Rome's decline in this satire), while also subverting the elements from the epic scene into their present decay (which will likewise become a recurring feature in this satire). So, while in Ovid's passage, the cave (*antrum*, *Met.* III.157) was naturally created with no artificial interference (*arte ... nulla*, *Met.* III.158), Juvenal's caves (*speluncas*, *Sat.* III.17) are unnatural and manmade (*dissimiles veris*, *Sat.* III.18); similarly, the porous rock (*tofis*, *Met.* III.160 / *tofum*, *Sat.* III.20), which remains around the spring (*fons*, *Met.* III.161 / *aquis*, *Sat.* III.19), has now become surrounded by marble (*marmora*, *Sat.* III.20), and the grassy border (*marginem gramineo*, *Met.* III.162 / *viridi margine*, *Sat.* III.19) is no longer present. Juvenal's combination of direct quotation and paraphrase of Ovid's scene serves to immediately highlight the third satire's constant exploitation of witty comparison and subversive contrast between the mythological, epic past and the realistic, satiric present (as will be discussed at chapters seven, pp. 161-4, and eight, pp. 179-181).

In his seventh satire, Juvenal parodies the epic scene of the debate over the Arms of Achilles by re-enacting it as a rural court scene; it is actually two verbal reminiscences, *consedere duces* ("the judges sat down", VII.115 / *Met.* XIII.1) and *surgis* ("you rise", VII.115) / *surgit* ("he rises", *Met.* XIII.2) that show that it is in fact Ovid's version of the scene (*Met.* XIII.1ff.) that Juvenal is adapting here⁴⁰ (this re-enactment will be discussed in more detail at chapter seven, p. 170). The eleventh satire also sees a brief Ovidian phrase being utilised that creates a parallel between the satiric context and the relevant epic scene. In the satiric scene, hunger causes an emaciated family's possessions to be squandered, with the last possession to leave its owners being the family ring (*novissimus exit | anulus*.

³⁹ Both Scott (1927) 91 and Courtney (1980) 159 believe that Juvenal had Ovid's scene specifically in mind.

⁴⁰ Wilson (1903) 73, Hardy (1951) 194 and Courtney (1980) 364 all note that it is specifically Ovid's version of the legend that Juvenal is parodying here, as shown by these verbal pointers.

XI.42-3)⁴¹; in *Metamorphoses* II, as the day breaks on Phaethon and his father Apollo, the dawn only comes once Lucifer (the morning star) is last to leave the sky (*Lucifer... novissimus exit*, *Met.* II.115). This linguistic allusion between the two events cleverly suggests the wider parallel that disaster is approaching: just as earth was almost destroyed after Lucifer's withdrawal from the sky allowed Phaethon to recklessly ride Apollo's sun-chariot, so the impoverished family will face financial disaster after the loss of the ring, as its former owner is reduced to begging (*mendicat*, XI.43). Although the context of Ovid's lines has been somewhat deflated by both the new satiric context and the anticlimactic subject of the ring instead of Lucifer, Juvenal wittily elevates the poverty caused by a loss of family property to the 'end of the world' (which, to the victims, it metaphorically is!).

Juvenal's fourteenth and fifteenth satires each include brief phrases taken from *Metamorphoses* I, which, while not creating the same level of elaborate scenic parallels as the earlier verbal connections, nevertheless are exploited to clever effect. The first entry in a series of examples of parental instincts among animals in the fourteenth satire borrows Ovid's phrase *per devia rura* ("through pathless woods", XIV.75 / *Met.* I.675)⁴², describing how mother storks show their young how to catch lizards and snakes in the wild; the epic context describes Mercury's rod with which he shepherded goats through the wild. Both images become appropriate to Juvenal's wider satiric context, however, since innocent youths are just as easily shepherded and blindly educated by their corrupt parents without questioning their eventual destination - the simultaneous connection between mother storks (as well as the other animals described here), the shepherd-god Mercury, and corrupt parents is most deflating for the god. A similar connection between people and animals is made in the fifteenth satire, as the cannibalistic Egyptians are separated from the rest of humanity by the qualities which they share with simple animals: not only are both the animals and the Egyptians said to possess no soul (*animus*, XV.149), but they are both said to still "stare downcast at the ground" (*prona et terram spectantia*, XV.147). Juvenal has seemingly adapted this latter expression from Ovid's phrase *pronaque cum spectent animalia cetera terram* ("while the other animals [apart from man] stared downcast at the ground", *Met.* I.84)⁴³: the obvious implication from the context of the epic phrase is that, like these downward-looking beasts, the Egyptians are incapable of forming any true concept of the power of the heavens, unlike the rest of mankind (there may even be the hint of a joke, explaining in some way why the Egyptian deities were bestial in form).

⁴¹ Scott (1927) 63 points out another appearance of the phrase *novissimus exit* at *Met.* XI.296, again referring to Lucifer: although the wider context there (Daedalion's transformation into a hawk) does not seem appropriate to Juvenal's context, possibly Ovid had simply reused the phrase as an allusion to his earlier tale.

⁴² Scott (1927) 98 labels this phrase as an "epic 'verse tag'", unconsciously borrowed from Ovid by Juvenal.

⁴³ For Scott (1927) 94, the phrase is "obviously imitated" from the *Metamorphoses*; for Duff (1970) 447, it is merely "a reminiscence" of Ovid's work.

Lucan's *Bellum Civile*

Lucan's work is specifically referenced on only a handful of occasions by Juvenal, and the first quotation is a typically subversive moment of incongruous juxtaposition. In the second satire, the hypocritical and flamboyant effeminate Creticus is nevertheless complimented on his skills as a demagogue, an area in which he is said to be "fierce and unbeaten" (*acer et indomitus*, II.77 / BC I.146). While this phrase initially seems to be just a further example of an inappropriate military metaphor being used to describe one of the effeminate hypocrites (as Laronia had previously utilised in her speech – see chapter three, pp. 60-1), its further status as a description of Julius Caesar in the *Bellum Civile* adds the extra level of incongruous comparison between the epic hero's "ruthless violence"⁴⁴, and the apparently contradictory public face of the notorious effeminate and transvestite Creticus. The eighth satire also sees Juvenal adapting a phrase from Lucan's work for his own satiric ends: whereas in Lucan's work, Cato judged "the greatest sin" (*summa ... nefas*, BC II.286) to be the Civil War itself, Juvenal uses that same phrase (VIII.83)⁴⁵ to refer to the preference of life over honour (*animam praeferre pudori*, VIII.83), as exemplified by the committal of perjury in order to escape a death-threat (VIII.81). The phrase is therefore turned from a truly profound sentiment regarding war in the epic work into a superficially profound statement regarding honour in the satiric work, which actually refers to debased acts of crime and cowardice.

Juvenal also quotes from Lucan's epic work twice in his tenth satire, during his satirical attack on contemporary ambition; in both of these cases, Juvenal's satiric context actually concerns his epic exempla of the cost of such ambition, Alexander the Great and Hannibal, and so the imagery from the *Bellum Civile* is not intentionally deflated by its new associations. Initially, Juvenal maintains that "the world is not enough" (*non sufficit orbis*, X.168) for ambitious power-mongers such as these historical military leaders, which leads into accounts of their eventual powerless demises; Lucan's context for this phrase was in Caesar's inspirational speech towards his cowardly soldiers (BC V.356), and so this allusion simply acts as an embellishment of the original epic examples, since Caesar's ambition also led to an untimely demise⁴⁶. Juvenal goes on to paraphrase the idea in the following lines with a further image adopted from Lucan's work, as he portrays Alexander "blazing in the narrow confines of the world" (*aestuat ... angusto limite mundi*, X.169); the proximity of *aestuat* to *angusta* may be intended to echo Lucan's depiction of the "civil fury blazing on the narrow shore" (*aestuat angusta rabies civilis harena*, BC VI.63)⁴⁷.

⁴⁴ Rudd (1986) 110; Scott (1927) 97 also notes the metrical echo of the words at the beginning of the lines.

⁴⁵ Scott (1927) 97 briefly mentions this reference among several other, less convincing parallels with Lucan.

⁴⁶ Scott (1927) 98 only allows that this "may be a reference to Lucan".

⁴⁷ Scott (1927) 51 actually considers there to be an element of deflation here, from the description for an elevated abstract being applied to a man (however elevated the man in question might have actually been).

which would therefore pass a suitably negative judgement on Alexander's ambitious designs by their hostile association with the Civil War.

Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*

The generic assignation of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* has, like Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, also already been briefly discussed (see chapter one, p. 7); admittedly, there only seem to be three clear satiric references to Lucretius' didactic epic work (all occurring in Juvenal's satires), and hence, even if Lucretius is not a typical epicist, the allusions mentioned here do at least prove that Juvenal was creating a wider literary subtext in his satires. The first apparent Lucretian reference comes in Juvenal's description of the Golden Age at the beginning of the sixth satire: the satirist points out the newness of not only mankind's existence, but also the world and heaven (*orbe novo caeloque recenti*, VI.11); Juvenal's adaptation of Lucretius' identical point *tellure novo caeloque recenti* (*DRN* V.907) therefore adds an appropriate level of didactic grandeur to the Golden Age⁴⁸. The remaining two Lucretian references in the thirteenth satire also apply a level of grandeur to their satiric contexts which, similarly, does not then translate back into a simultaneous deflation of the epic lines: the minor elevation is sufficient justification here for the allusions to Lucretius' work. First, Juvenal exemplifies the old-fashioned values of his friend by mentioning that Calvinus has beseeched both "men and gods" (*hominum divomque*, XIII.31) to help in the maintenance of a trust; while the juxtaposition of man and god is common elsewhere, it is specifically the combination of the two genitive plural forms (the latter of which appears rather archaic) that creates the impression that Juvenal may have been influenced by Lucretius' use of the identical phrase right at the beginning of his didactic work at *DRN* I.1 (and indeed again later at *DRN* VI.94)⁴⁹, perhaps with an intention of backing up Calvinus' old-fashioned ideals. Juvenal then goes on to suggest that Calvinus' desire for punishment and revenge against criminals might already be taking place in the form of a guilty conscience (*diri conscia facti*, XIII.193) which is persecuting the criminals with self-flagellation (*flagellum*, XIII.195); this seems a more obvious adaptation of a Lucretian idea, since the similar phrase *sibi conscia factis* (*DRN* III.1018) occurs in close proximity to *flagellis* (*DRN* III.1019) during his own earlier ruminations on the subject of guilty consciences, and so Juvenal's point is raised to a grander, more philosophical level by the exploitation of the words⁵⁰.

⁴⁸ Duff (1970) 204 notes this minor borrowing from Lucretius.

⁴⁹ Scott (1927) 62 sees the phrase as "more clearly epic in tone", although her connections with Virgil are not very convincing; Ferguson (1979) 296 certainly considers the phrase to be an instance of "epic parody".

⁵⁰ Scott (1927) 95 includes this reference among a list of less convincing parallels to Lucretius.

Non-Epic Quotations

I noted in my opening chapter that the various moments of exploitation of non-epic genres by the satirists would be largely ignored, unless they occurred within sufficient proximity to a moment of epic exploitation to have a noticeable effect on the tone or mood of the passage (see chapter one, p. 13). However, this chapter provides an interesting opportunity to bring in several non-epic genres, since there do exist within a handful of the satires five phrases that are quite clearly quotations derived from specific non-epic works; these quotations then become particularly relevant to this thesis, as they all seem to possess a loose connection to different areas of epic exploitation, even though the source of the words is not in itself from the epic genre – whether the satirists have chosen to quote from within their own satiric genre itself, or from the pastoral or elegiac poetry genres, or even from a tragic play, in each case either the satiric context into which these quotations have been placed, or indeed the content of the lines themselves, seems to possess an element of epic exploitation of the types that have already been discussed in this thesis.

Persius introduces his programmatic first satire with a self-referential quotation from the beginning of Lucilius' own satires⁵¹: *o curas hominum! o quantum est in rebus inane!* ("O the vanity of mankind! O how empty their concerns!", Persius *Satires* I.1 / Lucilius *Satires* 2W / 9M). This elevated opening (discussed, with regard to Lucilius, at chapter three, p. 33) is immediately turned over, however, by an interlocutor's questions as to what kind of person would want to read such material (*quis leget haec?*, I.2); Persius cleverly appears to mock not only the satiric genre in itself, but also its apparent attempts at pretentious self-aggrandisement. Juvenal's one obvious non-epic quotation comes in his ninth satire on a homosexual gigolo, and is taken from the pastoral genre: the lament *o Corydon, Corydon* (IX.102 / *Eclogues* II.69) originally appeared in Virgil's rustic poem which dealt with the homosexual love between the shepherds Corydon and Alexis in elevated terms⁵². In satire, however, the line's meaning becomes slightly twisted, so that the homosexual lovers in the countryside have been caustically replaced by the city's contemporary, depraved practitioners of base carnal acts – any innocent and rural aspects that the line may have possessed (as well as any residual grandeur from Virgil's own allusive mythological intentions) are hence displaced by ironic sarcasm instead⁵³.

⁵¹ Barr (1987) 67, Harvey (1981) 14, and Zetzel (1977) 41 all suggest that the similarity of Lucretius' and Lucilius' names, as well as the Lucretian phrase *in rebus inane* (e.g. *DRN* I.330, I.399, I.569, etc.), might cast a shadow over this identification (from a scholiast's note on Persius referring to Lucilius); if the original line was in fact Lucretian, Persius' Stoicism would then be ironically juxtaposed with Lucretius' Epicureanism.

⁵² Clausen (1994) 61-3 notes the mythological (and heterosexual) models that Virgil must have used for this poem's depiction of grand (homosexual) love.

⁵³ Courtney (1980) 438 explains that "the sordid reality [of Juvenal's satiric context] contrasts with the stylised homosexuality of Virgil's milieu"; and Hightet (1954) 118 simply calls this parody (among others) "brilliant". Friedlander (cited at Martyn (1969) 46) actually includes this pastoral line in a list of the "familiar epic verses" which Juvenal utilises elsewhere.

It is the Menippean satire sub-genre, however, where literary quotation is highly prevalent, and so it should not come as a surprise that Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* features three non-epic quotations that (also unsurprisingly) are used in order to maintain the mockery of Claudius upon which the work relies. The first such quotation is also derived from Virgil's non-epic works (specifically, the *Georgics*), with a new context once it is placed into the satiric realm: as Mercury expresses his wish for Claudius' life to be ended by the three Fates, he asks them that Claudius "be killed, so that a better man may rule in his empty palace" (*dede neci, melior vacua sine regent in aula, Apocolocyntosis III.2 / Georgics IV.90*). The application of Virgil's advice for beekeepers to the fate of the Emperor not only belittles Claudius by making his Imperial illness analogous to that of a weak *queen* bee, but also paves the way for the pro-Neronian hexameters of the following section (see chapter three, p. 66). Seneca's mockery of Claudius' life and death is then extended by an apparent tragic quotation: *χαίρουτας, εὐφημοῦντας ἐκπέμπειν δόμων* ("take him from the house with cries of joy and good-speaking", IV.2 / Euripides' *Cresphontes*)⁵⁴. Seneca fuses the ideas of being joyful that the victim's suffering has finally ended, and of just being joyful that Claudius is dead, a blunt and unapologetic attack on Claudius' brutal reign. Seneca also ironically quotes from the genre of lyric poetry in order to mock Claudius: the scene is shifted from the heavenly debate on the Emperor's fate down to the Underworld, "from where they say that nobody returns" (*unde negant redire quemquam, XI.6 / Catullus III.12*)⁵⁵. Claudius is directly mocked during this transition passage by the fact that Mercury has to drag (*trahit, XI.6*) the reluctant 'hero' along the path; the quotation acts to further ridicule Claudius by making him humorously analogous to Lesbia's dead pet sparrow, whose own descent into the Underworld was the topic of Catullus' poem.

⁵⁴ Both Roth (1988) 23 and Eden (1984) 80 suggest that the context has been altered from Euripides' expression of joy that a person's suffering has ended, to joy that everyone else's suffering has ended here!

⁵⁵ Coffey (1976) 263 briefly points out this reference in a footnote on the practice of literary quotation in the Menippean satire sub-genre (see p. 138 above); Eden (1984) 127 points out that, since the manuscripts differ here, *unde* may in fact refer to heaven (*caelo, XI.6*), and hence Seneca is misapplying the quotation in order to make the joke that Claudius has managed to be kicked out by the gods.

Chapter 7 – Epic Scenes

Occasionally, the satirists appear to be making a direct analogy between their satiric context and a specific moment from an epic poem: the grand scene in question is actually re-enacted in the ‘reality’ of the satiric realm, and so parodic humour is provided by the typical juxtaposition of the elevated references and the stock satiric lowlife characters who are re-enacting them. This chapter will differ slightly from my earlier discussions on general epic motifs and general mythological and historical characters, because in the instances cited here it is more obvious that each satirist has a specific version of the epic myth in question, whether it is Homer’s, Virgil’s or Ovid’s accounts. There are also a handful of occasions where the satirists seem to have created their own versions of familiar epic scenes, starting from its depiction by one of the aforementioned epicists, but then twisting the details of the story into a parody that suits their satiric point. The fact that it is mainly Homer and Virgil whose epic works are exploited in this way (with only two clear Ovidian links appearing in Juvenal’s satires) shows that these pre-eminent literary works were clearly well-known to both the satirists and their anticipated audiences; of course, we should not ignore the fact that many of these mythological incidents would have been very prolific in other artistic realms (pottery, sculpture, painting, etc.), and the satirists (and maybe even the epicists themselves) could have used such media as their source material.

The *Iliad*

Since the events of the *Iliad* precede those of the *Odyssey*, it is an easy assumption that the order of their composition by Homer was the same - in this case, the opening scene of the *Iliad* (Achilles abandoning the Trojan War so that he can brood on the beach, moping over the loss of his lover Briseis) would be the earliest epic scene that could be exploited by later writers. Petronius does exploit the scene in his *Satyricon*, displaying his typical incongruity of lowly ‘heroes’ whose epic intentions fall flat when they attempt to recreate an earlier hero’s actions (a recurring motif in the *Satyricon*, as we shall see at chapter eight, pp. 184-6). In this case, Encolpius imitates Achilles by brooding on the shore (*proximum litori maestus conduxit*, 81.1) when his own lover, Giton, has been seduced by Ascyrtos. The juxtaposition of this lowly homosexual bickering within a grander epic context deflates the allusion somewhat, although Encolpius himself would ironically view the epic re-enactment as elevating his own supposed heroism¹.

