

Juvenal, Martial and the Augustans: An Analysis of the Production and Reception of
Satiric Poetry in Flavian Rome

by

Angelica Pass
B.A., University of Victoria, 2007

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Greek and Roman Studies

© Angelica Pass, 2012
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisory Committee

Juvenal, Martial and the Augustans: An Analysis of the Production and Reception of
Satiric Poetry in Flavian Rome

by

Angelica Pass
B.A., University of Victoria, 2007

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Cedric Littlewood (Department of Greek and Roman Studies)
Supervisor

Dr. Josiah Davis (Department of Greek and Roman Studies)
Departmental Member

Abstract

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Cedric Littlewood (Department of Greek and Roman Studies)
Supervisor

Dr. Josiah Davis (Department of Greek and Roman Studies)
Departmental Member

This thesis is about the creation, reception and dissemination of poetry in Flavian Rome as depicted in the satires of Juvenal and the epigrams of Martial. It deals with their relationship with their Augustan predecessors, especially Horace. It discusses the rhetoric of decline that pervades early Juvenalian satire, and to some degree, Martial's epigrams, especially in relation to an idealized and self-proclaimed Golden Age several generations before. It argues that this decline is representative of a political decline since the Age of Augustus and feelings of disenfranchisement of upper-class men under autocratic rule. It also examines the embeddedness of Flavian literature within its urban social context and the ways in which Martial and Juvenal handle the increasing interconnectedness of life and art in relation to their Augustan predecessors. There are three chapters, entitled *Amicitia* and Patronage, the *Recusatio*, and Locating the Poetic Feast.

Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Acknowledgments.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: <i>Amicitia</i> and Patronage	15
1.1: Patronage and Friendship, an Introduction	17
1.2: <i>Amicitia</i> in Juvenal.....	22
1.3: <i>Amicitia</i> in Martial.....	40
Chapter 2: The <i>Recusatio</i>	51
2.1: The Callimachean and Augustan <i>Recusatio</i>	53
2.2: The Satiric <i>Recusatio</i>	66
2.3: Satire and Epic	71
2.4: The <i>Recusatio</i> in Martial.....	79
Chapter 3: Locating the Poetic Feast	87
3.1: The Grove	89
3.2: Food and Satire in Horace	93
3.3: Food and Satire in Juvenal.....	99
3.4: Juvenal in the City	101
3.5: Juvenal's Rustic Parody and Augustan Ideals of Separation.....	105
3.6: Martial.....	110
3.6a: Decline in Martial	111
3.6b: Martial in the Country.....	113
3.6c: Food and Satire in Martial	120
3.6d: The Saturnalian Epigrams.....	126
Conclusion	136
Bibliography	144

Acknowledgments

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor, Cedric Littlewood, for his patience and guidance during this long and arduous process. Also thanks to the rest of the Department of Greek and Roman Studies for encouragement and inspiration while I was an undergraduate and MA student. I am also, of course, grateful to my friends and family who have always supported me with good humour. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the University of Victoria and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for the financial assistance that enabled me to complete this thesis.

Introduction

This paper will focus on the relationship between the poets Martial and Juvenal and their Augustan predecessors, particularly Horace and to a lesser degree, Virgil. Martial and Juvenal in the genres of epigram and satire respectively, often represent their world in a state of decline, specifically from a self-styled Golden Age of literary production several generations before.¹ This Golden Age occurred under the reign of the emperor Augustus, where patronage and appreciation for literature flourished. Martial and Juvenal both portray themselves as impoverished writers, living in the squalor of the Roman city where their writing is not appreciated and they have to struggle to make ends meet. This is not a world that can produce literature that will last purely due to its dedication to aesthetic quality—Juvenal even explicitly disavows aesthetic value for his poetry, saying that it is bankrupt and arises solely from his indignation. Literature has become degraded, reflecting the degraded society that produces it, and a commodity to be exchanged for immediate rewards rather than a product to last throughout the ages.

However, from the few biographical facts that we do know about these later poets, we know that they were not impoverished (This will be discussed in Chapter 1). Martial also states that his epigrams are able to offer something of value, mostly to his social circle whose activities they record, but also to the entire world. Therefore, the question must be asked, if this rhetoric of decline does not reflect a literal decline, or even necessarily a literary one, what does it reflect? I think that it demonstrates two writers

¹ For references to the Golden Age in Augustan literature, see *Aeneid* 8.324 (a reference to the Age of Saturn as a Golden Age) and 8.348 (the reference to the current city of Rome as golden in comparison to an overgrown expanse in the time of Evander) and *Eclogues* 4 (a reference to the birth of a child beckoning a new golden age, the child being the likely offspring of Antony and Octavia).

coming to terms with the interconnectedness of life and art—brought about by an increasing professionalization of literature—as well as negotiating ways to survive and prosper as literary men under an increasingly autocratic regime. While the early satires of Juvenal especially reveal a rather dismal view of a world of poetry as mendicant, mercenary and prostituted, in Martial we often see a celebration of literature that is firmly embedded within society and with an integral role in social exchange. Through the acceptance and celebration of poetry as a professional pursuit, we see Martial offering a new code for the production of quality literature, which relied neither on aesthetic purity or a political regime, two concerns of the Augustans which were often diametrically opposed. Furthermore, from the vantage point of writing literature while immersed in society, we see these later poets questioning the ideals of separation and independence that were so important to their predecessors. While direct comparisons with the Augustans could serve to highlight the decline in literature in the Flavian era, these comparisons also draw attention to the tensions inherent in this idealized world, tensions that were already present within Augustan poetry. They reflect not only a new place for literature but also a new hope for the immortality of the poetic product in a world that has drastically changed.