¹ Walsh (1968) 211 elaborates that Encolpius is “a comic Achilles” in this scene.

Although Petronius was the first satirist to adapt this first epic scene, he was, of course, not the first satirist to adapt *any* epic scene: we have already seen in chapter six (pp. 135-6) how both Lucilius and Horace had made a specific verbal reference to a later scene in the *Iliad*, as Apollo re-enacted his rescue of Hector from Achilles by removing the lesser threat of the pestering satiric buffoons. The duel between Hector and Achilles was also exploited in the seventh satire of Horace's first book, as a grand comparison for the poem's quarrelling litigants (see chapter five, p. 123); the comparison is then backed up by a reference to an earlier conflict in *Iliad* VI. The descriptions of the two satiric opponents, Rupilius and Persius, had already shown that they were somewhat mismatched in terms of social status: Horace's second heroic image is therefore of an equally mismatched (*disparibus*, i.VII.16) epic contest, between the Greek hero Diomedes (whose nationality and strength equate him with Persius) and the Trojan warrior Glaucus (whose supposed inferiority associates him with the lowly Rupilius)². Ironically, this epic conflict was actually short-lived, since the heroes' families were closely linked, and so rather than fight they merely traded armour (*Il.* VI.119ff.). Horace alludes to this event by opining that the lesser man (*pigrrior*, i.VII.17 - i.e. Glaucus) left the battlefield after doling out gifts to his former opponent (*muneribus missis*, i.VII.18): the grand allusion is therefore brought into closer, deflating connection with the satiric context, as Rupilius would have been better off if he had followed Glaucus' example by accepting fault and paying the appropriate price. The most mocking aspect of these two epic comparisons, however, is the final anticlimactic comparison of the litigants with a pair of lowly gladiators (i.VII.19ff. - see chapter three, p. 58), which utterly deflates the preceding, contextually 'lesser' epic heroes.

Juvenal directly evokes reminiscences of the *Iliad* in three of his satires, as we find Homeric scenes being ironically re-enacted in contemporary society. In his programmatic first satire, Juvenal's catalogue of debauched activities includes the petty act of a young soldier trying to impress his girlfriend, who is standing nearby wearing his cloak (*lacernatae ... amicae*, I.62), with his skills as a charioteer: Juvenal's epic allusion here is in his elevated identification of this speeder as Automedon (I.61) - while the name had probably become proverbial for a charioteer, his connection with this childish act of excessive testosterone deflates his epic role³. The third satire features two scenes evidently borrowed from the *Iliad* - these connections intensify the link between Juvenal's socially

² Although Buchheit (1968) 549 mistakenly mentions Pandarus when he means Glaucus, his observation that "ist Diomedes hier von Horaz auf den Griechen Persius zu beziehen, so muß konsequenterweise der Latiner Rupilius mit Pandaros parallelisiert werden" nevertheless shows that, in both literal theme and metaphorical imagery, this satire is about the conflict between Greeks and Romans / Trojans.

³ Braund (1996) 90 notes Automedon's specific appearance as Achilles' charioteer in *Iliad* IX.

collapsing Rome and the literal fall of Troy, adding an Homeric flavour to the predominantly Virgilian allusions of this satire (see below, pp. 161-4). The first such scene shows the ignorant family of a recently-deceased man as they carry out their usual daily chores (III.261ff.) – Homer had already utilised such a device after Hector’s demise at *Il.* XXII.440ff., switching the scene to the needlework and bath preparations of the hero’s wife Andromache⁴. A related scene occurs a few lines later, as a Roman thug acts out “the night of Achilles” (*noctem ... | Pelidae*, III.279-80): the subsequent translation of a line from *Iliad* XXIV (see chapter six, p. 137) shows that the night in question is Achilles’ sleepless tossing and turning over the death of his friend Patroclus. The reasons for this thug’s epic grief serve to deflate the comparison: not only is he drunk (*ebrius*, III.278), which is a more likely cause for insomnia, but the epic reason of Patroclus’ death is then twisted into the lack of death in a stranger, because the thug has not managed to mug anybody⁵. Juvenal’s thirteenth satire also features a final re-enactment of a scene from the *Iliad*, although it is only the adjective *Homericus* (XIII.113) that points the audience in the right direction for the epic source of the satiric scene. The contemporary situation finds Calvinus shouting various protests about a theft and act of dishonour which he has suffered: the volume of this reaction is then likened to the shouts of Homer’s Mars (*quantum Gradivus Homericus*, XIII.113)⁶. Juvenal’s explicit reference to a Homeric scene in which Mars reacts in such a way must refer to the god’s loud battle cries at *Il.* V.859ff., the comparison thus serving to exaggerate Calvinus’ sense of betrayal to the extent of divine warmongering⁷: however, Calvinus’ immediately preceding comparison to a mime (*mimum*, XIII.110), where one might more readily expect to see a man suffering an injustice, establishes a further juxtaposition between the epic heights and farcical depths that Calvinus’ anger has reached.

The *Odyssey*

Homer’s *Odyssey* is more regularly exploited by the satirists, if only because the epic’s plot offered more variety than the *Iliad*’s interminable battles and skirmishes. The scenes set in the Underworld in *Odyssey* XI appear to have particularly interested Horace, since he references them in two different satires. The eighth satire of Horace’s first book features two witches, Canidia (a recurring character in Horace’s *Satires* and *Epodes*) and

⁴ This connection is made by Duff (1970) 157-8, Estevez (1996) 288, and Braund (1996) 219, among others.

⁵ Braund (1989) 36 considers this mock-epic parallel “to emphasise the sordidness of the situation - because the thug is so utterly unheroic, so very different from the great Achilles”; Pearson & Strong (1892) 59 also explain that “the *grassator* who has not killed somebody in a street-brawl can’t sleep for remorse”.

⁶ While Mars’ epithet *Gradivus* can also be found in epic (at *Aen.* III.35 and X.542, and *Met.* VI.427), it is not a purely epic name (occurring, for example, at Livy I.20.4 and Ovid *Fasti* V.556).

⁷ Courtney (1980) 549 further notes that the shouts of Stentor (XIII.112) also featured nearby at *Il.* V.785-6.

Sagana, attempting to raise the dead in a former cemetery; the satiric scenes of necromancy bear close resemblance to their epic predecessors at *Od.* XI.36ff. Initially, these similarities are twisted slightly, as the imagery is misapplied in order to make the witches appear more frightening: they are pictured as howling (*ululantem*, i.VIII.25), whereas it was the spirits of the dead who wailed at *Od.* XI.43; and the hags had also been afflicted with a natural pallor that “made both of them terrible to behold” (*pallor utrasque | fecerat horrendas aspectu*, i.VIII.25-6), a subversion of Odysseus’ own paleness upon beholding the congregation of spirits at *Od.* XI.43. The subsequent depiction of the necromantic rites themselves exploits the epic version more closely: a short trench is first scraped in the ground (i.VIII.26 / *Od.* XI.25); a lamb is then ritually sacrificed (i.VIII.27 / *Od.* XI.35), and its blood poured into the ditch (i.VIII.28 / *Od.* XI.36); the end result of these rites is then the resurrection of the spirits of the dead (i.VIII.29ff. / *Od.* XI.37ff.), who produce a sharp, mournful sound (i.VIII.41 / *Od.* XI.43)⁸. Horace’s exploitation of Homer’s depiction of these magical rites creates a more elevated mood from which the satiric scene can then fall: the Priapus-scarecrow’s fart (*pepedi*, i.VIII.46) serves to deflate not only the god’s bowel (literally), but also (metaphorically) the grand and sinister atmosphere which Horace had gradually built up over the course of the satire (see chapter five, pp. 106-7).

The epic necromantic scene is immediately followed by a conversation between Odysseus and the summoned ghost of the blind seer Teiresias regarding the heroic traveller’s route home (*Od.* XI.90ff.); Horace adapts this scene for his own satiric purposes in the fifth satire of his second book. While the basic framework of Horace’s scene retains its epic context (Teiresias offering advice to Odysseus in the Underworld), the satirist twists the actual topic of discussion into a more appropriately satiric subject, namely legacy-hunting. While it may therefore appear to be Teiresias who is initially subverted by his lowly knowledge, Odysseus was the actual instigator: whereas in the *Odyssey*, the hero had asked the seer when he would make his homecoming to his wife (*Od.* XI.100), his satiric concerns are more realistic, as he asks how he can regain the wealth which he has lost during his exploits (*quibus amissas reparare queam res | artibus atque modis*, ii.V.2-3). Horace’s new question for the Greek hero hence brings the stoically self-restrained Odysseus into the contemporary world as just another money-grabbing lowlife, and Teiresias’ debased advice of inheritance-seeking and money-grabbing is appropriate to this new aspect of the epic character⁹. While this kind of extensive parody of Homer’s work

⁸ Brown (1995) 172 notes these elements of “parody or travesty of the famous scene”.

⁹ McGann (1973) 81-2 remarks that the original epic scene “could scarcely be more remote” from the theme of legacy-hunting; Braund (1992) 23 opines that “the debunking of Homer’s characters by their portrayal as cynical and mercenary makes the poem high in entertainment value but low on advice”.

was not necessarily original¹⁰, Horace does at least make the innovation of using these ancient Greek characters to criticise an anachronistic *Roman* practice: this level of contextual juxtaposition is then intensified several times throughout the satire. Odysseus' typical description as "cunning" (*doloso*, ii.V.3)¹¹ ironically shows that the Greek hero already possessed an apparent natural aptitude for the tasks of legacy-hunting and sycophantic fawning to wealthier men. His initial reluctance to accept this fact, because he has become used to dealing on even terms with his enemies at Troy (*haud ita Troiae | me gessi certans semper melioribus*, ii.V.18-9), is swiftly swayed by Teiresias' blunt retort that he will therefore remain poor (*ergo | pauper eris*, ii.V.19-20), again highlighting Odysseus' mercenary instincts over his earlier grandeur. The epic imagery evoked by Odysseus' self-assertion that he has tolerated greater adversity in the past (*et quondam maiora tuli*, ii.V.21) is the hero's argument with his heart (*Od. XX.18ff.*), although his present adversity of sycophancy is a subtle twist on the equivalent epic toils of dealing with Polyphemus and then remaining incognito in the presence of his wife and her suitors (see chapter six, p. 136). Teiresias' prophetic abilities are ironically exploited when he apparently predicts a scandalous event at Rome from Horace's era involving the legacy-hunter Nasica (ii.V.55ff.), since these events are both obscure (possibly not just to the modern reader) and from the real Roman world (rather than the mythical Greek realm). After more discussion on the satiric subject of legacy-hunting, the 'reality' of the Homeric scene is then reintroduced in the satire's concluding lines, as Teiresias claims that "powerful Proserpina is dragging [him] away" (*sed me | imperiosa trahit Proserpina*, ii.V.109-10). Although the role of Proserpina (or her Greek equivalent, Persephone) in the Underworld was akin to that of Mercury / Hermes in Heaven, as an escort for souls to and from Hades¹², Homer did not actually utilise the character in order to send Teiresias back to the Underworld at *Od. XI.150*, a final twist therefore in Horace's own rendition of the epic scene.

Juvenal's major satiric exploitation of a scene from the *Odyssey* comes in his fifteenth satire on cannibalism. The scene is set as in *Odyssey IX*, as Odysseus tells the story of his voyage at Alcinous' banquet (XV.13-5): the king is rightly astounded (*attonito*, XV.13) by the mention of cannibalism (*carnibus humanis uesci licet*, XV.13)¹³, but the reaction from other quarters is not so naive. Juvenal diverts from the original epic course of

¹⁰ Coffey (1976) 86 notes that "Hellenistic sillographers ... parodied Homeric scenes" as a means of mockery.

¹¹ Muecke (1993) 180 points out the word's recollection of "the Homeric designations of Odysseus as *poikilomêtês*, 'full of wiles'", citing *Od. III.163* and *V.203* as examples of this epithet.

¹² Muecke (1993) 193 cites *Od. XI.225ff.* and *XI.385ff.* as later examples of the role of Persephone / Proserpina as chaperone of the dead.

¹³ Fredericks (1976) 178 equates Alcinous' shock with that of Juvenal's contemporary audience; Anderson (1987) 206 mocks his horror, since the Phaeacians and the Cyclopeans were actually neighbours (*Od. VI.4*).

the scene here by bringing in a critic whose laughter (*risum*, XV.15) is caused by his complete disbelief in the lies (*mendax*, XV.16) which Odysseus has just told¹⁴: this opponent's criticisms of the earlier stories of the *Odyssey* now bring in much mockery at the epic's expense. The man wishes that Odysseus be thrown back into the sea, to suffer the ferocity of the real Charybdis (*saeva dignum veraque Charybdi*, XV.17) - *vera* is the first sign that it is not just the tales of the cannibalistic *Laestrygonas et Cyclopes* (XV.18) which he doesn't believe, but most of Odysseus' other stories too¹⁵. These cannibals are certainly considered to be the most incredible part of Odysseus' narrative, but also considered unlikely are the Scylla (XV.19), the clashing Cyanean rocks (XV.19-20), and Circe's metamorphosis of Elpenor and the rest of Odysseus' crew into pigs (XV.21)¹⁶, not forgetting the idea of a bag somehow containing all of the winds (*tempestatibus utres*, XV.20). Juvenal adds his own valid comments here which serve to further deflate the epic scene: first, this critic is still sober (*nondum ebrius*, XV.24), implying that the rest of the audience accepted Odysseus' after-dinner tales out of mere drunkenness¹⁷; and second, Odysseus was washed up alone (*solus*, XV.26), and so there were no witnesses to verify his stories. While these elements of the epic tale are all suitably deflated as unbelievable (note that Homer's credibility seems to have been a satiric motif - see chapters two, pp. 21-2 and p. 27, and five, pp. 111-2 and pp. 117-8), Juvenal's main point here is that the cannibalistic episodes of Odysseus' tales are the most incredible and unrealistic aspects, an amusing subversion of expectations given cannibalism's subsequent realistic treatment in this satire¹⁸. However, by dismissing these epic presentations of cannibalism as the most ridiculous lies of the notoriously devious Odysseus' tall tales, Juvenal is therefore clearing the way for the shocking facts and reality of his own true story on the Egyptian cannibals¹⁹.

¹⁴ Anderson (1987) 206 calls Juvenal's critic "an impatient, too sober sceptic"; Courtney (1980) 596 notes that earlier commentators (such as Lycophon and Lucian) had also considered Odysseus' tales here a fantasy.

¹⁵ Duff (1970) 437 differentiates between the truth, and "the fictitious Charybdis" that Odysseus mentioned at *Od.* XII.101ff.; Courtney (1980) 596-7 explains that "the speaker does not believe in Scylla and Charybdis ... but they are at least more plausible than the cannibal episodes".

¹⁶ Ferguson (1979) 317-8 notes that these threats were considered the stock perils of epic journeys by Juvenal's time (although Homer probably originated them), and so the speaker's incredulity may in part be anachronistic; although Courtney (1980) 597 notes that Elpenor was not specifically named during Homer's account of Circe's transformations, Pearson & Strong (1892) 309 had already pointed out that Elpenor was present on Circe's island of Aea, and so his transformation can be sensibly inferred by an attentive listener.

¹⁷ Smith (1989a) 819 pre-empted Juvenal's eventual point that "cannibalism today is a sober reality ... not an after-dinner tale".

¹⁸ Singleton (1983) 202 notes that Juvenal seems to be ironically making "an invitation to scepticism"; but McKim (1986) 61 is probably closer in his suggestion that "Juvenal provokes in his readers the reflection that cannibalism may not be so incredible after all".

¹⁹ This vital difference is set out well by Ferguson (1979) 322: "[Juvenal] wants to present the crimes as a unique barbarity: it does not help to say that gods or heroes have also perpetrated it"; however, Fredericks (1976) 179 suggests that Juvenal's point is simply to highlight the differing presentations of cannibalism in literature, whether in its fantastical aspect as in the epic scenes, or in the purported documentary aspect as Juvenal intends here.

The majority of the satiric re-enactments of scenes from the *Odyssey* come in the *Satyricon*: these parodic scenes differ somewhat from Petronius' aforementioned re-enactment of part of the *Iliad*. Whereas in that case the epic allusion was implied, the connections with the *Odyssey* are actually stated explicitly by Encolpius. These recurring, blatant pointers to epic moments indicate both that the plot of the *Satyricon* could be viewed as a broad parody of the *Odyssey*, and that Encolpius himself wishes his adventures to be viewed in inappropriately heroic terms (see chapter eight, pp. 184-6). The majority of these direct Odyssean references occur in the latter half of the *Satyricon*: the first comes during a further argument between the homosexual triumvirate of Encolpius, Giton and Ascyltos. Giton is forced to hide under a bed (*grabatum subiret*, 97.4) when the jealous Ascyltos bursts in on the reconciled lovers: Encolpius ironically labels Giton as *Ulixes* (97.4), specifically alluding to the hero's escape from the blinded Polyphemus in *Odyssey* IX by hiding himself under a ram's skin (*pro arieti*, 97.4). The substitution of a bed for a ram, a cowering slave-boy for a cunning hero, and an enraged and jealous homosexual for a raging monster is enough to deflate the epic scene; Giton manages to lower the tone even further when the dust under the bed causes him to sneeze (three times - *ter*, 98.4 - an elevated failure!), therefore allowing Ascyltos to find his *Ulixem* (98.5), and hence altering the original epic outcome²⁰. An equally deflating epic allusion occurs during a voyage on the ship of Encolpius' enemy Lichas - while Lichas is twice equated with Polyphemus because of this enmity with our 'hero' (see chapter five, p. 122), his *quasi*-epic role is actually a different Odyssean character. Lichas' discovery of the true identity of his stowaways by recognising a unique feature of Encolpius is explicitly turned into the scene at *Od.* XIX.467ff., where Odysseus' nurse (*Ulixis nutricem*, 105.11) recognises her former charge because of a tell-tale scar. There is a perverse subversion of the epic scene, however, since it is not a scar (*cicatricem*, 105.11) that gives away Encolpius' identity but rather his genitals (*inguina*, 105.10)²¹ - we cannot be sure why Lichas was familiar with Encolpius' genitals, although it might have involved Lichas' wife Hedyle (113.3) as an earlier conquest of Encolpius. The phallic humour of the scene not only acts as a deflation of Encolpius' self-delusions of epic heroism, but also intensifies the appropriateness for the phallic god Priapus to be Encolpius' divine foil (see chapter eight, pp. 185-6).

²⁰ Cameron (1970) 400 notes that "the comparison is made explicit at 97.5 and 98.5"; Connors (1998) 38 is wise to note that "to recognise the particular character who plays the Odysseus role can add a certain literary subtlety to what are otherwise broadly comic scenes".

²¹ Cameron (1970) 400 discusses this 'epic' scene in more detail; McDermott (1983) 83 points out Petronius' typical telegraphing whereby "the appropriate hero's name (usually Odysseus / Ulysses) is mentioned too".

Perhaps the most elaborate of Petronius' Odyssean re-enactments, however, is Encolpius' subsequent affair with a woman named Circe (125ff.). The name itself is an obvious reminder of the witch who acted as Odysseus' foe in *Odyssey* X; however, the satiric circumstances provide further connections with Homer's tale. Having been washed ashore on Croton after a shipwreck (caused by the storm discussed at chapter four, pp. 86-8)²², Encolpius seems to adopt the pseudonym Polyaeus (126.1): this name was an epithet of Odysseus (meaning "much-praised") around the time of his encounter with the witch Circe²³, and hence Encolpius increases his delusions of epic heroism by assuming the name. The satiric character Circe also seems to have an epic self-awareness: while she specifically denies a similar epic heritage as "the daughter of the sun" (*Solis progenies*, 127.6), she does intend to follow her Homeric namesake by indulging in a romance with 'Polyaeus' (*Polyaenon Circe amat*, 127.7), since the two names seem fated to be connected in such a way forever²⁴. There may be a more subtle connection to the myth later, as Encolpius cannot consummate their affair due to his impotence: Circe's main act in *Odyssey* X was the metamorphosis of members of Odysseus' crew into pigs, but now her namesake seems to have transformed Encolpius too²⁵. Of course, the more likely reason for Encolpius' impotence is the wrath of Priapus (see chapter eight, pp. 185-6), but Circe's part here (in that Encolpius is only impotent with her) should not be altogether ignored.

The *Aeneid*

The later satirists parody several scenes from Virgil's *Aeneid*; Juvenal's third satire, however, impressively exploits several scenes from *Aeneid* II, in conjunction with further reminiscences of Homer (see p. 156 above), Ovid (see chapter six, pp. 147-8), and the Underworld of *Aeneid* VI (see chapter four, p. 77). The purpose of the references to *Aeneid* II seems to be the connection of the 'falling city': while Troy was falling literally under the assault of the Greeks, Juvenal's version of Rome is falling in a moral sense, mainly due to the influx of Greek immigrants. While the differing levels of analogy between *Aeneid* II and the third satire range from the obvious to the conjectural, in each case the actual epic scene in question is not being specifically mocked by its satiric re-enactment: rather, Juvenal is creating a grand metaphor that contrasts the nobility of the epic past with the

²² Both Zeitlin (1971) 67-8 and Walsh (1968) 211 establish a further epic connection here, as Aeneas' own shipwreck off the coast of Carthage in *Aeneid* I led to his affair with Dido.

²³ Cameron (1970) 400, McDermott (1983) 83 and Walsh (1968) 211 all discuss the name Polyaeus.

²⁴ Connors (1998) 40 notes the "precisely Homeric terms of reference" which Circe uses "to distinguish herself from her Homeric model".

²⁵ McDermott (1983) 83 suggests this interpretation: "Odysseus' men are turned into animals; Encolpius too is 'unmanned', but farcically so".

immorality of the degraded present (the subsequent nature of the narrator Umbricius' 'heroic' role in this satire will be discussed at chapter eight, pp. 179-81).

Juvenal's initial allusion to *Aeneid* II actually comes from the end of Troy's demise, since he was not making a chronological comparison between the epic and satiric events. Juvenal meets with his friend Umbricius, who is leaving Rome, at an abandoned temple to Egeria²⁶ (III.25 - see chapter six, p. 148, on this temple's Ovidian depiction): Aeneas' last meeting in Troy (with his fellow Trojan refugees at *Aen.* II.713-4) was also at an abandoned temple (formerly dedicated to Ceres)²⁷. As Umbricius' reasons for his self-imposed exile are revealed in his subsequent tirade, and his racist views on Greek immigrants become apparent, we find a further scene from the Trojan war being re-enacted in contemporary Rome, as Umbricius angrily points out how even supposedly humble rural Romans (*rusticus*, III.67) are degrading themselves by wearing specifically Greek items, such as slippers (*trechedipna*, III.67), lotions (*ceromatico*, III.68) and medals (*niceteria*, III.68). These Romans have become morally weakened by their adoption of a Greek guise; the few Trojans who had similarly disguised themselves in the Greek garb and armour of a slain patrol (*Aen.* II.370-430) were eventually killed, but only after wreaking a small amount of havoc²⁸. The exact nature of the analogy has therefore been inverted here: while the disguised Trojans caused a brief hiatus in their destruction, these 'Greekised' Romans have actually hastened their own (moral) demise.

Umbricius' later anti-Greek remarks create some specific racial stereotypes: two of these traits seem to be particularly applicable to two of the key Greek figures in *Aeneid* II. Umbricius' first concern is the innate guile that the Greeks seem to possess: he sneers at their self-professed 'assets' of quick wits, desperate audacity and glib tongues (*ingenium velox, audacia perdita, sermo | promptus*, III.73-4). This description could easily apply to the famously cunning Greek epic hero Odysseus (see footnote 11 above) - and his most deceitful act was undoubtedly leading the soldiers inside the Trojan Horse at *Aen.* II.261. Umbricius' second, related worry is his bigoted generalisation of the Greek people as "a nation of comic actors" (*natio comoeda est*, III.100): this fraudulent trait does not just apply to the stage, of course, since a typical Greek can be seen in everyday situations to exaggerate and create every emotion from laughter to sadness, supposedly even to the extent that he can sweat on command (III.100-3)! The other key act of deceit in *Aeneid* II

²⁶ Gifford (1992) 22 identifies Egeria as "one of the Camenae (water-nymphs), who after the third century BC were identified with the Muses" (see chapter four, pp. 85-6, on Juvenal's further exploitation of the Muses, and chapter five, p. 112, on Egeria's subversive appearance in one of Horace's satires).

²⁷ Estevez (1996) 291-2 plays up this connection, and refers to an earlier article by Fredericks (in *Classical Bulletin* 49 (1972)) as a source.

²⁸ Estevez (1996) 290 again suggests this connection.

comes courtesy of Sinon - his ruse for duping the Trojans into letting the Horse into the city was essentially an over-the-top piece of acting (*Aen.* II.69ff.)²⁹.

The satire's most blatant analogy to *Aeneid* II, and the link that then points us in the direction of the other Virgilian connections (see chapter six, p. 142), is Ucalegon's (III.199) re-enactment of his epic appearance during a fire (*Aen.* II.312). It is important to note that Ucalegon's name only ever appears at these two points, and in both cases he is the helpless victim of a fire³⁰ - even if the other allusions between Troy's fall and Rome's decline did not exist, this scene would be enough to hint at Juvenal's intentions. The immediate effects of this fire on another poor victim, Cordus, seem to offer up a subtle difference between this literal act of destruction in Rome's otherwise metaphorical ruin, and Troy's devastated remains. Umbricius laments how Cordus had nothing to begin with and has lost even that (*nil habuit Cordus*, III.208): his scanty belongings are catalogued over a few lines as having included a small bed (*lectus ... minor*, III.203), six pots (*urceoli sex*, III.203), a wee mug (*parvulus ... | cantharus*, III.204-5), and some rodent-gnawed books of poetry (*rodebant carmina mures*, III.207). Cordus' meagre losses are in stark apposition to Virgil's catalogue of Trojan treasures (*Troia gaza*, *Aen.* II.763), including tables of the Gods, solid-gold dishes and stolen garments (*mensaeque deorum | crateresque auro solidi captivaque vestis*, *Aen.* II.764-5), which have survived the war's destruction, and are being plundered by the Greeks. Luxurious treasures of this kind *are* present in Juvenal's Rome, however: the naked marble statues (*nuda et candida signa*, III.216) and silver chests (*modium argenti*, III.220) that belong to a hypothetical rich man could, ironically, be more easily replaced in this debauched and elitist Rome than Cordus' paltry losses.

Juvenal's connection of the fires in Rome and Troy is extended by the further nocturnal perils that can be found in Rome (note the obvious link that most of the action in both this satire and *Aeneid* II occurs at night). Wagons full of timber, which teeter in the street on the brink of falling over, are a regular danger (III.254ff.); Juvenal's depiction of these wagons seems to evoke Virgil's simile between the fallen Troy and a felled tree (*Aen.* II.626ff.). In both the epic and the satiric scenes, the trees are personified in their swaying as both nodding (*nutant*, III.256/ *nutat*, *Aen.* II.629) and threatening (*minantur*, III.256/ *minatur*, *Aen.* II.628)³¹: Juvenal's minor twist on the image, though, is the fact that these

²⁹ Estevez (1996) 294 elaborates that Juvenal's image of a typical Greek represents "a portrait of the duplicity of Ulysses and the acting virtuosity of Sinon, a theme as thoroughly woven into the fabric of the first part of *Aeneid* II as it is woven into the first part of the satire".

³⁰ Estevez (1996) 281 notes that most commentators will at least allow this reference as a parallel between the two cities' 'falls'.

³¹ Both Scott (1927) 76 and Braund (1996) 87 suggest this epic passage as a source for Juvenal here, while Lelièvre (1972) 459 specifically highlights "the phraseology used by Virgil".

trees have already been felled and turned into timber, yet they are about to fall again, a parodic redoubling of Virgil's original scene. Further wagons carry Ligurian stones (*saxa Ligustica*, III.257), which would be even more dangerous if they were to fall out in a traffic accident: the results of large rocks falling on people are graphically realised by Juvenal, although the rubble from a toppled tower at *Aen.* II.466-7 had been an earlier, if less vivid, example³² (see chapters four, p. 77, six, pp. 142-3, and seven, p. 156, on the further epic touches which are afforded to this crushed victim's tale).

Juvenal also includes a reference to a scene from *Aeneid* II in his tenth satire; his twist here, however, is to create an alternative epic scene of his own invention in order to make his satiric point about old age. The allusion begins with the satirist's claim that "Priam might have gone to the underworld when Troy was still intact" (*incolumi Troia Priamus venisset ad umbras*, X.258); it appears as if Juvenal is going to concoct a rhetorical debate in which the destruction of Troy is prevented in some way, and Priam's death does not come amidst his city's ruin. It is the image of Priam's death that holds the satirist's attention for the moment, however: Priam's funeral is said to have been attended by his daughters Cassandra and Polyxena, whose grief is expressed in typical garment-rending style (*Cassandra ... scissaque Polyxena palla*, X.262), and his son Hector, who serves as a pallbearer (*portante*, X.260). Juvenal's actual intentions now become clearer, since none of these children were able to attend their father's real funeral: Priam famously outlived Hector, reclaiming his son's corpse at *Il.* XXIV.468ff.; Polyxena was killed soon after Achilles, whose death must, logically, have preceded Priam's during the war; and Cassandra would presumably have been abducted by Agamemnon at around the same time as Priam was killed. Troy's survival, then, is not the point: the city would have been destroyed anyway, and so the only way that "Troy might have been intact at the time when Priam went down to the Underworld" would have been for Priam to die at an earlier and different time (*diverso tempore*, X.263) to when he actually did, and specifically prior to Paris' incitement of the Trojan War (X.263-4). Priam is hence again exploited as a mythological example of old age causing great grief (see chapter five, pp. 130-1): in his case, this was caused by the destruction of his city (*omnia ... | eversa*, X.265-6) which he was forced to endure before his death at the hands of Pyrrhus³³. Juvenal's made-up scene of the ceremony after Priam's hypothetical death is actually more elevated than the depiction of his true demise: the only ceremonious aspect of Priam's actual death was its proximity

³² Estevez (1996) 288 points out that the collapse of both the tree and the tower in the *Aeneid* were examples of "a deliberate act"; Juvenal's falling timber and stones are accidental.

³³ Scott (1927) 91 and Courtney (1980) 479 both point to the epic source of Priam's death as *Aen.* II.550ff.

to an altar (*ante aram*, X.268), inspiring Juvenal's final deflation of Priam by likening him to a sacrificial bull (*ut vetulus bos*, X.268 - see chapter three, p. 56).

Petronius' first Virgilian reminiscence is also from *Aeneid* II; Encolpius, having overcome his grief for Giton that seemed reminiscent of Achilles' woes (see p. 154 above), now takes Aeneas as his apparent epic model by succumbing to rage (82.1) just as the Trojan hero had done after losing Creusa (*Aen.* II.749ff.). Typically, the epic mood is deflated: the mythical revenge that Encolpius swears on his apparently traitorous former allies is comically cut short when his weapons are confiscated (*despoliatus*, 82.4) by a sentry³⁴. A more extensive and more exact recreation of a scene from *Aeneid* II comes with the poet Eumolpus' narration of the fall of Troy at chapter 89, drawing his inspiration from a pictorial representation of the events which hangs in the art gallery where Encolpius has just encountered him. The content of Eumolpus' poem parallels Virgil's earlier account of the tales of Laocoon and Sinon (*Aen.* II.13-267) quite closely, but without descending into an actual parody (as noted at chapter three, p. 67, Eumolpus' lack of poetic abilities are the point of this scene): he includes the key details of Sinon's deceitful stories, Laocoon's warnings, and his (and his two sons') subsequent deaths at the jaws of a pair of portentous sea snakes, climaxing with the fateful entry of the Trojan Horse within Troy's gates³⁵. Ironically, the actual fall of Troy (which was presumably featured in the nearby portrait) is never actually reached, since Eumolpus' dreadful rendition is cut short by an abusive crowd; however, the imagery of Sinon and the Trojan Horse is actually more relevant to Petronius' work, since it "reflects the *Satyricon's* themes of deceit and disguise"³⁶.

The war in Latium, which takes up the later books of the *Aeneid*, is the other main area of Virgil's epic work that is regularly exploited by the satirists. Horace appears to be paralleling one of Virgil's scenes from the build-up to this war in his ninth satire: the encounter with the buffoon contains three incidental details of their route - they begin at the *via Sacra* (i.IX.1), and pass Vesta's temple (*Vestae*, i.IX.35) on their way "across the Tiber, near Caesar's gardens" (*trans Tiberim ... prope Caesaris hortos*, i.IX.18). These minor details serve to heighten the realism of Horace's encounter in Rome, but they also bring to mind the tour of the future site of Rome which Aeneas is given by Evander in *Aeneid* VIII: however, since this satire was composed before the *Aeneid* was published (although Horace and Virgil were acquainted with one another), it is more likely that both authors were

³⁴ Both Conte (1996) 3 and Slater (1990) 90 make the connection to the *Aeneid* regarding Creusa; Zeitlin (1971) 59, however, suggests that Aeneas' outburst against Helen at *Aen.* II.567-595 is the intended allusion.

³⁵ Zeitlin (1971) 62 observes that "the presentation [in satire] adheres almost faithfully to the original [i.e. Virgil's version] in sequence of ideas and action".

³⁶ Zeitlin (1971) 66: these two themes are the most obvious recurring motifs in the *Satyricon* as a whole - less blatant in the *Troiae Halosis* are the further ideas of "luxuria, futile relationships and sacrilege".

simply following a similar predecessor's work. Evander's role as host to both Aeneas and Hercules is more explicitly referenced and re-enacted in Juvenal's eleventh satire, as the satirist's persona is elevated into association with the epic king in regard to their hospitality³⁷. Juvenal's persona promises his would-be guest, Persicus, that he will have an Evander (*habebis | Evandrum*, XI.60-1) as his host; Persicus then also shares in this mythological elevation by being compared to Evander's guests. First, he will be Hercules, allusively signified by his epithet *Tirynthus* (XI.61); his identification with Aeneas, however, is slightly diminishing towards the epic hero, since he is called "the lesser guest" (*minor illo | hospes*, XI.61-2), presumably since he was smaller than the immense Hercules (see chapter three, p. 47). Persicus' association with the two heroes is then extended by allusions to the manner of their deaths, the words *flammis* and *aquis* (XI.63) respectively implying Hercules' funeral-pyre and Aeneas' drowning; although we cannot be entirely sure of Persicus' identity or status, he is inevitably inappropriately elevated by his potential re-enactment of these gods' deeds.

Juvenal's fifteenth satire exploits the imagery of the actual war in Latium itself - the fact that the contextual satiric conflict is the Egyptian siege that leads to cannibalism makes the elevated association with the epic battle somewhat incongruous and unsuitable. The siege begins during a grand banquet, as the assailants stir themselves into action for their attack on the drunken revellers with parodic battle-cries (*iurgia*, XV.51 - literally, "insults"), which act as bugles (*tuba*, XV.52) sounding the charge³⁸. The war in Latium broke out after two similar sounds incited the men to war: first, Silvia's laments over the dead stag (*Aen.* VII.500-4), and then the trumpet of the Fury Allecto (*Aen.* VII.511ff. - note that Juvenal had already exploited this image at VII.71, as mentioned at chapter two, p. 28). The connection is enhanced by the barbaric Egyptians rushing into the fray with their initial weapons only being their bare hands (*nuda manus*, XV.54); similarly, the men in Latium were unprepared for battle, and then grabbed whatever weapons they could (*Aen.* VII.505-10). The Egyptians soon follow this precedent by picking up the only better weapons that lay at hand, namely rocks (*saxa*, XV.63), although these are eventually upgraded themselves with swords (*ferrum*, XV.73) and arrows (*sagittis*, XV.74) taken from their fallen enemies; the warriors in Latium had also upgraded their impromptu weapons to swords and spears (*Aen.* VII.523ff.). Besides this vague correlation³⁹ to *Aeneid* VII, Juvenal makes a more explicit connection between the rock-hurling Egyptians and assorted epic

³⁷ Wilson (1903) 113 notes the further link that, despite their generous hospitality, both hosts were quite poor.