The difficulty in drawing comparisons across genres and time periods is that changes in literary outlooks can be brought about by a multitude of factors. To simply compare Juvenalian satire with Virgilian pastoral or Propertian elegy, for example, and on this basis to compare Augustan and Flavian Rome would be ineffective since the concerns and perspective of satire are different from those of pastoral or elegy in any time period. The major touchstone in my comparative discussion will be Horace. In

addition to composing *Odes*, *Epodes* and *Epistles*, Horace also wrote extensively in the satiric genre and it is to Horace that Juvenal and Martial most often draw connections. In *Satires* 1, which will be discussed at several points in this paper, Juvenal states that the vices pervading Rome are worthy of the Venusian lamp, a reference to Horatian satire, since Horace was born in Venusia (*Satires* 1.51). Similarly, in *Satires* 7, Juvenal draws comparisons between patronage in his age and patronage in the Golden Age with references to Horace (*Satires* 7.62). Similarly, Martial, while writing epigram instead of satire, also establishes himself as following in Horace's steps; in 1.107, he says that he would write a great work if he were given the leisure that Maecenas gave to Horace. He chooses targets common to Horatian satire (and Roman satire in general) such as legacy hunters (Martial 1.10 and 4.56; Horace *Satires* 2.5), guests or hosts with bad table manners (Martial 5.79 and 3.82; Horace *Satires* 2.5), and adulterers (Martial 1.74, 6.22, 6.24, 11.7; Horace *Satires* 1.2).² He also allies his writing with the Horatian ideas that satirical literature is subpoetic and can offer ethical instruction (Horace *Satires* 1.4, Martial 10.4).³ While Martial and Juvenal certainly borrow from other Augustan poets as well, particularly Virgil, and these relationships will be part of this discussion, it is Horace that provides a generic predecessor and consequently Horace that allows comparative analysis of the changing context of literary production in Augustan and Flavian Rome.

In order to begin any literary analysis, it is important to first discuss the historical periods that fostered this literary production, starting with a brief overview of the changing political and social structures that defined the Augustan era. Octavian, as

² See Sullivan (1991): 103-105 for further discussion of Martial's debt to Horace.

³ Spisak (2007): 20-22.

Augustus was originally called, was the adopted son of Julius Caesar, and after the assassination of Julius Caesar in 44 BC, Octavian was involved in a bloody civil war, culminating in his defeat of Mark Antony and Cleopatra at the Battle of Actium in 31 BC and in Alexandria in 30 BC. He quickly moved to consolidate his power and legitimize his rule, that of a single man, over the formerly Republican city of Rome; he staged a great ceremony in 29 BC to mark his victories and celebrate the coming of peace to a city beleaguered by civil war. In 27 BC, he assumed the title of Augustus. The rule of Augustus marked not only a period of stability in which patronage for the arts could flourish, but also the coming of a new era of imperial rule although the principate was initially distinguished from autocracy and likened to Republican rule by the definition of the emperor as *princeps senatus*, first of the senate, or *primus inter pares*, first amongst equals. In his *Res Gestae*, Augustus styles himself as the restorer of the Republic after a period of civil unrest (*RG* 1) and states that he refused to assume any title or authority contrary to the traditions of Rome's ancestors (*RG* 6).

The Augustan Golden Age of literary achievement roughly spans the years between Julius Caesar's assassination and the death of Augustus in 14 AD. The creation of an imperial system and the personal influence of the imperial ruler—especially on Virgil and Horace who became close acquaintances of the emperor, under the mediating influence of their patron, Maecenas—would be formative in the literature that was produced during this age. Poets, like most citizens, had reason to welcome this new order and the opportunity to use their art for pragmatic reasons, namely to associate themselves with someone in a position of authority.⁴ This is not entirely a new thing since poets such as Ennius and Lucilius also recorded their relationships with men of authority in their

⁴ White (1993): 207.

poetry but what has changed is the creation of a regime that they could also associate with. The new imperial rule of Augustus, marked not only by his great victories over adversaries but also the reinvigoration of religious cults and civic rituals as well as monumental new building regimes, provided plenty of material for celebration. Bearing witness to the overthrow of the senatorial Republic and inauguration of state control under one leader meant negotiation of these themes in literature; Virgil's *Aeneid*, for example, provides justification for Augustus' rule by establishing a foundation for this rule as far back as the foundation of the city of Rome itself.

While Virgil and Horace's poetry marks the culmination of the Golden Age of Latin literature, the Silver Age started immediately after Augustus' death in 14 AD.⁵ After the death of Augustus, the succession of Julio-Claudian emperors was as follows: Tiberius (14-37), Caligula (37-41), Claudius (41-54) and Nero (54-68), a succession which in the most general terms can be said to go from good to bad. Similarly, after the tumultuous year of four emperors (68-6) the succession of Flavian emperors follows a similar pattern: Vespasian (69-79), Titus (79-81) and Domitian (81-96), whose rule parallels the despotic tyranny of his Julio-Claudian predecessor Nero. While Domitian marks the end of the Flavian line, for the purposes of this essay, Juvenal will often be referred to in conjunction with Martial as Flavian, since his concerns often reflect those of the Flavian age, although he was properly writing a little bit later under Nerva (96-98), Trajan (98-117) and Hadrian (117-138).

This thesis will explore the relationships between Augustan and Flavian literature in two major ways. The first will be an exploration of the rhetoric of decline that

⁵ Unlike the Golden Age, the Silver Age was never called such at the time, but there was a rhetoric of decline common not just to Martial and Juvenal, as we shall see with the discussion of Longinus below.

permeates much of Flavian literature—often expressed through comparisons to the Augustan Golden Age—and how this reflects feelings of disenfranchisement of upper class men under an increasingly autocratic regime. This is particularly prominent in the early Juvenalian satires, where the inequalities of interpersonal relationships are framed in the context of the tyrannical rule of Domitian. The second will look at the embeddedness of Flavian literature within society—which seems to have been related to an increasingly autocratic regime—versus the desire for autonomy and separation in Augustan literature. While contrasts with their Augustan predecessors may on the surface appear to cast Flavian poetry in a diminished light, they also seem to question the attainability of Augustan ideals and offer a more realistic role for poetry within society.

During the intervening period between Augustan and Flavian Rome, there were many changes; especially notable for this paper were the political changes that came about with emperors such as Nero and Domitian. As stated above, the autocracy of Augustus was masked as the revival of Republican rule; however, by the time that Martial and Juvenal were writing, imperial rule was well-established. The tyrannical rule of Domitian was a major influence in both their writing, often negatively contrasted with the freedom and respect for men of a senatorial class under Augustus. In this thesis, the rhetoric of decline that permeates a great deal of early Juvenalian satire and, to a smaller degree, the epigrams of Martial, will be read as commentary on the political decline brought about by tyrannical rule. References to decline are extensive in Juvenal, whether it is a decline in the rights of clients, the impoverished poet himself being amongst these clients, or a decline in literary appreciation and achievement. However, the persona of the impoverished poet is not likely to represent Juvenal's actual circumstances; while biographical information in his satires is

scarce, there was an inscription found at Aquinum, Juvenal's birthplace,⁶ which mentions a Juvenalis honoured as captain of a cohort. This position would have put him into the class of knights, or *equites*, meaning he had a capital of at least 400 000 sesterces, which was more than enough to live in modest comfort.⁷ However, in Book 1 especially, the inequalities of the patron-client relationship intermingle with satirical commentary on the reign of Domitian. These unequal relationships can all be read in the light of their political surroundings; by focusing on the inequalities in relationships between patrons and clients, the satirist is highlighting the inequalities between upper class men and the emperor, a divide which Augustus attempted to mask but which became more and more prominent as the imperial era progressed.

It is also important that the decline in literary quality that Juvenal bemoans at many points in his corpus—discussed primarily in Chapter 2 of this thesis—can also be related to autocratic rule. Longinus, a Greek literary critic who most likely lived in the first century AD, wrote a treatise on how to write good poetry entitled *On the Sublime*. In chapter 44, he argues that while democracy is the nurse of genius, people who grow up as slaves under despotic rule cannot appreciate eloquence and liberty and subsequently his current age has no understanding of fine art. This makes the connection between despotic rule and a decline in literary quality in the Silver Age explicit and in Juvenal, by focusing on his own and his age's inability to produce and appreciate good art, the satirist is commenting on the changing social environment which has fostered this lack of appreciation.

With the increasing autocracy of imperial rule, by the Flavian era, poetry's involvement in the imperial regime was not a matter of debate and, consequently, a major

⁶ According to Umbricius in *Satires* 3.319.

⁷ White (1978): 88.

difference arises when comparing Flavian with Augustan poetry, namely the embeddedness of poetry within not only the political regime but also the imperial city itself. Martial's *Liber Spectaculorum* was published in 80 AD to celebrate the opening of Titus' amphitheatre and reveals the staging of nature and culture within the context of the Flavian amphitheatre, all under the gaze of the emperor. In Martial's next books, the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, which will be discussed in Chapter 3, we see a focus on the geographical provenance of the objects in the books, demonstrating Rome's cosmopolitan diversity and the city as a locus of display.⁸ The obsession with the constructs of the Flavian city is far more extensive than descriptions of the Augustan city within its literature and "in awarding primacy to the Flavian bricks and marble, [Martial] subverts the Augustan motif of the superior durability of poetic words."⁹ It is also important that Martial embraces his involvement in the imperial project no matter which emperor happens to be ruling at the time; his epigrams span the rule of three emperors and contain praise of all three.

The embeddedness of literature within the imperial program and the city will form another part of this argument, starting in Chapter 2 with a discussion of the Augustan deployment of the Callimachean aesthetic. The Callimachean aesthetic will be discussed in detail at the beginning of Chapter 2, but must be briefly outlined here. It consisted of a preference for small works opposed to large scale ones, poems that are sweet and soft rather than loud and weighty and ones that are refined and polished rather than large and poorly written. Divine intervention was also important to the Callimachean aesthetic in that the poet was bidden to write in the smaller genres by Apollo and this is the justification that he gives for his style of poetry. The notion of finely-wrought poetry that is answerable only

⁸ Roman (2010): 95.

⁹ Roman (2010): 112.

to the gods and the Muses rather than the general mob is important, as it forms a basis for aesthetic exclusivity. The Augustan poets incorporate aspects of the Callimachean aesthetic into their *recusationes*, or refusals to create politically influenced literature; they often portray themselves as being in the midst of composing epic or panegyric, dedicated to a noble addressee, when a god, often Apollo, tells them to write in the smaller genres such as elegy or pastoral. These refusals often occur within a carefully constructed poetic grove, and the creation of this space is significant since within it the poet is free from the vulgar reality of daily life as well as political influences. This posture of refusal and separation was meant to ensure that the poetry would adhere to the Callimachean standards and, in turn, last throughout the ages due to its aesthetic quality. It also adds a new political element since the refusal to write political poetry was not integral to the Callimachean aesthetic; his claims that the god Apollo has sanctioned his poetry are in response to criticisms that he does not write loud and thundering poetry but they are not issued in conjunction with a refusal to write poetry in praise of a noble patron. The fact that these Augustan *recusationes* mention the noble addressee by name is important as well since in mentioning the patron at all, the poet is highlighting his close relationship with that man while at the same time insisting that the aesthetic integrity of his poetry must not be influenced by this relationship. The aesthetic exclusivity of Callimacheanism is complexly repackaged to present a form of social exclusivity, with the poet and his noble patron forming a small appreciative circle, while the poet all the while circumscribes the role the patron plays, namely that he must allow the poet the autonomy needed for producing quality poetry.

This notion of Callimachean aesthetic exclusivity being repackaged as social exclusivity is even evident in Horatian satire, a genre which is usually defined by its quotidian nature and less concerned with claims of exclusivity. In *Satires* 2.1, for example, Horace offers his justification for writing satire and casts the emperor Augustus as Apollo and an aesthetic judge of poetry. By inviting the emperor into a poetic space—but only in the guise of a god and a judge of poetry—the poet is also creating a socially exclusive space, and limiting his audience to the members of the imperial court. This focus is not just on the quality of the work but also the autonomy of the poet from the pressures of everyday life and criticism and, importantly, his ability to define the role the emperor plays in his poetics. This relationship is tenuous, however, in that it relies on the poet to define his involvement with the emperor or patron and for the great man to respect this; the staging of tensions between patrons' expectations and poets' needs is found in Horace *Epistles* 1.7, where Horace seems to be answering to his patron Maecenas' complaints that the poet lingers too long in the country. It is further complicated by the fact that both Virgil and Horace wrote panegyric poetry and also tied the hopes for the immortality of their poetry not only to its aesthetic quality like Callimachus but also to the imperial regime, as we see in Horace *Odes* 3.30, for example, in which the poet claims that he has produced a monument more lasting than bronze, which will last as long as the imperial regime does.

In Martial and Juvenal, however, the distinctive space for poetic production and the careful negotiations between patrons' expectations and poets' autonomy is not found. As already mentioned, their poetry is deeply embedded in the city and in the imperial regime, for better or for worse. They reject the aesthetic values of the Augustans and the need to produce poetry in an exclusive and separate environment and in Juvenal, the outlook for

poetry that is so deeply interconnected with the circumstances of its production is often dismal; however, this is not always the case, especially in the later satires where there is some celebration of urban poetry as well as mockery of Augustan ideals of separation. In Martial, we see not only the acceptance of poetry's role in social exchange but even the impossibility of producing his type of poetry separate from the cosmopolis, demonstrated by his lack of productivity on his return to Spain. He celebrates his poetry's role in his present age—be it providing social commentary, praising patrons and the emperor or, in the Saturnalian poems, standing as substitutes for actual gifts—rather than the complex negotiation between the eternal values of poetry and the eternity of the Roman political regime. While on the surface his epigrams appear ephemeral and disposable and very opposed to the Callimachean ideal, they also have value to his social circle and will carry this value as long as they are exchanged and shared by the members of his community.