³⁸ Anderson (1987) 208 notes that "the [satiric] conflict was not noble warfare, but riot".

³⁹ Scott (1927) 88-9 admits that the similarity between the two scenes is general rather than detailed, and that there is a marked contrast between the level of damage sustained in satire and epic.

heroes who had also used rocks as weapons; as well as the further incongruous elevation of the cannibalistic warriors in association with epic heroes like Turnus (XV.65), Ajax (XV.65) and Diomedes (alluded to by both the patronymic *Tydides*, and his successful target of Aeneas, XV.66-7)⁴⁰, Juvenal mockingly adds that the Egyptians' rocks were much smaller than the boulders hurled by these heroes (XV.67-8), because mankind had become much weaker since Homer's time (*nam genus hoc vivo iam decrescebat Homero*, XV.69)⁴¹.

One of the most important passages during the war in Latium concerns Aeneas' shield, upon which Vulcan had engraved a series of illustrations of the 'future history' of Rome (*Aen.* VIII.630ff.); Juvenal appears to refer to this scene in his tenth and eleventh satires, as does Seneca in his *Apocolocyntosis*. During Juvenal's discussion on longevity in his tenth satire, he creates a brief catalogue of three treacherous conspirators who had lived deservedly short lives, namely Lentulus, Cethegus and lastly Catiline (X.287-8), whose final position marks him out as the most important of these dead traitors; Catiline can also be found in this important position on Aeneas' shield (*Aen.* VIII.668), where he is the only one of the Underworld's band of sinners to be recognisable⁴². Seneca may also be alluding to this depiction of the Underworld's criminals in his *Apocolocyntosis*, when Claudius encounters all of his former 'friends' there (XIII.6); ironically, Claudius was himself responsible for most of their deaths, and so he is actually the biggest criminal here⁴³. Juvenal parodies the actual concept of art appearing on a shield during his ruminations on the spoils of war in the eleventh satire. A soldier is shown to be ignorant of the Greek artistry (*Graias mirari nescius artes*, XI.100) involved in an ornate plate that he has plundered; Juvenal creates a connection with the Virgilian scene by describing an image that the epic shield and this Greek dish had in common, namely the story of Romulus and Remus (*geminos ... Quirinos*, XI.105 / *geminos*, *Aen.* VIII.631). The details included in the plate's version of events parallel the shield's depiction of the legendary founders of Rome: they are shown being suckled by their she-wolf mother (*Romuleae ... ferae*, XI.104 / *lupam*, *Aen.* VIII.631) while sheltering in a cave (*sub rupe*, XI.105 / *in antro*, *Aen.* VIII.630); Juvenal's image of a naked man with spear and shield (*nudam effigiem in clipeo ... et hasta*, XI.106) must then indicate the twins' father, Mars, who was also briefly mentioned

⁴⁰ Ferguson (1979) 319 notes that the targets of Turnus and Ajax were Aeneas and Hector respectively; Scott (1927) 61 and Courtney (1980) 601 both cite the epic scenes of rock-throwing as *Aen.* XII.896ff. (Turnus at Aeneas), *Il.* VII.264ff. (Ajax at Hector), and *Il.* V.302ff. (Diomedes at Aeneas).

⁴¹ Smith (1989) 818 rightly views the juxtaposition as a "comic comparison" of epic warriors and bickering Egyptians; although McKim (1986) 64 opines that this comparison fails because the Egyptians' barbarity is so deflated against the epic heroes' battles, this actually highlights Juvenal's intentionally ironic juxtaposition.

⁴² Courtney (1980) 481 notes the reason for Catiline's prominence in the two scenes: "both authors regard the attempted overthrow of the state with true conservative Roman horror".

⁴³ Leach (1989) 212 further notes an "allusive irony" with Cato's separation from the crowd at *Aen.* VIII.670.

(although not specifically featured) in Virgil's scene (*Mavortis, Aen. XI.630*)⁴⁴. The shared details of the shield and the plate serve to deflate the former and elevate the latter, since the epic images are now appearing on mere crockery. This is reinforced when the soldier breaks up this fanciful silver plate into fragments in order to make pretty decorations for his weaponry and armour (*in armis, XI.109*); the epic images on the lowly plate are now actually 'appearing' on the more appropriate armour, a witty parody that turns the soldier into a *quasi-Aeneas* by his decorated shield.

A final specific scene from the war in Latium is possibly re-enacted by Encolpius and Giton in the *Satyricon*, and again Petronius' point in exploiting such an epic repetition would be that, in spite of their heroic pretensions, his homosexual 'heroes' are completely inept at accurately repeating any of their epic predecessors' acts. The satiric context is typically base, as Encolpius' friendship with Eumolpus causes another jealous argument with his lover Giton, thereby leading to the melodramatic climax of a double-suicide attempt by the young couple; it is only an attempt, and not a success, however, because they have used a blunt blade (*rudis enim novacula, 94.14*), and so they end up lying in each others arms "playing dead" (*mimicam mortem, 94.15*). It is not just death that they appear to be mimicking here, but also the earlier suicide of Nisus after his friend Euryalus' death (*Aen. IX.422ff.*); their comic failure in repeating the epic warriors' deaths amplifies their epic incapability, but Petronius also seems to be deflating the epic scene, since Nisus' suicide comes from loyalty to Euryalus, rather than the satiric homosexual desire⁴⁵.

Brief mention should also be made of one of Juvenal's more comical references to the *Aeneid*, where he piles together four different Virgilian scenes into just three lines in his seventh satire, with a subversive twist. His satirical context is the Roman teacher (*grammaticus, VII.216*) whose literary (and specifically epic) knowledge was expected to be flawless, and so he is always being put on the spot by being tested on his familiarity with the *Aeneid*, even when he is on his way to the baths (*rogatus, | dum petit aut thermas aut Phoebi balnea, VII.232-3*). The trivial minutiae that the teacher is required to know includes: *nutricem Anchisae, nomen patriamque novercae | Anchemoli, dicat quot Acestes vixerit annis, | quot Siculi Phrygias vini donaverit urnas* ("he must say the name of Anchises' nurse, the name and birthplace of Anchemolus' stepmother, the age of Acestes when he died, and how many bottles of Sicilian wine he gave to the Trojans". VII.234-6). Juvenal's ironic twist here is that the specific answers to these queries cannot, in fact, be

⁴⁴ Pearson & Strong (1892) 227, Duff (1970) 364-5 and Courtney (1980) 504 all identify the allusion to Mars here, as well as some of the wider connections with Aeneas' shield.

⁴⁵ Conte (1996) 78 labels this "sublime scenario" as a further example of the "mythic-heroic paradigm" that Encolpius wishes his adventures to possess.

found anywhere in Virgil's text - Acestes certainly appears throughout *Aeneid* V, but he is still alive at the book's end; the exact number of bottles in his gift to the Trojans is not given at *Aen.* I.195-7; the brief reference to both Anchemolus and his stepmother in one line at *Aen.* X.389 is not long enough to go into a detailed back-story on the *noverca*; and Anchises' nurse is *never* mentioned, although this is probably an ironic confusion of father and son, since Aeneas' nurse, Caieta, does appear briefly at *Aen.* VII.2 - and so the questioner is either trying to trick the teacher with one of these spoof questions, or (more likely) is simply ignorant about the *Aeneid* himself⁴⁶.

The *Metamorphoses*

Juvenal recreates three scenes from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in his satires: while Ovid's inclusion as an 'epic' author for the purposes of this thesis has been discussed elsewhere (see chapter one, p. 7), it is certainly his accounts of the mythological incidents which are parodied here by Juvenal. In his programmatic first satire, Juvenal defines the intended scope of his satiric range, claiming to be going back as far as the usual marker for the beginning of human history, namely the flood (I.81-4). Ovid's familiar account of the roles played by Deucalion and Pyrrha during this mythical event (*Met.* I.316-437) seems to have been the model which Juvenal closely followed in his own truncated version:

*ex quo Deucalion nimbis tollentibus aequora
navigio montem ascendit sortesque poposcit
paulatimque animae caluerunt mollia saxa
et maribus nudas ostendit Pyrrha puellas*

("from the time when Deucalion, as the clouds raised the sea-level, ascended a mountain in his ship, and demanded their fortunes, and gradually the soft stones warmed with life, and Pyrrha showed the naked girls to the men", I.81-4). In just four lines, Juvenal has covered the story's basic points for which Ovid had taken over a hundred lines: the arrival in their boat on Mount Parnassus (*Met.* I.316-9), their prayers to the goddess Themis (*Met.* I.377-83), the creation of man from rocks (*Met.* I.400-15), and the distinct roles that Deucalion and Pyrrha had in the separate creation of men and women respectively (*Met.* I.411-3)⁴⁷. Of course, Juvenal cannot resist inserting some degree of subversion, and so Pyrrha's description as 'displaying naked girls to the men' at I.84 could be mockingly read with Pyrrha as a brothel's madam, showing off her naked prostitutes to potential customers:

⁴⁶ Both Pearson & Strong (1892) 128 and Wilson (1903) 79 simply include the references to these (and other) passages of the *Aeneid*; later commentators, including Duff (1970) 288, Ferguson (1979) 229 and Courtney (1980) 378-9, are more wise to the joke that the required answers cannot actually be found there.

⁴⁷ Scott (1927) 57 believes the reminiscence is intended "partially at least as *augendi causa*".

Juvenal's subsequent point that his satires will "include all human action from [this time]" (*ex quo ... | ... | quidquid agunt homines*, I.81-5) would then suggest that debauched deeds (such as visiting brothels) have in fact existed since the beginning of mankind⁴⁸.

One of the female mythological characters whose name is mentioned in Juvenal's sixth satire is the nymph Psecas (VI.491) – her presence is as a handmaiden who is scolded by her impatient mistress, which therefore lightly mocks Psecas' epic presence as one of the beauticians tending her divine mistress Diana at *Met.* III.165ff. (of course, the allusion ridicules Diana's vain bathing even more)⁴⁹. A final Ovidian scene, namely the debate over the Arms of Achilles in *Metamorphoses* XIII, is brought into two separate satires with differing effect. First, in the seventh satire, Juvenal elevates his lowly, contemporary scene of a country law-court (VII.115ff.) into a repeat performance of Ovid's epic account of oratorical skills, as shown by the two verbal parallels already discussed in chapter six (p. 148), *consedere duces* ("the judges sat down", VII.115 / *Met.* XIII.1) and *surgis* ("you rise" VII.115) / *surgit* ("[Ajax] rises" *Met.* XIII.2)⁵⁰. However, the satiric scene provides several deflating twists on the epic version, including Juvenal's 'judges' being simply yokels (*bubulco | iudice*, VII.116-7), the contemporary 'Ajax' seeming to suffer from stage fright (*pallidus*, VII.115)⁵¹, and the contemporary, lesser orator actually winning his case, thereby avoiding Ajax's fate of infamous madness, but, ironically, winning only some ham (*petasunculus*, VII.119) and onions (*bulbi*, VII.120) rather than a mythological trophy. Juvenal also makes a brief allusion to this mythological debate in his eleventh satire, although this time slightly subverting the tale by including two details that do not appear in Ovid's account. First, Thersites is said to have refused to lay claim to the Arms of Achilles (XI.30-1); then, Odysseus' victory is said to have been followed by a disgrace (*discrimine*, XI.32). Juvenal's satiric point is that epic's most base character Thersites did not attempt to attain things which were outside of his means, whereas the epic hero Odysseus was somehow undone by his birthright (presumably referring to his subsequent ordeals in the *Odyssey*): it is therefore ironic here that the lowly Thersites is a better exemplum to follow than the usually heroic Odysseus.

⁴⁸ Barr (1991) 144 points out Juvenal's recurring motif of "a compendious account of an old story ... [ending] in bathos"; Braund (1996) 95 expands on this debauched imagery: "the new race is immediately as corrupt as its predecessors wiped out in the flood".

⁴⁹ Ferguson (1990) 207 notes Psecas' epic appearance; Courtney (1980) notes several further connections to Ovid's non-epic works throughout this satire (particularly the *Ars Amatoria*), as well as the mention of Ovid's birthplace *Sulmonensi* at VI.187 (pg. 269), suggesting that Ovid may be thematic for the sixth satire.

⁵⁰ Scott (1927) 53 notes the Ovidian connection.

⁵¹ Smith (1989a) 822 labels the contemporary 'Ajax' as "completely incongruous: by turning pale, he demonstrates how wretchedly incapable he is of posing as this formidable character from myth".

Chapter 8 – ‘Heroes’

I have already outlined my definition of an epic poem as “long ..., written in hexameters, with elevated style and language, and [concerning] an important event (such as a war, or a journey) that is carried out by important people (mythological heroes, historical figures, or even the gods themselves)” (chapter one, p. 6). Throughout this thesis, I have shown that part of the satirists’ intentions was to cut against the epic grain, as it were, and to thereby purposefully set the satiric genre against the epic genre. Hence, satire in essence becomes the opposite of epic: short (although still written in hexameters), with a generally mundane or colloquial style and language, and concerning an unimportant event that is carried out by unimportant people. The unimportant events thus become gambling (Juvenal I.91-2), prostitution (Juvenal IX), and lawsuits or other petty disagreements (Horace i.VII) that occur, not in mythological or historical times, but in the satirists’ own contemporary periods; and the unimportant nobodies who carry out such events are called Coelius (Lucilius 211W / 1134M), or Labeo (Horace i.III.83), or Proculeius (Juvenal I.40) - names that are essentially common or without distinction. Certain individual satires by the earlier satirists, as well as the longer Menippean satires by Seneca and Petronius, take this concept to an additional level: they have an epic framework and a central character (usually the narrating persona), yet still exist in the lowly satiric world. The main figure can therefore be seen as a ‘satiric hero’: while some of his misadventures may be related in a more elevated manner than might be expected in satire (for example, the re-enacted epic scenes covered in chapter seven), this elevation is again exploited for the purpose of contrasting the grand and the lowly, the epic and the satiric, the ‘hero’ and his unheroic arena.

The ‘Heroic Satirist’

The satirists on occasion viewed *themselves* in a *quasi*-heroic manner, usually because of the bravery and controversy of their adoption of the ‘alternative’ genre of satire: ironically, the imagery that is evoked here is, of course, epic imagery, as the satirists picture themselves (and each other) as warriors, fighting the great conflicts of the satiric arena. Ennius is the first satirist to make this connection, in a fragment with several layers of grandeur: *Enni poeta salve qui mortalibus | versus propinas flammeos medullitus* (“hail, o poet Ennius, who serves up to mortal men the flaming verses that were drawn from your own heart”, 6-7W). The respective images of poet-as-god (see chapter two, pp. 19-20) and then god-as-bartender (see chapter five, p. 105) are alternately elevating and deflating; they are joined by Ennius’ elevated, militaristic self-image as a warrior using ‘flaming verses’ as

his weaponry (given the godlike connections, fiery thunderbolts seem an appropriate weapon here¹), and so these satiric barbs are imagined as causing actual damage.

The first, programmatic satire of Horace's second book contains several images of the 'heroic satirist'. Horace opens the poem with a claim that his first book of satires made him appear *nimis acer* ("too fierce", ii.I.1)² - he seems to imagine that others view him as a moralising epic warrior, whose satiric attacks are just as wounding to his victims as if he had literally beaten them (given Horace's fairly conservative form of satire, this is a somewhat ironic and exaggerated self-image). Horace's 'heroism' is then made more concrete when he states that "this pen will not attack a living person in vengeance, and it shall guard me like a sword protected by its sheath" (*sed hic stilus haud petet ultro | quemquam animantem et me veluti custodiet ensis | vagina tectus*, ii.I.39-41): while it is true that "the pen is turned into a weapon"³, the additional description of the sword being sheathed shows that it is only a weapon of defence, preventative rather than offensive. Even this solely defensive role is adopted by Horace with a degree of reluctance, since he prays that his weapon may be put aside when it has become rusty through disuse (*ut pereat positum robigine telum*, ii.I.43). The image of 'Horace-the-warrior' has been gradually downplayed over the course of the satire; a further joke comes with his animal analogy, that "the wolf attacks with its teeth, and the bull with its horns" (*dente lupus, cornu taurus petit*, ii.I.52). Horace's inference is that the satirist attacks his own enemies with the innate weapon of an angry sense of indignant morality - however, the imagery could also suggest that Horace was born with a pen in his hand to act as his physical weapon.

Persius' first satire also conveys the sense that the satirist is a moralising warrior; however, unlike Horace, Persius is a more active fighter, since he is following the 'heroic' example of his predecessor Lucilius in "cutting up" (*secuit*, I.114)⁴ Rome's immorality. This metaphorical attack on the city's sinning populace is compounded by the slightly less militaristic intentions to "rinse out" (*vaporata*, I.126)⁵ their ears with satire. The belligerent qualities of Persius' satire are again played up in his fourth satire: *caedimus inque vicem praebemus crura sagittis* ("we strike out with, and in turn offer our legs to, these arrows", IV.42). Persius elevates the previous lines' insults against effeminate men as metaphorical missiles, and hence makes his satires appear to be capable of inflicting physical pain.

¹ Anderson (1982) 104 links this image to that of Horace at Juvenal I.51 (see p. 173 below), where the lamp (*lucerna*) stands for both the midnight oil and the fiery satiric verses that are being composed.