The major elements of contrast between Flavians and Augustans can be separated into three general thematic headings, which will form the chapters of this thesis. Chapter 1, on patronage or *amicitia*, begins with an exploration of what these terms meant in ancient Rome. Through a look at the descriptions of *amicitia* in Juvenal's early satires and especially the poor treatment of a client in *Satires 5*, which is a foil for an earlier satire of Horace, we see how these depictions reflect not only a decline in friendship in comparison to the idealized relationships of the Augustan era but also fears about the disenfranchisement of upper class Roman men under tyrannical imperial rule. The mirroring of poetry and prostitution in Juvenal Book 3 also depicts the production of literature as a mercenary activity. Juvenal's view of *amicitia* is mostly negative in these early satires; in Martial's epigrams, however, while many similar complaints about the lack

of respect for clients in Flavian Rome exist, there are also many instances of the poet expressing his gratitude for the gifts and support of several patrons. While the obvious connection between the production of epigrams and financial gain seems to indicate the mercenary nature of literary production in Martial as well, it is also reflective of the positive role poems can play in gift exchange, which formed the basis of Roman interpersonal relationships, and the realistic potential for poetry to be the basis of a man's livelihood. Martial's ability to express his expectations from his patrons in literary form demonstrates that the poet is comfortable writing from within society—rather than asserting his independence from his patron—and that he sees a place of value for his poetry within this society. Martial, and even to some degree Juvenal, call into question the supposed autonomy of their Augustan predecessors through direct comparisons between patronage “then and now” and Martial asserts the value of his poetic product in a way which does not rely on the Augustan code for the production of quality literature, namely focusing on epigram's role in gift exchange and its ability to commemorate and immortalize the activities of his social circle.

Chapter 2 focuses on the *recusatio*, which is a poetic refusal to write in the higher genres such as epic or to honour a noble addressee in panegyric due to the poet's dedication to the more personal small-scale genres such as lyric, pastoral or elegy. This was a common literary tool that allowed the Augustans to assert their independence from their patrons and from the sphere of political influence and to adhere to the Callimachean aesthetic code, which placed value in literature that was short, delicate and finely-wrought, rather than long, bombastic, and full of superfluous material. The satiric *recusatio*, evident in satiric poetry from Horace onward, takes a different form, however, in that the poet refuses to

write in the higher genres not because of a preference for the artistic quality of the smaller genres; instead, he rejects artifice altogether in preference for quotidian themes. Satire is not a genre that can focus on the separation of art from life since real life is its subject matter. Again, for Juvenal, we see the satiric *recusatio* and satire's relationship to epic unfold in a dark form; in refusing to write epic, the satirist merely produces a degraded version of epic since he sees the vices of his surroundings in epic terms but cannot live up to epic models. He sees little hope or value for his poetry in his current society. Martial, however, in his *recusationes*, presents a more hopeful view of a society where art mimics life. He refuses to write in the higher genres for financial rather than aesthetic reasons but unlike Juvenal, he can imagine an appreciative audience for his poetry and recognizes its value in recording every day themes since it is celebrated by those whose activities it commemorates. His focus on real life directly defies the Augustan ideal that quality poetry can only be produced when free of societal or political pressure, which was often complicated by the view that the immortality of poetry was ultimately tied to the immortality of the state. Martial's rejection of these Augustan parameters surrounding poetic production presents a new kind of poetic autonomy.

In Chapter 3, the relationship between the location for poetic production and modes of its consumption are examined. Food is a common metaphor for literature and for the Augustans, literature fed on a simple rustic country diet and produced in a grove or country estate, separate from the expectations of the patron and the trials of the city, is superior to that produced in the city. Even within these poems, however, we see the staging of tensions between the unrealistic hope of the poet relying on a patron for support but also asserting his separation from the great man. Furthermore, the desire for a simple rustic life is

problematic due to the fact that urbanity breeds sophistication in literary production and appreciation. For Martial and Juvenal, the poetic product is inseparable from the urban circumstances of its production and the vices of the city that serve as its fodder. While food metaphors are again often used to represent literature in decline in Juvenal's early satires and the poet bemoans the trials of life in the city versus an idealized rustic existence, in the later satires, we see a more moderate approach and even gentle mockery of the moralistic idealizing of country life, which seems to question the idealism and autonomy of his Augustan models. In Martial as well, the rustic existence is contrasted with the trials of the city; however, we also see what happens when a rustic retreat becomes available to the poet, namely that his type of poetry cannot exist separate from the city and, more importantly, the social circle that sustains it. Similarly, in his use of food metaphors to describe his poetic program, what often seems meager and inferior on the surface is actually favoured by people of good taste. The Saturnalian poems especially, and their obvious homage to Augustan predecessors, demonstrate epigram's ability to create an alternate space of literary experience that does not rely on the ideals of Augustan literary production to sustain it. It is possible to produce immortal and meaningful literature without the independence offered by a rustic retreat; Martial can operate from within a realm of political influence, which asserts a new kind of poetic autonomy and a route to immortality which is much different from and perhaps much more realistic than that of his Augustan predecessors.

Chapter 1: *Amicitia* and Patronage

This chapter will begin with a discussion of the meaning and significance of patronage and *amicitia*—friendship—in ancient Rome and will then examine the tensions inherent in Martial and Juvenal’s descriptions of *amicitia* within their poetry. Both poets discuss *amicitia* in decline and, in Juvenal’s case especially, this decline pervades all elements of society, particularly in the early satires.¹⁰ He presents the client-patron relationship as significantly degraded since the Augustan age and also often presents himself and his friends as impoverished clients. Since, as we shall see below, neither Juvenal nor Martial was actually impoverished, it is important to consider, what this rhetoric of decline means. In Juvenal’s early satires, references to *amicitia* in decline intermingle with references to the tyranny of Domitian and subsequently indicate a sense of disenfranchisement of elite men under an autocratic ruler. By hearkening back to the Golden Age, the satirist reflects a longing for not only the appreciation of poetic achievement in this age but also the Augustan political regime itself. Furthermore, the equation of poetry and prostitution in Book 3 demonstrates the satirist’s concerns about the possibility of poetry’s becoming a mercenary activity in a world where poets have come to rely on literature as their livelihood. The fears about producing quality poetry in the post-Augustan world also relates to concerns about autocracy since, as we saw in the introduction, Longinus expressed the impossibility of producing and appreciating good art under tyrannical rule. The reading of disenfranchisement and literature in decline in

¹⁰ Juvenal’s attitude towards friendship softens in the later satires, especially 11 and 12 as we shall see in Chapter 3 (pg. 109ff.). This is in accordance with the general transition in the later books away from the *indignatio* that pervades the first one. See Anderson (1962).

Juvenal is not absolute however; even within the description of the feast in *Satires* 5, it is possible to see elements of criticism of the Augustan regime he seems to praise so highly.

These elements of criticism are picked up even more obviously in Martial and it becomes clear that in often exaggerated descriptions of decline in *amicitia* and the hopeless position of the client in Flavian Rome, both Juvenal and Martial are drawing attention to some of the fictions of the perfect *amicitia* relationships in the Augustan Golden Age and the pressures and lack of freedom that poets must have felt even in this idealized era. In Martial, while there are examples of patronage in decline, there are also many examples of positive *amicitia* relationships. While the epigrammatist's focus on material exchange can be read as mercenary, it also reflects the valuable role he sees for his epigrams within the Roman practice of gift exchange and the comfort he feels in operating from within a society, rather than being set apart from it. The sometimes obsessive attitude towards poetry's material value and his relationships with his friends reflects the new attitude of a poet who sees his poetry as his livelihood for better or worse. While there are instances when disappointment could ensue if his role as poet was not valued, in general, by celebrating this role for literature, he is setting up his poems as an alternative to the Augustan ideals of autonomy and separation and providing a different view of literary quality. For Martial, the role of poetry in recording *amicitia* relationships demonstrates a new path to poetic immortality which is very different from, but not necessarily inferior to, that of the Augustans who place much of the value of their poetry in its ability to subscribe to the Callimachean aesthetic of literary quality and exclusivity.

1.1: Patronage and Friendship, an Introduction

Both Juvenal and Martial discuss a decline in interpersonal relationships, and often this decline is represented through direct comparisons to the relationship between Augustan writers and their generous patrons. In the later Flavian authors, there is a strong divide between an ideal of friendship, or *amicitia*, which involves a mutual cultural exchange of gifts, services and respect and what interpersonal relationships have seemingly become, which is entirely based on degrading material exchange with a lack of fairness and respect between the two parties. Before discussing this in more detail, it is important to understand what patronage and friendship meant in the ancient world.

According to Saller (1982), a patronage relationship, in its strictest sense, is defined in three ways.¹¹ Firstly, the relationship must be based on reciprocal exchange and mutual benefit. Secondly, the bond must be a personal one, which separates it from a commercial transaction in the marketplace. Thirdly, the bond is an unequal one, formed between a superior and inferior member, this being the main point that distinguishes it from friendship between equals.¹² Patronage performed a universal social function in the Roman world since it was used to unite the peripheries of the empire to the centres through the controlled access to goods and services.¹³ Patrons—the ruling elite—would control the routes of access to these resources, thus ensuring their clients' indebtedness and service to them, and in the early republic, patronage ensured social integration and

¹¹ Saller (1982): 1.

¹² This definition provides some difficulty, however, in that it seems that patrons could also be friends with their clients, as was the case with Maecenas and Horace. However, as we shall see throughout the thesis, the unequal nature of his relationship with Maecenas was the source of some anxiety for Horace.

¹³ Wallace-Hadrill (1989): 73.

control.¹⁴ While the transition to imperial rule brought about an even more centralized form of government, the basic function of patronage remained the same.

It is important to discuss some of the language used to describe patronage relationships and friendship (*amicitia*) in ancient times. Firstly, it is significant that nothing in imperial law or linguistic definition argued for a “technical” definition of patronage.¹⁵ The system and the language used to describe it was highly fluid; while modern translations and gradations (such as a differentiation between *amici*, friends, and *clientes*, clients) often obfuscate the overlap between patronage and friendship, the Romans applied the same language of friendship, trust and obligation to both types of relationships indifferently.¹⁶ While we might expect *patronus* and *cliens* to be the primary words used to describe relationships between unequal parties, this was not the case; *patronus* and *cliens* were only usually used in a legal sense, since the inferiority implied by the words excluded them from polite discourse.¹⁷ In general, the language of *amicitia*, was preferred since it was apparently ambiguous enough to encompass many classes of people, especially when qualifying adjectives such as *inferiores*, *minores*, or *pares* were added to distinguish between inferior and superior members.¹⁸ *Amicitia* generally involved exchanges of benefits, services and gratitude (*officia* and *beneficia*) between members. Romans applied the language of patronage and *amicitia* to a variety of

¹⁴ Wallace-Hadrill (1989): 74.

¹⁵ Saller (1989): 49.

¹⁶ Wallace-Hadrill (1989): 77.

¹⁷ Saller (1982): 9.

¹⁸ See White (1978): 81 for other qualifying adjectives that could be used such as *pauperes*, *tenuiores*, *humiles*, *mediocres* and *modici*.

relationships and the words *amicus*, *cliens* and *patronus* were “variously manipulated in different circumstances.”¹⁹

For the purposes of this thesis, it is also important to look at the relationship between poets and wealthy men, which was not distinct from the relationship between the great man and his other followers. The application of the modern terms of patronage to literary relationships is again not correct since the poets seldom would use this language themselves and the code of *amicitia* could fully encompass the treatment of poets. Clientage is also an inappropriate term since it creates too large a divide between the wealthy man and his companions. Furthermore, it suggests a formal arrangement based on reciprocal exchange and obligation rather than the looser parameters of personal esteem. Finally, it suggests that nonmaterial forms of assistance were more important than financial benefits, which does not correspond with the descriptions of client characters we find in first-century literature.²⁰ Therefore, from here on, the term patronage will mostly be replaced with the more broad terminology of friendship or *amicitia*, although when the difference in status needs to be clarified, I will call the wealthy man the patron and the inferior the client.

Almost all the major poets of the imperial age—including Martial and Juvenal—were amongst the Roman class of knights (*eques*) or senators,²¹ meaning they had at least a capital of four hundred thousand sesterces; this was enough money that, if invested

¹⁹ Saller (1989): 57. This will be evident in Juvenal’s alternating between *amicus* and *cliens* in *Satires* 3. See page 25.

²⁰ See especially Juvenal *Satires* 3.41-48; White (1982): 57-58.