² *Acer* is used to describe Lucius Sulla at Cicero *Pro Murena* 32, Appius Claudius at Livy X.15.8, and Julius Caesar at *BC* I.146; Muecke (1995) 206 notes that the phrase also has legal connotations, appropriate since the dialogue is between a satirist and a lawyer.

³ Muecke (1993) 108; is this perhaps an early example of the axiom 'the pen is mightier than the sword'?

⁴ *Seco* is used for decapitation at *Aen.* IX.331 and *BC* X.342, but can also suggest surgery (e.g. *Aen.* XII.389).

⁵ The Elder Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* includes many medical instances of *vaporo* (e.g. 22.131 and 31.128).

Juvenal also attributes warlike dimensions to the satiric genre in his programmatic first satire; before he turns himself into an epic-style hero, however, he first elevates his satiric predecessors into this metaphorical warrior role. Juvenal's first 'satiric hero' (although in the sense of a satirist whom he sincerely praises as an inspiration for his own adoption of the genre⁶) is actually Lucilius, who is heroically eulogised as a charioteer in an allusive, periphrastic⁷ description of the satiric genre as "the ground over which the great son of Aurunca urged on his horses" (*decurrere campo, | per quem magnus equos Auruncae flexit alumnus*, I.19-20)⁸. Ironically, this grand imagery comes immediately after Juvenal's subversive comments about the triteness of the epic genre, and hence this is actually the first indicator in Juvenal's satires of the conflicting levels of his wider exploitation of the epic realm: he either mocks epic characters and situations, or uses them as elevated objects of comparison and imitation, depending on the desired satiric effect. Juvenal goes on to consider another of his satiric forebears as a worthy model for his work: like Lucilius, Horace is also granted an allusive periphrasis, as "the lantern of Venusia" (*Venusina ... lucerna*, I.51)⁹. The conclusion to this first satire finally sees Juvenal deciding to follow these 'heroic' predecessors, and adopt the satiric genre, which is then described in increasingly martial terms. Juvenal's intentions are first labelled by the sea-faring metaphor of "setting sail, and opening out the entire canvas" (*utere velis, | totos pande sinus*, I.149-50)¹⁰: the satirist grandly announces that he is ignoring all of the previously-raised objections, and is nevertheless forging ahead in his satiric endeavours. Lucilius is then reintroduced (by name this time, at I.165) in order to show the anger and tears (*inde irae et lacrimae*, I.168) which satire's attacks can provoke: the attacks are actually made quite literal here, since Lucilius is described with sword drawn (*ense stricto*, I.165) and full of fire (*ardens*, I.165) like an epic warrior. Juvenal's adoption of the satiric genre now becomes a militaristic scene, as he dons the helmet (*galeatum*, I.169) of satire, announces his entry into the satiric realm like the battle-cry of the bugles (*tubas*, I.169), and then prepares himself for the inevitable conflict (*duelli*, I.169): however, Juvenal inserts a brief moment of self-deprecation here, since this conflict will actually only be with dead opponents who cannot retaliate against him (I.171)!

⁶ Braund (1996) 80 explains that "it was common practice for Roman writers to establish their choice of genre by reference to an eminent predecessor or the 'inventor' of the genre".

⁷ Courtney (1980) 89 notes that Ausonius apparently links Lucilius to Aurunca at *Epistle* 15.9.

⁸ Scott (1927) 32 considers this passage to be "somewhat more poetic than might be expected from a writer of *sermo*"; Courtney (1980) 89 paraphrases Juvenal's image of Lucilius as "an epic hero" who was "fighting against vice in a battle with epic fury", which Winkler (1989) 418 also paraphrases as "an epic hero sweeping down on vice in his chariot".

⁹ Both Barr (1991) 143 and Braund (1996) 88 explain that Horace was born in Venusia, and that the lamp was a common image associated with a poet's late-night composition.

¹⁰ Braund (1996) 107 considers the grand nautical image to, in fact, be "fairly common".

The 'Satiric Hero'

Lucilius was probably the first satirist to include 'satiric heroes' in his work; at least the allocation of various connected fragments seems to suggest that this was the case. One of his early discernible satires describes a journey that Lucilius' persona has made through the south of Italy: the satirist parodies epic's heroic voyages (e.g. the *Odyssey* or the *Argonautica*) by having this *faux*-heroic persona encounter several *quasi*-epic situations. The first fragment expresses to its addressee the apparent renown and pleasure which the traveller has garnered from his voyage (*tu partem laudis caperes, tu gaudia mecum | partisses*, 94-5W / 97-8M): whereas heroes such as Odysseus and Jason both received great praise at their homecomings, the following depiction of the tribulations of Lucilius' traveller seems pathetic in contrast to those epic voyages. For instance, in asking if the roads upon which he will be travelling have been levelled off (*degrumavisti*, 97W / *degrumabis*, 100M), this 'hero' seems keen to lessen the discomfort of his land journey, already a less harrowing experience than the standard epic sea journey; this is heightened by his apparent disgust in labelling the journey as "slippery and slimy" (*labosum atque lutosum*, 98W / 109M). The trials of these early parts of the journey are soon downplayed as being "all a game and a lark" (*omnia ludus iocusque*, 103W / 111M), so that the subsequent route through Setia's mountains can appear more harsh (*opus durum*, 104W / 112M) by comparison: the narrator's tolerance and endurance are called into question, however, since these mountains lay only a few miles outside of Rome. Furthermore, regular pauses for bodily refreshment (*curando corpori*, 107W / 115M) are therefore required by these weak and pampered travellers. One of these stopovers, at Palinurus (122W / 127M), sees our 'hero' being subverted further by his unsuitability for even this relatively leisurely journey: the lack, in this outlying area, of the type of delicate food to which he has become accustomed in Rome, such as oysters, purple-fish, mussels and asparagus (*ostrea nulla fuit, non purpura, nulla peloris, | asparagi nulli*, 126-7W / 132-3M), combined with the apparent shock at a dirty pot (*incrustus calix*, 129W / 135M) in which these simpler folk cook, again makes this supposedly heroic traveller appear to be an upper-class Roman with little qualification for pursuing an epic journey. The effect of these unhygienic cooking conditions on the digestive system of Lucilius' persona is a further deflation of his heroism, due to the vulgar juxtaposition of the (literally) deflating belch (*ructus*, 130W / 136M). The 'heroic' persona's belittlement is finally compounded when, upon awakening in the morning, he immediately shouts on his slaves (*e somno pueros cum mane expergitus clamo*, 139W / 143M), his over-reliance on his servants acting as a final reminder of his urbane softness and hence his unsuitability for the role of 'epic voyager'.

Lucilius' other example of the 'satiric hero' comes in a poem on a gladiatorial contest of which fourteen lines have survived: the gladiators themselves seem to have been ironically elevated above their lowly positions into *quasi*-heroic roles, with Pacideianus as the classical hero, and Aeserninus as his villainous opponent, in an 'epic' duel. The Samnite Aeserninus displays his villainous qualities in his description as "a nasty piece of work" (*spurcus homo*, 173W / 150M), and his worthiness (*dignus*, 173W / *dignu*, 150M) for a mere gladiatorial position; Pacideianus, on the other hand, is lavished with hyperbole as the single best gladiator in history (*optimus multo | post homines natos gladiator qui fuit unus*, 174-5W / 151-2M), and is therefore supposed to be a warrior comparable to Achilles or Odysseus, despite his actual gladiatorial status. Lucilius then parodies epic's gory fight scenes as Pacideianus details his battle-plan to his adoring crowd (an image oddly prescient of modern-day boxers or wrestlers before a fight): this 'speech before battle' was also common in epic poetry, as a leader rallied his army for the imminent onslaught¹¹ - here, however, the 'leader' seems to be rallying his fans in order to spur *him* on in the fight, an obvious deflation of the device. The pattern which this battle-plan follows could actually be taken as the course of some epic battle: first, a simple prediction by Pacideianus of the outcome (i.e. Aeserninus' death), followed by elaboration on how this will come about (176-7W / 153-4M); then, some anticipated wounds for the hero, as the villain initially takes the upper hand (*in os prius accipiam ipse*, 177W / 154M); finally, the expectation of the hero's victory over his enemy by piercing Aeserninus' torso right through with his sword (*quam gladium in stomacho surdi ac pulmonibus sisto*, 178W / ... *furia ac pulmonibu sistu*, 155M). Pacideianus' bloodlust has evidently been growing throughout his speech, and now he adopts Achillean levels of arrogance to match his anger by calling for the fight to begin immediately (just as Achilles 'called out' Hector at *Il.* XXII.261-272.), so consumed is he by zeal and hatred (*studio atque odio*, 181W / 158M). Pacideianus' prediction actually comes true, as he finally 'gores' his opponent like a rhinoceros (see chapter three, p. 53) and pierces Aeserninus' chest with his sword (*haerebat mucro gladiumque in pectore totum*, 185W / 1187M). Although the 'satiric conflict' here was actually an armed contest in which someone died, the lowly nature of the protagonists' roles as mere gladiators shows Lucilius' mocking intentions in their 'heroic' elevation.

The fifth satire of Horace's first book, recounting the journey of the author's persona to Brundisium, follows the satiric precedent of Lucilius' earlier 'epic' voyage (see p. 174 above). Horace's exploitation of this Lucilian theme (and his possible attempts at topping Lucilius' account, given his criticism for his predecessor at i.IV.6-13) is then

¹¹ E.g. *Il.* II.110ff. and *Ann.* 382-3S (and later examples at *Aen.* XI.14ff. and *BC* I.299ff.).

combined with the details of an actual journey undertaken by Horace himself, producing a constantly mock-heroic travelogue¹². All commentators on this satire mention that the reference to Maecenas and Cocceius as *legati* (“ambassadors”, i.V.29), alongside the final line’s destination of Brundisium, suggests that this was a specific diplomatic mission taken in around 37BC: regardless of the historical details (or even veracity) of the journey, we should realise that our narrator, ‘Horace’, is in the company of men with an important task, yet he specifically does not talk about such matters. His deliberate decision not to mention the serious (or, as it were, ‘epic’) purpose of the journey heightens the epic parody of the inconsequential moments that Horace does choose to discuss as their journey unfolds¹³: Horace’s game is almost as if Homer had chosen to recount the *Odyssey* from the point-of-view of the cabin-boy, focusing on details of ocean-bound servitude rather than the miraculous events of monsters and magic.

The poem begins in elevated fashion as Horace “leaves mighty Rome for the modest accommodation of Aricia” (*egressum magna me accepit Aricia Roma | hospitio modico*, i.V.1-2) - it has been suggested that Horace was parodying the opening of Odysseus’ after-dinner narration of his exploits here, although this seems to have been mainly based on the parallel constructions of ‘I left A to go to B’¹⁴; if the connection to *Odyssey* IX is recognised, however, then it is yet further evidence of Horace’s intention to turn his satire on the trip to Brundisium into an inconsequential epic parody. Regardless, this grand opening is soon deflated by a deliberate truncation of the narrative, since, by the fourth line, Horace is already at least two nights into the journey - this is clear from the two distinct references to their accommodation in Aricia (*hospitio*, i.V.2), and in Forum Appi (*cauponibus*, i.V.4). A further deflation comes in Horace’s depiction of the unsuitability of these travellers to be heroic voyagers: their laziness (*ignavi*, i.V.5) sees them split up a part of their journey which others might accomplish in a single day, and Horace’s own travel-readiness is diminished by his indigestion, humorously elevated by the military metaphor of “declaring war on one’s stomach” (*ventri | indico bellum*, i.V.7-8), caused by the poor quality of the local water (*propter aquam, quod erat deterrima*, i.V.7). The elevated circumlocution that signifies the journey’s third night (i.V.9-10 - see chapter three, p. 41) introduces another technique of epic subversion in this satire, as these hints of mock-heroic

¹² Barnes (1988) 58 notes that “this irony does not extend to all the events of the journey; but it recurs through the poem, and in those places the allusion to epic emphasises by contrast that an event or a situation is banal”.

¹³ Anderson (1982) 39 considers Horace to be “a master of irony” in his emphasis on mundane issues in this satire, although he then ties this into the banality of “human experience”.

¹⁴ Actually, Ehlers (1985) 80 claims that “in wenig mehr als einem Vers finden sich Ausgangs- und Endpunkt der ersten Etappe, in beiden Fällen findet sich der Akkusativ der ersten Person, in beiden Fällen geht der Satz im Enjambement im folgenden Vers weiter und endt dort in einer Art Apposition” - see chapter six (p. 138) for an actual satiric appearance of *Od.* IX.39 (as a quotation at Seneca *Apocolocyntosis* V.4).

elevation are juxtaposed with lowly, trivial, non-epic events such as sailors arguing in base language (i.V.11-14), drunken revellers competing in tuneless singing (i.V.15-19), and the travelling city-dwellers' unheroic insomnia in the countryside (*avertunt somnos*, i.V.15).

The stop at Anxur (i.V.26) allows the ambassadors Maecenas and Cocceius to join the travelling party, alongside Fonteius Capito, glowingly praised by his close association with Antony (i.V.32-3): Horace subverts the grand introduction to the true 'heroes' of this diplomatic voyage, however, by concentrating on his own mundane and unheroic activities, specifically his need to apply black lotion to his bleary eyes (*oculis ego nigra meis collyria lippus | illinere*, i.V.30-1). The later, non-diplomatic companions of the voyage are also graciously lavished with elevated praise as "radiant spirits, the likes of which the earth has never before created, and than whom nobody else is closer to me" (*animae qualis neque candidiores | terra tulit neque quis me sit devinctior alter*, i.V.41-2); however, this refocus of the audience's attention away from the important figures of the journey could also be explained as grateful praise for Plotius, Varius and Virgil (i.V.40), who, as hangers-on of Maecenas, had initially introduced Horace to his literary patron¹⁵. The satire constantly shifts the audience's attention onto the mundane (and, mockingly, usually food-related) details of the various stopover locations of the trip, which are usually granted some mock-epic description: any important events that may have occurred at the allusively-identified "city of the Mamurrae" (*in Mamurrarum ... urbe*, i.V.37)¹⁶, the grandly-evoked "inn next to the Campanian bridge" (*proxima Campano ponti quae villula*, i.V.45), or the stylishly assonant "shops of Caudium" (*Caudi cauponas*, i.V.51), are passed over in favour of the banal details that interest Horace's persona, such as Capito's role as cook (*Capitone culinam*, i.V.38), the taking on of supplies such as salt (*salemque*, i.V.46), and a fully-stocked hostel (*plenissima villa*, i.V.50), respectively. The latter stopover also refers to Horace's conjunctivitis again (*lippis*, i.V.49), this inadequacy being compounded by the dyspepsia (*crudis*, i.V.49) suffered by his fellow unheroic traveller Virgil.

An obvious moment of epic parody comes during the relation of a 'battle' (*pugnam*, i.V.52) which Horace witnesses on his journey: ironically, this 'battle', which requires both an invocation to the Muse (*Musa*, i.V.53 – see chapter four, p. 83) and a catalogue of the combatants (assuming a catalogue can consist of only two entries!) in order to do it poetic justice, is little more than an argument between two comic characters, the jester (*scurrae*, i.V.52) Sarmentus, and his opponent Messius Cicirrus¹⁷. One of the jokes during the pair's

¹⁵ Brown (1993) 144 mentions that the 'referee' role of Virgil and Varius is also alluded to at i.VI.55. and notes that this triumvirate then reappear, alongside Maecenas, in glowing terms at i.X.81.

¹⁶ Brown (1993) 144 identifies this as "a mock-epic periphrasis for the metrically inadmissible Formiae".

¹⁷ Gowers (1993b) 56 elevates the lowly conflict as a "quasi-Homeric duel", alongside several other vague reminiscences of the *Odyssey*.

verbal jousting is that Messius is called *Cyclopa* (i.V.63), due to the scar (*cicatrix*, i.V.60) across the left side of his face: Horace has therefore mimicked Odysseus by meeting his own *quasi*-Polyphemus, although one bereft of any dangerous qualities. A fire at Beneventum should be a dangerous encounter for our ‘hero’: however, despite the grand-sounding metonymy of the fire as Vulcan (*Volcano*, i.V.74), the commotion surrounding the event is actually due to the “lean thrushes” (*macros ... turdos*, i.V.72) that the crowd were trying to snatch from the fire, a ludicrously lowbrow image. Horace’s ‘heroic’ homecoming to Apulia contains a further *quasi*-epic scene, although our ‘hero’ is again made to appear idiotic (*stultissimus*, i.V.82) and so unsuited for his role, as he suffers the humiliation of a girl’s rejection and a subsequent wet dream (see chapter four, p. 81, on the subversion of the dream motif here). The travellers’ ‘heroism’ is further softened by their exaggerated sorrow and weeping at departure of Varius (*flentibus hinc Varius discedit maestus amicis*, i.V.93), since he has simply arrived at his final destination, rather than his death. In the poem’s final eleven lines, Horace increases the pace of his narration: the travellers are whisked from Rubi (i.V.94) via Gnatia (i.V.97) to Brundisium itself (i.V.104) with only passing references to each town. The eventual arrival in Brundisium after only 104 lines allows Horace to ironically point out the lengthiness of both the journey itself and his narration of it here (*Brundisium longae finis chartaeque viaeque est*, i.V.104) - this satire was actually shorter than the previous four satires in the first book, and so the ‘epic’ features of the poem do not extend to an overly-verbose length¹⁸.