²¹ White (1978): 88. Evidence for Martial’s status as an *eques* comes in *Epigrams* 5.13.1-2 (*sum, fateor, semperque fui, Callistratus, pauper / sed non obscurus nec male notus eques*, I am, I confess, and have always been poor, Callistratus, yet no obscure or ill-famed knight). As already mentioned in the introduction, Juvenal’s status is a little more difficult to prove but there was a Juvenalis honoured at Aquinam as captain of a cohort, which is likely the same person as Juvenal the satirist, due to Umbricius’ allusion to Aquinam as Juvenal’s birthplace at the end of *Satires* 3.

according to usual practices in land and loans, yielded enough income for a man to easily live in modest comfort.²² The vocation of poetry did not produce income in itself—at least the poet could not rely on it as a sole source of income—but it did provide other opportunities for poets through their assimilation into the upper class circles of society and the attachment to a wealthy *amicus*. It took a great deal of both time and skill to accompany the patron during his daily activities and adapt to his humor and occupations; White (1982) even states that by the imperial era, the role of the lesser *amicus* deserves to be considered as the “career most readily available in Roman society for an educated man of moderate means.”²³

The function of *amicitia* was determined by the need of the leisured class for display, companionship and diversion; its rewards came from the generosity that a wealthy gentleman was expected to show towards his circle of friends.²⁴ A poet’s ability to satisfy the literary cravings of a rich man and to increase the distinction of his name through its inclusion in poetic works made him a perfect addition to an entourage. It was possible that men assumed the occupation of poet in hopes of financial gain, due to a general preoccupation with getting money that pervaded the first century.²⁵ Eventually this would lead to an increasingly mercenary element evident in poetry, accompanied by the inevitable complaints when financial expectations were unfulfilled.²⁶

From these definitions, two central tensions arise, that will be important when looking at the writings of Martial and especially Juvenal. First, while *amicitia* relationships were personal ones, they were also unequal. The inequality in his

²² White (1982): 52.

²³ White (1982): 56.

²⁴ White (1982): 59.

²⁵ White (1982): 61.

²⁶ White (1982): 61.

relationship with Maecenas was some concern for Horace and both Martial and Juvenal complain about their patrons' lack of consideration and esteem for their clients.

Specifically, Juvenal exploits the language of *amicitia* to highlight the decline and inequality in interpersonal relationships.

A second tension arises when considering the role of literary men within *amicitia* relationships. While poets received many benefits from being engaged in relationships with great men—namely the sponsorship of recitations, praise and the circulation of books, acquaintance with other great friends and protection from slights or jealousy²⁷—it is also true that poets offered services to their patrons that others could not and therefore hoped to avoid some of the tasks of the daily client. For example, in Juvenal 7, as we shall see, the poet complains that the wealthy patron offers no material support for his man of letters despite his many services.

Another tension that arises when considering Martial and Juvenal especially is the complication between the ideal of friendship and mutual exchange and the mercenary aspect of *amicitia* that highlights its descriptions in the Flavian authors. The relationship is supposed to be a personal one but we see doles handed out in great quantities to masses of undifferentiated clients and poets trying to woo various patrons just to make ends meet. Martial and Juvenal reflect a world obsessed to a greater degree than their Augustan predecessors with the increased professionalism of poetry and its place within social exchange. Therefore, often *amicita* relationships, and especially the role of literature in social exchange are described in mercenary terms and it appears that the idealized relationships of old have been diminished to their lowest form. This concern

²⁷ White (1978): 85.

and obsession with decline will play an integral role in defining Juvenal and Martial's relationship with their Augustan predecessors.

1.2: *Amicitia* in Juvenal

From the outset of Juvenal's *Satires*, we see a world in which *amicitia* is in decline and often confusingly intertwined with the ethics of the marketplace. In his programmatic first satire, Juvenal states that it is impossible not to write satire in a city so corrupt with vice and the once-noble relationship between friends has devolved into a purely financial exchange. In the place of dinners once shared amongst friends, patrons and clients, the wealthy dine alone and the *sportula*, or a small basket, is offered to the client at the doorstep of the wealthy man (1.94ff). While the patron may have once provided a meal for his client in exchange for a day of service, this meagre payment is now expected to be adequate compensation. Furthermore, the *sportula* is insultingly administered. The steward of the patron's house carefully checks the client's face to ensure that he is not an impostor and the client has to wait amongst foreigners, upper magistrates (praetors and tribunes) and wealthy freedmen who likely do not need the contents of the small basket. This is a world in which the bond between client and patron has been entirely reduced to financial compensation for services and furthermore, the compensation does not appear to be equal to the client's hopes or expectations.

In the household in *Satires* 1, the wealthy man is also so far removed from his subjects that all classes of people are lumped together: magistrates, freedmen, foreigners and the poor client all wait together at the threshold. While Juvenal is bemoaning a decline in the ideal *amicitia* relationships of old, he is also bemoaning another type of

decline in the Flavian world, specifically the loss of class distinction and traditional privileges for wealthy men under an emperor who has come to exist on a separate plane from other elite.

Initially, under Augustus, the principate was distinguished from an autocracy and likened to republican rule by the definition of the emperor as *princeps senatus*, first of the senate or *primus inter pares*, first amongst equals. In his *Res Gestae*, Augustus styles himself as the restorer of the republic after a period of civil unrest (*Res Gestae* 1) and states that he refused to assume any title or authority contrary to the traditions of Rome's ancestors (*Res Gestae* 6). However, over time, the effort to conceal imperial rule under democratic titles faded. In his *De Clementia*, Seneca addresses the emperor Nero about clemency as a virtue in a ruler. Roller (2001) discusses this text and finds that the relationship between the ruler and his aristocratic subjects is described according to either the paradigm of the master and slave relationship or to the father and child relationship, with the former being bad and the latter good.²⁸ *De Clementia* offers these conflicting paradigms to Nero as a young emperor, presumably to encourage the proper treatment of aristocrats opposed to the humiliations and injuries suffered in some earlier reigns.²⁹ The need for such a text reflects the concerns of an aristocratic population under increasingly tyrannical imperial rule.

By the reign of Domitian, the imperial title had devolved completely into tyranny with the emperor rendering the power of the senate obsolete and asking to be called “*dominus et deus*”, master and god (Suetonius, *Domitian*, 13.2). The proximity of the poem on Domitian's reign, *Satires* 4, to the poem on *amicitia* at a banquet, *Satires* 5,

²⁸ Roller (2001): 246.

²⁹ Roller (2001): 233-247.

which will be discussed later in this chapter (pg. 29), shows Juvenal's belief in a connection between the devolution of *amicitia* and the decline in the rights of the political elite under despotic rule.

The decline in interpersonal relationships re-emerges in *Satires* 3 where the character Umbricius, apparently an old friend of the poet, tells of his choice to leave Rome due to the city's increasingly sordid nature. Umbricius says that he remains poor in Rome because he cannot demean himself either by performing the immoral jobs that others undertake to support themselves or by lying to gain favour (29-48). Furthermore, Umbricius laments that wealthy men choose hypocritical flatterers as clients, most of them Greek, rather than straightforward and honest Roman men such as himself (3.86-94). The rhetoric of this passage is particularly disparaging, with the word *amicus* being repeated ironically several times (7, 101, 107, 112, 121), while Umbricius styles himself as not a friend, but a client (125, 188), indicating that the conception of equality and mutual exchange that existed in the idealized *amicitia* relationships of old is no longer present. Instead, in these instances, the loyal client is tossed aside in exchange for Greek flatterers and must actually pay tribute to the patron's slaves in order to receive a meagre handout. Once again, as in *Satires* 1, the clients and servants appear as an undifferentiated mass before the patron.

It is also important to consider the perspective of Umbricius in this satire. The name Umbricius derives from the word *umbra*, meaning shadow, and here Umbricius is speaking from the perspective of a shadow or ghost who no longer belongs in Rome. This is further cemented by the fact that he is headed to Cumae, the home of the Sibyl and the entrance to the Underworld in the *Aeneid*. In *Satires* 2.8, which will be discussed in more

detail in its relationship to Juvenal's *Satires* 5, Horace refers to Maecenas' clients Balatro and Vibidius as shadows (*umbrae*). However, the position of the client-shadows in Horace is much better than in Juvenal. They give witty speeches and while the banquet ends in disaster for its host, Nasidienus, the shadows leave confidently with Maecenas. Umbricius, however, has no such hopeful escape; his choice is between a Rome in which he will never succeed or Cumae and the Underworld, where he will presumably, like a shadow, disintegrate into nothingness.

Umbricius also observes that patrons do not look at a man's character, only his income, status or proficiency in flattery; he laments that poor men even offer a source of amusement to the wealthy (3.123-153). While these complaints are not unique to the Flavian or post-Flavian age—in *De Officiis*, written in 44 BC, Cicero dedicates a section to this very point, that merit should be the primary concern when bestowing patronage, not the prosperity of the client (2.69-71)—here we see Juvenal handling a familiar topos with much more extreme indignation.

Satires 5, the last satire in Book 1, also offers insight into the Juvenalian view of *amicitia* in decline, specifically in the form of a banquet. The banquet was an important satirical topos in Greco-Roman culture as it performed a major social function. Through descriptions of the banquet, food becomes part of social dialogue and its various meanings can be created, such as its moral message in Horace's *Satires* 2.6 or its function in satirizing a foolish host in the Dinner of Trimalchio in Petronius' *Satyricon*.³⁰ Juvenal's banquet poem is particularly important in that it directly recalls Horace's *Satires* 2.8, which also has a banquet as its focal point. The similarities between the Juvenalian and Horatian satires are surely not accidental and must therefore be examined

³⁰ Poetry's use of food metaphors to describe the poetic program will be discussed in Chapter 3.

in some detail to learn about the relationship between Juvenal and his Augustan predecessor. On the surface, while humour pervades the Horatian satire, the Juvenalian one focuses on moral decline; all the characteristics of the Horatian banquet scene function to underline the main theme of the collapse of the traditional patron-client relationship.³¹ However, in recalling the Augustan poem so directly but in such a different style, it is also possible that Juvenal is perhaps questioning some of the idealized aspects of the Augustan *amicitia* relationships, particularly Horace's possible insecurities about his relationship with Maecenas.

To begin the comparison between the Juvenalian and Horatian banquet satires, it is useful to examine the general atmosphere, conversation and interaction of the guests at the banquet. In Horace, the various positions of most of the men are presented, including their seating arrangements, personalities, reactions to events and comic speeches.³² The interlocutor of Horace's satire, the comic poet Fundanius, was also a guest and describes the whole banquet for the entertainment of the reader. In general, the descriptions of the behaviour of various guests serve to create a convivial atmosphere.

In the banquet in Juvenal, however, the scene is very different. There is no attention paid to the antics of the guests, humorous or otherwise. Except for Trebius, none of the other guests are mentioned by name; he is obviously not alone at the feast since he was only invited to fill the third place on a cushion but the mention of other

³¹ Morford (1977): 220-221

³² A complete list of the guests and their seating locations are given (2.8, 20-23). Nasidienus' two clients are also revealed; Porcius, as his name would indicate, makes a pig of himself and Nomentanus aids his patron by describing features of the banquet that might have escaped the guests' attention (2.8.24-26). The comic antics of Vibidius and Balatro, the shadows of Maecenas, are also discussed: drinking too much (2.8. 33-35) giving ironic speeches, and joking around with the servants (2.8.80-83).

diners is rare.³³ There is no exchange between host and guest except for the original invitation to the banquet.³⁴ This lack of conversation and the fact that no other diners are mentioned creates a great sense of isolation of host and guest; by cutting out any other exchanges at the banquet, Juvenal could have created a sense of camaraderie between Virro and Trebius but instead the fact that they attend the same banquet but are isolated in very different spheres enhances the general theme of the degradation of *amicitia* relationships.

The next point of comparison between Horace and Juvenal can be found in the banquet itself: the food and aspects of preparation and service. While the host and guests in Horace's satire receive the same food and service, in Juvenal's satire, the differences in the meals of the host and client are used to highlight the decline in the *amicitia* relationship as are the direct parallels between the foods mentioned in the Horatian banquet and those in the Juvenalian one. The host, Virro, eats many of the same foods that the Horatian diners consume, but the client, Trebius, consumes an entirely different and inferior menu.³⁵ Furthermore, while the general pattern of the Juvenalian banquet follows its Horatian predecessor, Juvenal plays up certain aspects of the Horatian one to further highlight inequalities between host and client. For example, while a section on wine occupies 5 lines in Horace, in Juvenal it expands to 24 lines to highlight not only the

³³ These occur at line 26 (a fight between Trebius and other guests), 129 (the challenge to any of the guests to say "Cheers" to the host), 146 (unimportant guests are served *ancipites fungi*, toadstools of doubtful quality), and 149 (friends of equal status to Virro will receive fresh fruit).