Juvenal uses the concept of the ‘satiric hero’ several times in his satires, although (apart from his ‘heroic’ appearance at I.169ff., discussed at p. 173 above) it is always his ‘mouthpiece characters’ that adopt this heroic mantle, rather than some self-identifiable ‘Juvenal’ persona comparable to ‘Lucilius’ and ‘Horace’ in their travelogue satires. The second satire features two such mouthpieces, Laronia and Creticus: the former is an apparent adulteress who speaks out against hypocrisy among effeminate men, the latter is a lawyer who, as just such an effeminate hypocrite, briefly tries to defend his position. The bold opinions of both opposing figures are made in direct speech: it is as if they are verbally engaging each other prior to an actual physical engagement in battle, thereby turning their brief presence in the satire into a ‘heroic’ conflict, deflated by their flaws and unsuitability for the role. The adulteress Laronia specifically attacks the hypocrisy that allows sodomy, committed by homosexual adulterers, to be ignored by the rarely-invoked

¹⁸ Anderson (1982) 19 notes that an ironic connection between Horace’s criticism of Lucilius’ verbosity and this last line (with which Classen (1981) 342 also agrees) was first made by “the scholiast Porphyrio”; Barnes (1988) 58 suggests that this line is “perhaps mock-heroic”, since this journey from Rome to Brundisium seems to have only taken around a week, and even this was overlong given their apparent route: Gowers (1993b) further suggests that “the endings (*-que ... -que*, [i.V.]104) are mock-Homeric”.

Scantinian law (II.44), while female adultery is regularly punished by the *lex Iulia* (II.37): however, her own hypocrisy is exposed by her self-serving attempts to justify her own actions while criticising similar acts by others, mocking the offence that her morality has supposedly suffered. Her belligerent attitude is displayed by the various military metaphors that she incongruously sets up in juxtaposition to the effeminate hypocrites' actions (see chapter three, pp. 60-1); her referencing of the heroines Penelope and Arachne (see chapter five, p. 114) also adds a mock-epic flavour to her speech¹⁹. Creticus is introduced as Laronia's military opponent when he refuses to follow the other, chastened hypocrites in decamping (*fugerunt*, II.64) in disgrace: instead, he brazenly flaunts his effeminacy and transvestism with his see-through garb (*multicia*, II.66) which he defends with the phrase '*sed Iulius ardet, | aestuo*' ("but July is blazing, and I'm hot!", II.70-1). This flippant defence of his clothing deflates Creticus' 'heroism', particularly in contrast with the martial audience (*populus modo victor*, II.73) that attend his court appearances; the subsequent epic depiction of Creticus in this lawyer's role as *acer et indomitus* ("fierce and unbeaten", II.77 / *BC* I.146 - see chapter six, p. 150, on the quotation) incongruously elevates the effeminate hypocrite alongside Laronia as an ironic 'satiric hero' in this satire.

Juvenal's third satire features a further 'mouthpiece' adopting the role of 'satiric hero', the patriotic exile Umbricius (named at III.21). There are various methods which Juvenal uses in order to thrust Umbricius into the heroic spotlight in this satire, including connections to previous heroes and gods, as well as the subtextual connotations of Umbricius' name²⁰; the most pervasive of these techniques, however, is the continual analogy in the poem between Rome's metaphorical fall and Troy's literal fall in *Aeneid* II, thereby equating Umbricius with Aeneas. The connection between Umbricius' desertion of Rome and Aeneas' desertion of Troy is established in the opening scene of the satire, wherein Juvenal meets Umbricius at an abandoned temple of Egeria on the outskirts of Rome so that his friend can explain his decision to abandon the city for Cumae; Aeneas' flight from Troy had similarly begun with a rendezvous for the Trojan refugees at an abandoned temple of Ceres on the outskirts of the city, and so the connection between Umbricius and Aeneas is suggested. This link then recurs at various points throughout the satire, as Juvenal's description of the terrors of Rome parallels Virgil's account of the fall of Troy: topics such as the Romans who voluntarily dress up as Greeks, the deceitful and overacting Greeks in Rome, and the fire at Ucalegon's house all evoke moments in *Aeneid* II, as already discussed in greater detail at chapter seven (pp. 161-4). The ultimate nature of

¹⁹ Braund (1995) 214 notes that Laronia is slightly more rational than Juvenal's persona: "her speech is not a harangue or a tirade", as Juvenal's early satires sometimes appear to be.

²⁰ As Motto & Clarke (1965) 275 realise, we should not naively consider Umbricius to have actually existed.

Umbricius' subsequent 'heroism', however, is mock-epic, since his response to these ironically elevated obstacles is his cowardly flight into a self-imposed exile at Cumae.

The opening scene also establishes two further motifs in relation to Umbricius' 'heroism'. We can already see from this introduction that Umbricius is preparing to make his withdrawal from Rome on the grounds that the city has become degraded and debauched: this is also the usual reason behind the withdrawal of the gods at the end of the Golden Age²¹. Umbricius' re-enactment of this 'withdrawal myth' is hinted at by the similar absence of Egeria, who has been ejected from her temple by the usurping Jews (*Judaeis*, III.14): the divine nymph's withdrawal is representative of the degradation that Rome has suffered at the hands of foreigners, which is essentially Umbricius' reason for leaving too (although it is the invading Greeks, rather than the Jews, who have prompted this action)²². The fact that Umbricius' final destination is Cumae also adds another facet to his 'heroism', as shown by the two mythological periphrases which Juvenal uses to elevate the town: first, it is called the home of the prophetic Sibyl (*Sibyllae*, III.3), and then as the place "where Daedalus removed his exhausted wings" (*fatigatas ubi Daedalus exiit alas*, III.25)²³. The former statement is a further nod towards Aeneas, since Virgil's hero consults the Sibyl at Cumae²⁴, before descending to the Underworld, (*Aen.* VI.1ff.); the latter phrase also connects this satire with Virgil's epic, since Daedalus' landing at Cumae is pictured next to the entrance by which Aeneas enters the Underworld (*Aen.* VI.14). Umbricius' departure from Rome, previously linked with the fall of Troy, now takes on associations with the Underworld: however, Umbricius is ironically not entering the Underworld at Cumae, like Aeneas had done before him, but was instead leaving the metaphorical 'Underworld' that Rome had become by going to this traditional exit from the actual Underworld²⁵. The connection with Daedalus is also apt: apart from creating a further connection to *Aeneid* VI, Daedalus' mythological example of 'removing his wings' at Cumae will now be metaphorically followed by Umbricius when he settles there²⁶.

²¹ Motto & Clarke (1965) 272-3 mention several examples of the 'withdrawal myth', including Juvenal's later exploitation of Pudicitia's withdrawal at the end of the Golden Age (VI.1ff. - see chapter four, pp. 71-2).

²² Motto & Clarke (1965) 273 mention the various aspects of Roman life that have fled alongside Egeria.

²³ Scott (1927) 101 briefly includes the line in a list of periphrases for places, Pollmann (1996) 483 in a list of "Örtlichkeiten"; Braund (1996) 178 labels the phrase as "an epic-style periphrasis", while Duff (1970) 128 makes the wider point that Juvenal "has a great liking for describing places and persons by a periphrasis giving some historical or mythological details", although not exclusively (see chapter three, pp. 40-9).

²⁴ Braund (1996) 173 cites *Aen.* VI.1ff. as the primary evidence for Cumae being the home of the Sibyl.

²⁵ Estevez (1996) 282 establishes that the reference to Cumae regarding Daedalus is a fairly specific pointer to the Underworld's entrance in *Aeneid* VI, since other authors place his landing point at Sicily or Capua.

²⁶ Witke (1962) 246 identifies a further contrast that "Daedalus fled home because his work was too well received by Minos. Umbricius must flee from home because his talents go begging"; Braund (1996) 178 has an alternative interpretation for the allusion: "Daedalus here represents escape from the minotaur ... so the periphrasis suggests that Rome is like a labyrinth full of unnatural monsters from which Umbricius is fleeing".

There is an underlying connection between most of the degrading and shameful actions in Rome which have sickened Umbricius into performing his self-imposed exile: the influx of Greek activities, mentalities, and even citizens, has essentially turned Rome into “the Greek city of Rome” (*Graecam Urbem*, III.61)²⁷. As a result, Umbricius feels that there is no room left there for a true Roman (*non est Romano cuiquam locus hic*, III.119), the singular noun suggesting that Umbricius counts himself in a patriotic minority of one²⁸. The preceding heroic allegories are therefore combined with an apparent subtext to Juvenal’s choice of the name ‘Umbricius’ for his mouthpiece in this satire, showing the true complexity of Umbricius’ role as a ‘satiric’ hero. Umbricius’ self-opinion as the last Roman among ‘Greeks’ reinforces the association with Aeneas, who had to adopt the ‘Roman’ identity because Troy no longer existed due to the invading Greeks²⁹. Hence, we must see Umbricius himself as being representative of the former essence of Rome - and his name does in fact suggest this, since *umbra* means “ghost” or “spirit”³⁰. A superficial reading of the third satire would find a simple report by Juvenal of an actual tirade made against Rome by his disheartened, patriotic, real friend Umbricius: however, the satire’s well-developed subtext means that Juvenal has actually conferred upon this ‘Umbricius’ persona a complex role of ‘satiric hero’ that simultaneously amalgamates Aeneas, Daedalus, a withdrawing god, and even ‘Rome’ itself.

There are three characters in Juvenal’s fourth satire who can be viewed as inappropriate ‘heroes’: the opening and conclusion of the poem respectively ridicule Crispinus, the mini-Domitian with extravagant tendencies, and the Emperor himself, who was the leader of the grand council deciding the trivial fate of the big fish (see chapter five, pp. 100-1). Between these two ‘heroes’, however, comes the big fish itself, which ironically becomes the central ‘heroic’ figure for several lines³¹. The fish is introduced with some mock-epic lines evoking the Muses (IV.34-5 - see chapter four, p. 85), making the events to follow appear grander than they truly were. The fish itself is then introduced in a grand periphrasis as *Hadriaci spatium admirabile rhombi* (“an Adriatic turbot of amazing size”, IV.39): the delay of the word *rhombi* partly points to the mock-epic nature of the line

²⁷ Juvenal may have borrowed Virgil’s phrase *Graia ... urbe* (*Aen.* VI.97) here, especially since Virgil was referring to Aeneas’ eventual destination of Pallantium, the future site of Juvenal’s *Graiam Urbem*, Rome.

²⁸ Motto & Clarke (1965) 269 opine that, since “Rome is no longer, in any traditional sense, Rome at all”, Umbricius himself has become “in essence Rome itself”.

²⁹ Estevez (1996) 299 neatly sums up the heroic allegories as “two lonely and dispirited figures, the last Roman and the first, Umbricius and Aeneas, each leaving a city in flames and fallen to the Greeks, each heading to the same physical place from opposite ends of time”.

³⁰ Motto & Clarke (1965) 275 decipher Umbricius’ ‘speaking name’ as meaning “that shade or *umbra* representative of the deceased Eternal City”; Braund (1989) 30 neatly sums up the poem with her interpretation of Umbricius as “the spirit of Roman-ness, fleeing an un-Roman Rome”.

³¹ Both Pearson & Strong (1892) 70 and Duff (1970) 170 describe the fish’s journey as “mock-heroic”; Courtney (1980) 212 clarifies that the satire “preserves epic form but ridicules it by non-epic content”.

(see chapter three, p. 48). The assorted figures that the fish encounters immediately after its capture, such as the fisherman and the “inspectors of seaweed”, are themselves depicted in periphrastic lines, thereby elevating the events surrounding the fish to a higher level (see chapter three, p. 46). It is the journey of the fish to the Emperor’s palace, however, which transcends its effective bridging of the gap between the fish’s appearance and Domitian’s adoption of the central role, and becomes like a mini-epic adventure in itself, despite the fact that the ‘hero’ is just a fish, and a dead fish at that³². The journey begins with the elevated adversities that the fish’s courier had to overcome at IV.56-9 (see chapter three, p. 41, on these periphrastic lines regarding harsh weather conditions): it is obviously ironic that this courier (*hic*, IV.59) must endure the wintry conditions, rather than the ‘heroic’ fish itself. The next obstacle to be overcome by the fish and his proxy is an amazed crowd of onlookers (*miratrix turba*, IV.62), whose hometown of Alba is elevated by the epic circumlocutions alluding to its foundation by Ascanius and its ties to the cult of Vesta (see chapter three, p. 44). After finally gaining admission to the palace, while the senators are amusingly kept outside (*exclusi*, IV.64), the honoured fish is ushered into Domitian’s presence with a ceremonious speech more appropriate for an ambassador’s arrival (IV.65-9). While this completes the dead fish’s ironically ‘active’ role in the satire, its incongruous ‘heroic’ role is then maintained both by its position as the main topic of discussion in the council, and by Veiento’s military metaphor describing it (see chapter three, p. 62).

Juvenal’s final ‘satiric hero’ is Catullus, the shipwrecked sailor in the twelfth satire, whose ‘heroic’ role is established by the details of the storm which caused him to become shipwrecked. The parallels between Juvenal’s storm and the various literary storms that preceded it lead Juvenal himself into labelling the scene as a “poetic storm” (*poetica ... | tempestas*, XII.23-4 - see chapter four, pp. 86-8); we should expect, then, that Catullus will become a ‘*poeticus heros*’ in the way that he faces up to, and subsequently survives, the trials of such an ‘epic storm’, and certainly Catullus’ re-enactment of the epic heroes’ responses to their own storms (as covered in chapter four) does seem to grant him a degree of actual heroism. Furthermore, while Catullus’ arrival onshore at Alba Longa must be seen as a ‘fact’ of the events, there is a more allegorical point: when the unnamed area is identified by Juvenal’s allusive references to Ascanius (XII.70) and Lavinium (XII.71 - see chapter three, p. 44, on these periphrases), as well as the etymological explanation of the ‘white’ sow (XII.72-3 - see chapter five, p. 120, on the sow’s deflated portrayal), we should note the interconnecting allusion to Aeneas’ arrival in Italy, which indicate an intentional

³² Braund (1992) 45 comments here that “epic phrases are mingled with phrases and ideas alien to epic”, a point that can be extended beyond Juvenal’s fourth satire to the majority of the satiric genre.

analogy between the 'satiric hero' Catullus and the epic hero Aeneas³³. However, one of Juvenal's subsequent images suggests that the earlier 'epic' details of the storm, as well as this analogy with Aeneas, may well have been Catullus' own invention, and so we shouldn't accept them at face value. The satirist points to the custom among shipwreck survivors to tell their fishy tales immediately afterwards (*garrula securi narrare pericula nautae*, XII.82); in fact, even in the epic genre, this is true, since both Aeneas and Odysseus can be seen to narrate stories following their shipwrecks (at *Aen.* II.1ff. and *Od.* IX.5ff. respectively). It is hence suggested that Catullus himself was creating the exaggerated 'heroic' allusions by associating himself with more-renowned survivors, and so Catullus becomes a self-promoting 'satiric hero' in a 'poetic storm' of his own creation.

Seneca's mockery of the 'hero' Claudius in his *Apocolocyntosis* has already been discussed in chapter five (pp. 102-4): however, this was more in regard to the Emperor being the target of a non-epicist's irreverence, rather than his role as the work's 'hero', although the two ideas are in fact connected. The various jokes that Seneca makes at the Emperor's expense are usually geared towards Claudius' various unsuitable traits (bloodthirstiness, stupidity and physical deformities) for the roles of both Imperial leader and, later, a god; moreover, Claudius is subsequently shown by these same traits to be unsuitable to act in the 'heroic' role that is established by the epic framework of the *Apocolocyntosis*. The self-consciously grand periphrases that establish the initial setting of the work (see chapter three, pp. 65-6), are an early hint that Seneca is establishing a mock-epic realm for his action to take place in; the initial appearance of Claudius at this point, lying constipated on his deathbed (*nec invenire exitum poterat*, III.1), shows that we are then being given a mock-heroic central character to match. The following epic journey, upon which Seneca sends his 'hero', takes in many grand scenes, from heavenly debates to visits to the Underworld, but the choice of Claudius as the voyager who makes this journey constantly undermines the grandeur of this realm, making it a mock-heroic stage. However, Claudius' overall unsuitability for his Imperial and godly roles is not the key factor in his unsuitability for the 'heroic' role: Seneca noticeably never really shows Claudius making any kind of decision or action that would impact on the story's proceedings. Claudius is not a proactive epic protagonist, but is merely a reactive satiric bystander: he has no choice in his death, which is implemented by various divine agents; his attempts at epic knowledge are merely an ill-fated response to Hercules' own heroic posturing (see chapter six, p. 138); and he is simply an onlooker during both of the supernatural debates on his fate in heaven

³³ Ramage (1978) 230 elaborates that the arrival of both figures in Italy is to be considered a happy occasion, pointing to several 'happy' words surrounding this passage; Ronnick (1993) 10 also makes the connection that both arrivals were "storm-caused".

and the Underworld. Although the plotting of the events of the *Apocolocyntosis* does, to an extent, follow epic tradition, Claudius does not follow the appropriate heroic tradition in his response to these events: typically, he shows no response at all, and simply allows matters to unfold with none of the heroic resistance of a more suitable epic hero.

Petronius establishes an even more self-consciously epic framework than Seneca's in his *Satyricon*, and he achieves this in two ways: we must differentiate between the author Petronius' 'epic reality' and the narrator Encolpius' 'epic reality'. The world in which Petronius has chosen to set his story's events is fictional on two different levels, each based on its relationship to the real Roman world in which Petronius lived: it is both a 'satiric reality' and an 'epic reality'³⁴. In the first place, the lowly aspects of reality have been exaggerated and enhanced in all of the characters in the *Satyricon*: stock satiric stereotypes - cheats, scoundrels, thieves, corrupt officials, sodomites, wastrels - populate this story to such an extent that it is clearly a 'satiric reality'. On the other hand, however, Petronius' plot, while clearly sticking to the novelistic formula, offers situations and characters that are more apt to the epic realm, such as shipwrecks, feasts, trips to the 'Underworld' and various elevated conflicts, so that the *Satyricon* then simultaneously becomes an 'epic reality'. This is enhanced by the handful of satiric characters whose names are more representative of the epic realm, although they do not share any of their namesakes' traits: Agamemnon in the *Satyricon* is not the Greek leader from many epic and tragic works, but rather a rhetorical teacher, and a somewhat verbose and sycophantic one at that; Menelaus is not Agamemnon's brother, as in the epic realm, but merely his assistant in the rhetorical school (*antescholanus*, 81.1); and while Circe does refer back to her epic predecessor (see chapter seven, p. 161), her intention to replicate the epic affair between Circe and 'Polyaenus' seems to be based merely on her apparently insatiable sexual appetite. Petronius' joke is the juxtaposition of these two realities, as satiric lowlifes (and particularly Encolpius) carry out epic functions: whereas earlier satirists used this technique in order to simultaneously elevate the satiric realm and deflate the epic realm, thereby making the genres appear closer, Petronius actually intends to widen the gap between them in order to show up the true baseness of his satiric characters³⁵.

The most telling juxtaposition between the epic and the satiric realms comes from the narrator Encolpius' own explicit comparisons between his antics and surroundings, and the grand events and images from earlier myth and literature. Encolpius regularly sets up

³⁴ Walsh (1970) 36 labels the two realms as "the sensational and the satirical".

³⁵ Sandy (1969) 298 establishes that "the anti-hero Encolpius and his corrupt friends are made to act out their roles of debauchery against an epic background so that their corruption will be all the more evident"; Conte (1996) 89-90 then elaborates that "the works that inspire [Encolpius'] *illusions de grandeur* are not the objects of Petronius' satire, nor are they subject to ironic degradation".

his own exploits (and occasionally those of his friends) as comparable with heroic deeds, almost suggesting that he wants to fool the reader into thinking that they are reading a contemporary epic work³⁶. However, Petronius typically follows up these epic allusions with ironic failures, and hence we are reminded that the *Satyricon* is a more humorous work, and the central would-be ‘heroes’ are completely inappropriate for the role. The prevailing reason for the failure of Encolpius, Giton and Ascyltos to be taken seriously as heroes is their effeminate relationship with one another - although, of course, Encolpius himself must be viewed as an all-round, pathetic individual beyond his sexual preferences. For example, their brief attempts at fighting are shown up not only by having women (19.4ff.) or geese (136.4ff.) as opponents, but then by actually failing to score convincing victories over them (see chapter three, pp. 64-5, on the *faux*-military descriptions of these ‘battles’). Encolpius’ assumption of the roles of Achilles (81) and Aeneas (82 - see chapter seven, p. 154 and p. 165, respectively) is also belittled because he is moping for his passive partner Giton instead of the epic heroines Briseis and Creusa. Giton himself is a poor substitute for Odysseus while (unsuccessfully) hiding under a bed to avoid detection of his homosexual affair with Encolpius (97 - see chapter seven, p. 160). Even the attempted suicide of the two lovers, which evokes the epic deaths of Nisus and Euryalus in *Aeneid* IX (see chapter seven, p. 168), is a mockery, not only because it is unsuccessful, but also because the re-enactors are melodramatic homosexuals rather than loyal friends. While this effeminacy may be appropriate to the satiric realm, it actually undermines the more masculine and ‘heroic’ allusions drawn from the epic realm³⁷.

A final mark of Encolpius’ ‘satiric heroism’ comes from one of his more subtle re-enactments of the heroic models presented by both Odysseus and Aeneas: namely, the causation of the hero’s entire suffering by the wrath of a god. In the *Odyssey*, Polyphemus, having been blinded by Odysseus, seeks vengeance from his father Poseidon (*Od.* IX.526ff.), which is evidently brought about in the shipwreck (*Od.* V.282ff.) that hampers the hero’s progress back home for so long. Similarly, Juno expresses her anger at Aeneas’ destiny of setting in motion the foundation of a city (i.e. Rome), which would become more powerful than her favourite city of Carthage, by setting obstacles in the hero’s path such as storms (in *Aeneid* I) and wars (in *Aeneid* VII). The deity who seems to plague Encolpius in the *Satyricon* is Priapus, the phallic god: the sexual depravity of both god and ‘hero’ is an appropriate connection. The one direct reference of this divine anger comes towards the

³⁶ Walsh (1970) 82 characterises Encolpius as “the anti-hero in the real world posturing as an Odysseus or an Aeneas”; Conte (1996) also labels Encolpius as “The Mythomaniac Narrator” in two of his chapter headings.

³⁷ Sullivan (1968) 216 considers there to be an underlying “literary erotic humour” in the *Satyricon*; Walsh (1970) 45 clarifies that Encolpius and his friends “meet situations demanding courage and intrepidity with acts of ludicrous cowardice, and ... regard their trivial plans and quarrels as Homeric trials”.

end of the *Satyricon*, when the impotent Encolpius laments that he has been afflicted by “the wrath of Priapus” (*ira Priapi*, 139.2), just as the earlier epic heroes had been harassed by their hostile deities - opinion has been split as to whether this reference indicates that Encolpius had been plagued by Priapus throughout the corrupted text of the *Satyricon* (and so his impotence is an appropriate punishment from the phallic god)³⁸. Looking back through the work provides a handful of further references to Priapus which might suggest the reason for his divine wrath at Encolpius. The first reference comes after the mock-battle between the ‘heroes’ and Quartilla: the fight is apparently caused by the inadvertent intrusion of Encolpius upon religious rites being conducted by this priestess (*sacrum ante cryptam turbastis*, 16.3), and Quartilla begs him not to reveal what he saw in the worship of Priapus (*quod in sacello Priapi vidistis*, 17.8). Most of this sequence is fragmentary or lost, but the later reference to some kind of trouble (*procellam*, 26.8) that the trio are keen to avoid possibly suggests that Priapus’ rage was invoked by Encolpius actually divulging the details of these religious rites; Priapus’ revenge, though, would then seem not to be Encolpius’ eventual impotence, but rather his revelation of Encolpius’ presence on Lichas’ ship in the captain’s dream (104.1). A further reason for Priapus’ anger at Encolpius could be the ‘heroic’ defeat of the attacking sacred geese (*anseris sacri*, 136.4 - see chapter three, p. 65): chronologically (at least according to the current textual tradition) this would then be a closer reason for Encolpius’ divinely-created impotence³⁹. Even though Encolpius seems to be following an epic tradition of persecution at the hands of a vengeful deity, the choice of the comical god Priapus as his pursuer deflates him as a ‘satiric hero’, whose sexuality overrides any heroic pretensions that he may inappropriately harbour. We must also consider the probability that Encolpius’ innate desires of heroism have simply led him to invent a suitably heroic godly vendetta against himself based on mere coincidence⁴⁰.

³⁸ Commentators who take Priapus’ vengeful role in the *Satyricon* seriously include Sullivan (1968) 63, Cameron (1970) 398, Walsh (1970) 76, McDermott (1983) 83 and Conte (1996) 94; the key detractor is Baldwin (1973) 294-6. Slater (1990) 40-2 prevaricates that if Priapus’ wrath was a wider motif in the *Satyricon*, then it is certainly not presented in accordance with other representations of Priapus.

³⁹ Baldwin (1973) 295 considers the two scenes to actually be too close too each other “to give literal truth to the image of *ira Priapi* pursuing Encolpius over the seas”.

⁴⁰ Conte (1996) 100 plays Devil’s Advocate when he labels Encolpius’ ‘vengeful god’ explanation for his impotence as “an illusory interpretation of some events in the narrative”.

Chapter 9 - Conclusions

It remains only to make a brief summary of the main points raised in my preceding chapters, which will then be related to each of the satirists' own comparative degrees of epic exploitation, before a final, universal overview of the practice as a whole.

Chapters 1 and 2: The epic genre was particularly popular in ancient times, to the extent that epic became ubiquitous within literature; poets seemed to latch on to the popularity of epic and then adopted it as their own genre for all the wrong reasons (essentially, fame and fortune over artistic endeavour and ability). The satirists were one of several groups of authors who therefore regarded their chosen field as an 'anti-epic' genre, and they expressed several sentiments to this end, whether they were criticising the epic genre in its entirety, or just a specific epic work or even an individual epic author.

Chapter 3: There were many stylistic and linguistic devices common to epic and other 'grand' genres. The satirists regularly exploited these elevated devices alongside a baser level of language in order to create a sudden jarring contrast between the different stylistic registers. Even more pervasive was their juxtaposition of this grander style with their stock satirical subject matter, describing satire's lowlifes in epic periphrases and grand similes, and with militaristic metaphors. This contrast between satiric content and epic context served to elevate the former while simultaneously deflating the latter.

Chapter 4: The epic genre, like most genres, had its own stock situations, themes and motifs that were utilised again and again during an epic story. When the satirists exploited such motifs, however, there was usually (although not always) some kind of contextual deflation, typically caused by the participation of satire's own stock characters within this situation; the main exception to this rule seems to have been the concept of the so-called 'Golden Age' of mankind, which the satirists typically exploited quite seriously as a historical contrast for the present vices that their satiric poetry is attacking.

Chapter 5: The most frequently exploited element of the epic realm was its characters, be they historical or mythological. The satirists' exploitation of historical epic figures tended to run in one of two opposite directions, depending on the contextual satirical point: either these figures were used like the 'Golden Age' motif above, as a serious historical contrast with the debauchery and immorality of the present; or they were treated in a somewhat dismissive or deflating manner, whether that aided the satirist's point or was simply a source of humour: the Emperor was one such historical figure whose presentation in the satiric genre was almost without exception intended to be mocking. This latter technique was the more common choice for characters from mythological epic:

whether they were gods and monsters, or heroes and heroines, the presence of these mythical figures in the satiric realm usually led to their subversive or comical portrayal.

Chapter 6: In an extension of chapter three's stylistic devices borrowed from the epic genre, the satirists sometimes saw fit to exactly replicate a specific phrase or line written by an earlier epicist. Usually, the point of this quotation was the humorous contrast between the original epic context of the words and their new satiric context, which hence elevated the satiric context to a ridiculous level; however, when the quotation was actually a deliberate misquotation, the joke tended to be at the expense of the original epic scene.

Chapter 7: As a sort of combination of both the generic epic motifs and the direct epic quotations that the satirists sometimes borrowed, there were occasionally certain specific scenes that were copied from their epic source material, either as a parody or as a re-enactment in the satiric realm. The satiric intention was again juxtaposition: the original epic scenes were deflated by their altered satiric context or lowly protagonists, while these satirical elements were ironically elevated by their association with a famous epic scene.

Chapter 8: Several satiric characters (and, indeed, sometimes the satirists themselves) can be viewed as 'heroes' within their individual satiric contexts, due to an accumulation of epic elements discussed in previous chapters. Of course, this 'heroism' is different to that of epic warriors, since these lowly characters exist in the satiric realm, an inappropriate source of comparison with actually heroic epic archetypes: their actions are hence sufficiently skewed and deflated to label them as merely 'satiric heroes'.

An extremely brief summation of the level and methods of epic exploitation that each of the satirists employed will also be useful, although it should be noted that I have not attempted any kind of statistical analysis on this topic (and indeed I would consider such analysis to be fundamentally flawed).

Ennius and Lucilius: The few short fragments that remain of Ennius' satiric writing makes any kind of analysis difficult, not least any intertextuality with his more favoured epic realm: ultimately, all that can be said is that some of the fragments do show a level of language that is perhaps more elevated than would be expected in the satiric genre (although it was in fact Ennius who was essentially creating this new type of writing). A similar problem affects Lucilius' fragmentary satiric work, although to a lesser extent: we can clearly see that he exploits various stylistic and thematic devices that would be more common in the epic genre, but the extent of this exploitation cannot be easily judged.

Horace: The satires of Horace show a much more concerted effort in exploiting epic material: elevated stylistic flourishes regularly appear in his work, and thematically grand elements such as mythological characters and epic motifs are often interspersed

alongside his stock satiric situations and characters. However, Horace has a tendency to go from one extreme to another in his exploitation of epic devices - some satires (particularly in the second book) feature very few noticeable moments of grandeur, whereas others (such as i.V, i.IX and ii.V) rely entirely on an epic framework to provide much of their humour.

Persius: Perhaps the most relevant topic that can be discussed regarding Persius in any context is his linguistic style - within the context of epic exploitation, we can see that Persius' utilisation of grand phrasing and devices is very important to creating both his persona and his general atmosphere. Generally, however, he uses the motifs and characters of epic quite sparingly, but in an effective manner for getting across his satiric point - and indeed it is perhaps this restraint that facilitates the effectiveness of his grand moments.

Juvenal: Juvenal's exploitation of the epic realm goes to the other extreme from Persius' restrained approach, yet it does not lose any of its effectiveness; indeed, the various techniques of epic exploitation discussed throughout this thesis are so thoroughly ingrained in Juvenal's satires that at times the other satirists seem to have been left by the wayside in comparison. Perhaps the most important aspect that Juvenal brought to the concept of epic exploitation, however, was subtext, as several of the satires (such as III, IV, and X) have an underlying theme which elevates the poems into the epic realm themselves.

Seneca and Petronius: The inclusion of the Menippean satires in this thesis may seem biased, since they were very heavily based on an epic framework already; however, it has hopefully been interesting to see how the various motifs and methods of epic exploitation remain basically constant, whether, as in the case of the Menippean satirists, one is writing an essentially epic tale which is being acted out by satiric characters, or whether, as the standard verse satirists usually do, one is merely including a passing reference (or a much wider allusion) to the epic realm within a specifically satiric context.

I discussed briefly at the end of my first chapter (p. 10) the basic cause and effect of the satirists' exploitation of the epic realm: by elevating the satiric elements with their proximity to the epic elements, but then simultaneously deflating these epic elements because of *their* proximity to the satiric elements, the satirists are essentially bringing the two genres into closer association with each other. Satire is therefore shown on an even footing with epic, with the intention of making the satirists' work appear more palatable to an apparently epic-obsessed readership; we could even take this popularisation of the satiric genre to an extreme level as an attempt by the satirists to usurp the epic genre with their own poetry (and certainly Juvenal's first satire seems to make this suggestion, at least). However, this kind of supposition can only be taken so far, and this is primarily because of the overall extent of the satirists' epic exploitation as a recurring motif in their

work - despite the lack of empirical and statistical evidence, I hope it is apparent that epic exploitation is not their primary intention. The main intention of satire, returning to the original definition in my first chapter, is “exposing, denouncing, deriding, or ridiculing vice, folly, indecorum, abuses, or evils of any kind” (p. 1); whereas this motif can be seen in almost every word written by the satirists, their exploitation of the epic realm, no matter how widespread this thesis may have made it seem, probably accounts for less than a tenth of any individual satirist’s overall output.

There are also a handful of other likely reasons for the satirists’ exploitation of epic material, and they can be related to a comment made by Quintilian regarding rhetoric: *doceat, moveat, delectet* (“it should educate, it should provoke, it should amuse”, III.5.2). While Scott does include this comment in her own concluding chapter, alongside other rhetorical ‘rules’ of which the well-educated Juvenal would have been aware¹, she does not, however, go on to associate these rules with the further areas of her ‘grand style’ (i.e. epic and tragedy), instead merely re-emphasising Juvenal’s familiarity with different ‘grand’ styles and authors². However, the three words in Quintilian’s dogmatic statement each seem to epitomise a certain facet of all the satirists’ exploitation of the different aspects of the epic realm. In the first instance, *doceat*: satire’s educational element can be seen by the word “exposing” above, as the satirists reveal the sins of mankind to a wilfully ignorant Roman audience. We can subsequently relate the satirists’ utilisation of elevated stylistic techniques and language to Lucretius’ comments about his own ‘epic’ style being equivalent to “a spoonful of sugar” at *DRN* I.933-950: the audience are therefore tricked into absorbing the metaphorical “medicine” that is the important information of a new genre (be it philosophy or satire) by cloaking its message in the stylistic elements to which they are more accustomed. Secondly, *moveat*: while a certain level of moralisation or even indignation would in itself cause some provocation, the satirists’ subversive, comical and often irreverent exploitation of the characters, motifs and ideas of epic would undoubtedly have an even greater shock effect on the epic-friendly Roman audience. And finally, but perhaps most importantly, *delectet*: assuming that the satiric genre’s readership could get over their initial shock at the irreverence shown towards the epic genre, they would hopefully appreciate the wit and humour that is regularly provided by the juxtaposition of these fantastical epic elements with the ‘reality’ of the satiric realm, an aspect which is perhaps most pronounced in the comic fantasies of Menippean satire³.

¹ Scott (1927) 107-8 suggests that Quintilian may actually have been Juvenal’s rhetorical teacher.

² Scott (1927) 114 only allows that somebody with a good rhetorical background would likely have a good knowledge of epic and tragedy too.

³ As Riikonen (1987) 23 mentions (see chapter one, footnote 17); Braund (1989) 2 also considers these elements of “parody [and] literary allusion” to epitomise the satirists’ intentions “to entertain the audience”.

Bibliography

Dictionaries

- *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, in *Britannica 2002 Standard Edition CD-ROM*, © Merriam Webster Inc., 1994-2002.
- *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (ed. S. Hornblower & A. Spawforth), Oxford, 1996.
- *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford, 1933.
- *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (ed. P.G.W. Glare), Oxford, 1982.

Texts and Translations

a) Satire

- Barr, W. (with Lee, G.), *The Satires of Persius*, Trowbridge, 1987.
- Barr, W. (with Rudd, N.), *Juvenal: The Satires*, Oxford, 1991.
- Brown, P.M., *Horace: Satires I*, Warminster, 1993.
- Clausen, W.V., *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis Saturae*, Oxford, 1959.
- Heseltine, M. & Rouse, W.H.D., *Petronius. Apocolocyntosis - Seneca*, London, 1975.
- Marx, F., *C. Lucilii carminum reliquiae* (volumes I and II), Lipsiae, 1904.
- Muecke, F., *Horace: Satires II*, Warminster, 1993.
- Müller, K. & Ehlers, W., *Petronius Satyrice*, Munich, 1983.
- Warmington, E.H., *Remains of Old Latin (Volume I) - Ennius*, London, 1935.
- Warmington, E.H., *Remains of Old Latin (Volume III) - Lucilius*, London, 1938.

b) Epic

- Bailey, C. *Lucreti De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, Oxford, 1898.
- Duff, J.D., *Lucan*, London, 1928.
- Jackson Knight, W.F., *Virgil: The Aeneid*, Harmondsworth, 1956.
- Melville, A.D. (with Kenney, E.J.), *Ovid Metamorphoses*, Oxford, 1986.
- Miller, F.J., *Metamorphoses / Ovid*, London, 1916.
- Mozley, J.H., *Valerius Flaccus*, London, 1934.
- Murray, A.T., *Iliad / Homer* (Volumes I and II), London, 1919.
- Murray, A.T., *The Odyssey; Homer* (Volumes I and II), London, 1924.
- Rouse, W.H.D., *De Rerum Natura / Lucretius*, London, 1975.
- Seaton, R.C., *Apollonius Rhodius The Argonautica*, London, 1912.
- Skutsch, O., *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*, Oxford, 1985.
- Williams, R.D., *The Aeneid of Virgil*, London, 1972.

Secondary Resources

(All abbreviations are standard, as found in *L'Année Philologique*.)

- Adams, J.N. & Meyer, R.G. (editors), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*. Oxford, 1999.
- Ahl, F., *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and other Classical Poets*. London, 1985.
- Ahl, F., "Form Empowered: Lucan's *Pharsalia*", in Boyle (1993), pp. 124-142.
- Anderson, W.S., "Juvenal 6: A problem in Structure," *CP* 51 (1956), pp. 73-94.
- Anderson, W.S., "The Programs of Juvenal's later books," *CP* 57 (1962), pp. 145-160.
- Anderson, W.S., *Essays on Roman Satire*, Princeton, NJ, 1982.
- Anderson, W.S., "Juvenal, *Satire* 15: Cannibals and Culture," *Ramus* 16 (1987), pp. 203-214.
- Astbury, R., "Petronius, *P. Oxy.* 3010, and Menippean Satire", *CP* 72 (1977), pp. 22-31.
- Austin, O.L., *Birds of the World*, London, 1961.
- Baldwin, B., "Ira Priapi," *CP* 68 (1973), pp. 294-296.
- Barnes, W.R., "Horace, *Sermones* I, 5.104," *Prudentia* 20 (1988), pp. 57-59.
- Blakeney, E.H., *Juvenal's Tenth Satire and Johnson's The Vanity of Human Wishes*, London, 1925.
- Bodel, J., "The *Cena Trimalchionis*", in Hofmann (1999), pp. 38-51.
- Bodoh, J.J., "Reading Laocoon in Virgil and Petronius," *L'Antiquité Classique* 56 (1987), pp. 269-274.
- Bonner, S.F., *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire*, Liverpool, 1969.
- Boyle, A.J. (editor), *Roman Epic*, London, 1993.
- Bramble, J.C., *Persius and the Programmatic Satire: A Study in Form and Imagery*. Cambridge, 1974.
- Braund, S.H., "Juvenal 7.50-52", *Phoenix* 36 (1982), pp. 162-166.
- Braund, S.H., *Beyond Anger: A Study of Juvenal's Third Book of Satires*. Cambridge, 1988.
- Braund, S.H. (editor), *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*. Exeter, 1989.
- Braund, S.H., *Roman Verse Satire*, Oxford, 1992.
- Braund, S.H., "A woman's voice - Laronia's role in Juvenal *Satire* 2". in *Women in Antiquity: new assessments* (ed. R. Hawley & B. Levick), pp. 207-219, London, 1995.
- Braund, S.M., *Juvenal: Satires, Book I*, Cambridge, 1996.

- Brink, C.O., “Second Thoughts on Three Horatian Puzzles”, in Harrison (1995). pp. 267-278.
- Buchheit, V., “Homerparodie und Literarkritik in Horazens *Satiren* I.7 und I.9”. *Gymnasium* 75 (1968), pp. 519-555.
- Cameron, A.M., “Myth and meaning in Petronius; some modern comparisons.” *Latomus* 29 (1970), pp. 397-425.
- Camps, W.A., *Propertius: Elegies*, Cambridge, 1965.
- Cèbe, J.P., *Varron, Satires Ménippées* (volumes 1-13), Rome, 1972.
- Classen, C.J., “Die Kritik des Horaz an Lucilius in den *Satiren* I.4 und I.5”. *Hermes* 109 (1981), pp. 339-360.
- Classen, C.J., “Satire, the elusive genre,” *SO* 63 (1988), pp. 95-121.
- Clausen, W., *A Commentary on Virgil: Eclogues*, Oxford, 1994.
- Coffey, M., *Roman Satire*, London, 1976.
- Connors, C., *Petronius the poet: Verse and literary tradition in the Satyricon*, Cambridge, 1998.
- Connors, C., “Rereading the Arbiter: *arbitrium* and verse in the *Satyricon* and in ‘*Petronius redivivus*’”, in Hofmann (1999), pp. 64-77.
- Conte, G.B., *The Hidden Author: An Interpretation of Petronius’ Satyricon*, London, 1996.
- Courtney, E., “Parody and Literary Allusion in Menippean Satire”, *Philologus* 106 (1962), pp. 86-100.
- Courtney, E., *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London, 1980.
- Courtney, E., “Petronius and the Underworld,” *AJPh* 108 (1987), pp. 408-410.
- Courtney, E., *The Poems of Petronius*, Atlanta, GA, 1991.
- D’Alton, J.F., *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism: A Study in Tendencies*, London, 1931.
- De Quehen, H., *Lucy Hutchinson’s Translation of Lucretius: De Rerum Natura*, London, 1996.
- De Smet, I.A.R. *Menippean Satire and the Republic of Letters, 1581-1655*. Geneva, 1996.
- Deroux, C. (editor), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History V*. Bruxelles. 1989.
- Diggle, J., “Juvenal 8.220,” *Classical Review* 88 (N.S. 24) (1974), pp. 183-184.
- Dominik, W.J., “From Greece to Rome: Ennius’ *Annales*”, in Boyle (1993), pp. 37-58.
- Drew, D.L., *The Allegory of the Aeneid*, Oxford, 1927.

- Duckworth, G.E., *The Nature of Roman Comedy: A Study in Popular Entertainment*, Princeton, NJ, 1952.
- Duff, J.D., *Fourteen Satires of Juvenal*, Cambridge, 1970.
- Duff, J.W., *Roman Satire: Its Outlook on Social Life*, Cambridge, 1937.
- Eden, P.T., *Seneca, Apocolocyntosis*, Cambridge, 1984.
- Edwards, M.J., “Horace, Homer and Rome: *Epistles* I.2,” *Mnemosyne* 45 (1992), pp. 83-88.
- Ehlers, W.W., “Das ‘Iter Brundisium’ des Horaz,” *Hermes* 113 (1985), pp. 69-83.
- Estevez, V., “Umbricius and Aeneas: a reading of Juvenal 3,” *Maia* 48 (1996), pp. 281-299.
- Feeney, D., *The Gods in Epic*, Oxford, 1991.
- Ferguson, J., *Juvenal: The Satires*, Bristol, 1979.
- Flintoff, T.E.S., “Juvenal’s Fourth *Satire*,” *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* (volume 6) (1990), pp. 121-138.
- Fraenkel, E., *Horace*, Oxford, 1957.
- Fredericks, S.C., “The function of the Prologue (1-20) in the Organisation of Juvenal’s Third *Satire*,” *Phoenix* 27 (1973), pp. 62-67.
- Fredericks, S.C., “Seneca and Petronius: Menippean Satire under Nero”, in Ramage, Sigsbee, & Fredericks (1974a), pp. 89-113.
- Fredericks, S.C., “Juvenal: A Return to Invective”, in Ramage, Sigsbee, & Fredericks (1974b), pp. 136-169.
- Fredericks, S.C., “Juvenal’s Fifteenth *Satire*,” *ICS* 1 (1976), pp. 174-189.
- Fredericks, S.C., “Irony of Overstatement in the *Satires* of Juvenal,” *ICS* 4 (1979), pp. 178-191.
- Gale, M., *Myth and Poetry in Lucilius*, Cambridge, 1994.
- Galinsky, G.K., *Ovid’s Metamorphoses: An Introduction to the Basic Aspects*, Oxford, 1975.
- George, P.A., “Petronius and Lucan *De bello civili*,” *CQ* 68 (N.S. 24) (1974), pp. 119-133.
- Gifford, W., *Juvenal’s Satires (With the Satires of Persius)*, London, 1992.
- Gildersleeve, B.L., *The Satires of A. Persius Flaccus*, New York, NY, 1979.
- Gowers, E., *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*, Oxford, 1993a.
- Gowers, E., “Horace, *Sat.* I,5: an inconsequential journey,” *PCPhS* 39 (1993b), pp. 48-66.

- Griffin, J., "Horace in the thirties", in *Horace 2000: a celebration: essays for the bimillennium* (ed. N. Rudd), pp. 1-22, London, 1993.
- Hardie, A., "Juvenal and the Condition of Letters: the Seventh *Satire*," *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* (volume 6) (1990), pp. 145-209.
- Hardy, E.G., *The Satires of Juvenal*, London, 1951.
- Harrison, S.J. (editor), *Homage to Horace: a bimillenary celebration*, Oxford, 1995.
- Harvey, R.A., *A Commentary on Persius*, Leiden, 1981.
- Henderson, J.G.W., "Not women in Roman satire but when satire writes 'woman'", in Braund (1989), pp. 89-125.
- Henderson, J., "Pump up the Volume: Juvenal I.1-21," *PCPhS* 41 (1995), pp. 101-137.
- Hight, G., *Juvenal the Satirist*, Oxford, 1954.
- Hight, G., *The Anatomy of Satire*, Princeton, NJ, 1962.
- Hinds, S., *Allusion and Intertext: dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*, Cambridge, 1998.
- Hofmann, H. (editor), *Latin Fiction*, London, 1999.
- Hooley, D.M., "Persius' refractory muse: Horatian echoes in the sixth *Satire*," *AJPh* 114 (1993), pp. 137-154.
- Housman, A.E., *Classical papers*, Cambridge, 1972.
- Hoyos, D., "Gourd god!: the meaning of *Apocolocyntosis*," *LCM* 16 (1991), pp. 68-70.
- Hudson, N.A., "Food in Roman satire", in Braund (1989), pp. 69-87.
- Jenkinson, J.R., *Persius: The Satires*, Warminster, 1980.
- Jocelyn, H.D., "The Poems of Q. Ennius," *ANRW* volume I.2 (1972), pp. 987-1026.
- Jones, F., "A note on Juvenal *Sat.* 7.86", *CQ* 76 (N.S. 32) (1980), pp. 478-479.
- Jones, F., "Juvenal, *Satire VII*", in Deroux (1989), pp. 444-464.
- Kilpatrick, R.S., "Juvenal's 'Patchwork' *Satires*," *YCS* 23 (1973), pp. 229-241.
- Kragelund, P., "Epicurus, Priapus and the Dreams in Petronius", *CQ* 83 (N.S. 39) (1989), pp. 436-450.
- Krenkel, W.A., "Horace's approach to satire," *Arethusa* 5 (1972), pp. 7-16.
- Leach, E.W., "The implied reader and the political argument in Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* and *De Clementia*," *Arethusa* 22 (1989), pp. 197-230.
- Lee, G., *Horace: Odes and Carmen Saeculare*, Trowbridge, 1998.
- Lelièvre, F.J., "Virgil and Juvenal's Third *Satire*," *Euphrosyne* 5 (1972), pp. 457-462.
- Luck, G., "On Petronius' *Bellum Civile*," *AJPh* 93 (1972), pp. 133-141.
- Macleod, C., *Horace: The Epistles*, Rome, 1986.

- Martyn, J.R.C., *Friedlander's Essays on Juvenal*, Amsterdam, 1969.
- Mayer, R., *Horace: Epistles*, Cambridge, 1994.
- McDermott, M.H., "The *Satyricon* as a parody of the *Odyssey* and Greek romance," *LCM* 8 (1983), pp. 82-85.
- McGann, M.J., "The Three Worlds of Horace's *Satires*", in *Classical Literature and its Influence: Horace* (ed. C.D.N. Costa), pp. 59-93, London, 1973.
- McKim, R., "Philosophers and Cannibals: Juvenal's Fifteenth *Satire*," *Phoenix* 40 (1986), pp. 58-71.
- Morford, M., "A note on Juvenal 6.627-61," *CP* 67 (1972), pp. 198.
- Morford, M., *Persius*, Boston, MA, 1984.
- Motto, A.L. & Clarke, J.R., "Per iter tenebricosum. The mythos of Juvenal 3," *TAPhA* 96 (1965), pp. 267-276.
- Muecke, F., "Law, Rhetoric, and Genre in Horace, *Satires* 2.I", in Harrison (1995), pp. 203-218.
- Newton, R.M., "Trimalchio's hellish bath," *CJ* 77 (1982), pp. 315-319.
- Pearson, C.H. & Strong, H.A., *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*, Oxford, 1892.
- Petersmann, H., "The Language of Early Roman Satire: Its Function and Characteristics", in Adams & Meyer (1999), pp. 289-310.
- Pollmann, K., "Die Funktion des Mythos in den Satiren Juvenals", *Hermes* 124 (1996), pp. 480-490.
- Post, E., *Selected Epigrams of Martial*, London, 1908.
- Powell, J.G.F., "Stylistic Registers in Juvenal", in Adams & Meyer (1999), pp. 311-334.
- Ramage, E.S., "Ennius and the Origins of Roman Satire", in Ramage, Sigsbee, & Fredericks (1974a), pp. 8-26.
- Ramage, E.S., "Persius, the Philosopher-Satirist", in Ramage, Sigsbee, & Fredericks (1974b), pp. 114-135.
- Ramage, E.S., "Juvenal, *Satire* 12: On Friendship True and False," *ICS* 3 (1978), pp. 221-237.
- Ramage, E.S., Sigsbee, D.L., & Fredericks, S.C. (editors), *Roman Satirists and their Satire: The Fine Art of Criticism in Ancient Rome*. Park Ridge. NJ, 1974.
- Relihan, J.C. *Ancient Menippean Satire*, Baltimore, MD, 1993.
- Richardson, T.W., "The Sacred Geese of Priapus? (*Satyricon* 136.4ff.)", *MH* 37 (1980), pp. 98-103.
- Riffaterre, M., "Compulsory reader response: the intertextual drive". in Worton & Still (1990), pp. 56-78.

- Riikonen, H.K., *Menippean satire as a literary genre, with special reference to Seneca's Apocolocyntosis*, Helsinki, 1987.
- Ronnick, M.V., "Form and Meaning of Juvenal's Twelfth *Satire*," *Maia* 45 (1993), pp. 7-10.
- Roth, P., "Two notes on Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*," *Latomus* 46 (1987), pp. 806-809.
- Roth, P., *Seneca, Apocolocyntosis*, Bryn Mawr, PA, 1988.
- Rudd, N., *Themes in Roman Satire*, London, 1986.
- Sandy, G.N., "Satire in the *Satyricon*", *AJPh* 90 (1969), pp. 292-303.
- Sandy, G.N., "Scaenica Petroniana", *TAPhA* 104 (1974), pp. 329-346.
- Saylor, C., "Funeral Games: the Significance of Games in the *Cena Trimalchionis*", *Latomus* 46 (1987), pp. 593-602.
- Scott, I.G., *The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal*, Northampton, MA, 1927.
- Sigsbee, D.L., "The Disciplined Satire of Horace", in Ramage, Sigsbee, & Fredericks (1974), pp. 64-88.
- Singleton, D., "Juvenal 6.1-20 and the Golden Age," *G&R* 19 (1972), pp. 151-165.
- Singleton, D., "Juvenal's Fifteenth *Satire*: a reading," *G&R* 30 (1983), pp. 198-207.
- Slater, N.W., *Reading Petronius*, London, 1990.
- Smith, W.F., "Heroic models for the sordid present: Juvenal's view of tragedy," *ANRW* volume II.33.1 (1989a), pp. 811-823.
- Smith, W.F., "Greed and Sacrifice in Juvenal's Twelfth *Satire*," *TAPhA* 119 (1989b), pp. 287-298.
- Sochatoff, A.F., "The purpose of Petronius' *Bellum Civile*. A re-examination," *TAPhA* 93 (1962), pp. 449-458.
- Solodow, J.B., *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses*, London, 1988.
- Sullivan, J.P., *The Satyricon of Petronius: a literary study*, London, 1968.
- Sullivan, J.P., "Form Opposed: Elegy, Epigram, Satire", in Boyle (1993), pp. 143-161.
- Toohey, P., *Reading Epic: an introduction to the ancient narratives*, London, 1992.
- Troost, L.V., "Economic Discourse in the Savoy Operas of W.S. Gilbert", in *Theorizing Satire* (ed. B.A. Connery & K. Combe), pp. 193-207, New York, NY, 1995.
- Van Rooy, C.A., *Studies in Classical Satire & Related Literary Theory*, Leiden, 1966.
- Van Rooy, C.A., "Arrangement and Structure of Satires in Horace. *Satires* I.1-4," *Acta Classica* 11 (1968), pp. 38-72.
- Von Albrecht, M., *A History of Roman Literature*. Leiden, 1997.
- Von Albrecht, M., *Roman epic: an interpretative introduction*. Leiden, 1999.

- Walsh, P.G., "Eumolpus, the *Halosis Troiae*, and the *De bello civili*," *CP* 63 (1968), pp. 208-212.
- Walsh, P.G., *The Roman Novel*, Cambridge, 1970.
- Wilson, H.L., *D. Iuni Iuvenalis Saturarum Libri V*, Boston, MA, 1903.
- Winkler, M.M., "The Function of Epic in Juvenal's Satires", in Deroux (1989), pp. 414-443.
- Winkler, M., "A Virgilian Echo in Juvenal's Eleventh *Satire*," *RhM* 133 (1990), pp. 375-378.
- Witke, E.C., "Juvenal 3, an Eclogue of the Urban Poor," *Hermes* 90 (1962), pp. 244-248.
- Witke, C., *Latin Satire: The Structure of Persuasion*, Leiden, 1970.
- Worton, M. & Still, J. (editors), *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*, Manchester, 1990.
- Zeitlin, F.I., "Romanus Petronius. A study of the *Troiae Halosis* and the *Bellum Civile*," *Latomus* 30 (1971), pp. 56-82.
- Zetzel, J.E.G., "Lucilius, Lucretius, and Persius I.1," *CP* 72 (1977), pp. 40-42.