³⁴ The invitation to the banquet is a single line, "*una simus*", *ait* (18). The conversation otherwise is also limited. There is a voice that tells Trebius to put down the forbidden bread he has reached for, followed by a soliloquy of Trebius about the hardships of being a poor client but there is no sense of exchange and reciprocity as there was in Horace (5.72-79)

³⁵ Lobsters or prawns (Horace 2.8.42; Juvenal 5.80), Venafran oil (Horace 2.8.45; Juvenal 5.86), and lamprey (Horace 2.8.42; Juvenal 5.99) are common to the Horatian diners and Virro, who also enjoys many other delicacies. However, in contrast Trebius consumes a single crayfish (5.85), lamp oil to drown his colourless cabbage (5.86-88), and an eel or Tiber bass fed on sewage water (5.103-106). His bread, water, and wine are also inferior to Virro's.

inferior quality of Trebius' wine but also the fact that while Virro's is served in a jewel-encrusted cup, Trebius must drink from a cracked vessel because Virro assumes his client will steal the high quality cups.³⁶ Furthermore, the slaves in Horace are described only very briefly while in Juvenal, their description is much longer because he highlights the fact that not only are the slaves waiting on Trebius and Virro different in appearance and price, but also that Virro's slave will not even deign to serve Trebius (5.52-69).

As in *Satires* 1 and 3, the distinction of people in the circle of the great man has become irrelevant. As stated earlier (pg. 24), *Satires* 5 immediately follows a poem about the reign of Domitian and this placement is not likely to be accidental. *Satires* 4 is an epic parody with its introduction focusing on the cruelty of an Egyptian courtier, Crispinus, who, amongst other travesties, paid 6000 sesterces for a 6-pound mullet. The main body of the satire describes a council called by Domitian on how to serve a huge fish, which was presented to him by a poor fisherman. By choosing a small event from Domitian's reign and magnifying it out of proportion with an exaggerated epic style—calling on the Muses only to insist they then sit down (34-5), using epic language to describe a fish (39: *spatium admirabile rhombi*, a turbot of wondrous size; 41: *implevit sinus*, fill a net or, alternatively, fill an entire gulf)—and by describing the cruelty of Crispinus and mirroring him with Domitian, Juvenal is suggesting the extremes of Domitian's reign of terror obliquely.³⁷ The lack of respect for upper-class men in this period is emphasized by discussions of Domitian's courtiers, who like fish, have survived only by not resisting the current (*ille igitur numquam derexit bracchia contra / torrentem, nec civis erat qui libera posset / verba animi proferre et vitam impendere vero*; so, he never struck out those arms

³⁶ Horace 2.8.13-17; Juvenal 5.24-48

³⁷ Gowers (1993): 202.

of his against the torrent, nor was he one to speak freely the thoughts of his heart, and stake his life upon the truth,³⁸ 89-91). The satirist states explicitly that to live to an old age is a miracle amongst the nobility (*prodigio par est in nobilitate senectus*, but to be both old and noble has long since become as good as a prodigy,³⁹ 97). Due to his proximity to the tyrant of *Satires* 4, Virro in *Satires* 5 can also be read as a tyrannical figure; the courtiers fearing for their lives in *Satires* 4 combine with the lack of distinction between guests at Virro's banquet to reflect the disordering of the proper social structure under tyrannical rule.⁴⁰

Another point of comparison between these two satires is the involvement and point of view of the satirist within the action of the banquet. In Horace, the satirist has a humorous attitude towards the events of the banquet. He begins the satire by asking the interlocutor, Fundanius, how his evening was at Nasidienus' party and throughout the rest of the satire he continues the conversation by asking what foods were served and who the guests were and encourages Fundanius to relate their amusing antics in full.⁴¹ He does not express any opinions of his own or pass any judgements about the events and appears only to be present to ensure that the details of feast are described in full. It is important that the events of the banquet in themselves form the basis of the satire, not the attitude of the satirist towards them; he is there merely to enjoy and share in the humour.⁴² While it

³⁸ Trans: Ramsay (1999): 63-65.

³⁹ Trans: Ramsay (1999): 65.

⁴⁰ For an analysis of tyrannical dining, see Goddard (1994). In a discussion of Nero's eating habits, the focus is not solely on the fact that the emperor was extravagant, since extravagance and generosity in feasting were features of good emperors as well. Instead the problem lies in the fact that, while feasting, he neglected his duties as emperor and that his feasts involved an inversion of status. The senators and equestrians were treated no differently from the masses and slaves and commoners mixed freely with senators. This is precisely the concern we see in Juvenal's depiction of Virro.

⁴¹ Horace 2.8.1-3; 2.8.18-19; 2.8.79-80.

⁴² See Freudenberg (2001): 117-124 where he analyzes *Satires* 2.8 and argues that Horace does actually make an appearance in the final speech of Balatro in that both men are being carefully watched by Maecenas and

is true that Horace was excluded from this banquet, a fact that might have caused him some discomfort and one that will be discussed later in the chapter (pg.36), his possibly bitter mockery from a position of exclusion is still not akin to the indignation we see in Juvenal.

The Juvenalian satirist plays a very different role in the satiric discourse. It is his voice that rules throughout the satire and there is no light banter with a narrating interlocutor. Furthermore, there is no humour in his statements; his point of view is characterized by a tone of indignation. He is obviously angry with Virro for his treatment of his client and there is even an intervention directed at Virro saying that no one expects the glorious patron-client relationships of old but that he could at least treat his clients as fellow citizens (5.107-113). However, at the very beginning and end of the satire, the anger is directed equally at Trebius for allowing himself to be treated so poorly for the sake of a few meals. In the prologue the satirist says that anything would be better than enduring the treatment of Virro, even to be homeless and eat the mouldy crusts of bread thrown to a dog (5.6-11). In the epilogue he states that if Trebius is able to accept every insult he receives then he deserves all of them and his actions will eventually reduce him to the status of a slave (5.170-173). There is no humour in this material but rather a sharp moral criticism that is not evident in the Horatian satire.

It is also significant that in addition to addressing Virro directly and passing his judgement against Trebius in a prologue and epilogue, the satirist also intervenes at several other points in the narration of the banquet. He bemoans the gluttony that has

are forced to speak in understated, cutting ways. Balatro mocks Nasidienus by giving a speech on the cruelties of fate; Horace describes the dinner but is careful to not offer any blatant criticism of Nasidienus, with Varius' smothered laugh (63-64) offering the only escape for pent-up ridicule of the meal. This is a theme common to the satires of Book 2, where despite many opportunities for biting satire, no real satire happens and the reader is left full but unsatiated.

invaded Rome (5.92-96). He also sarcastically mentions how differently Virro would act if Trebius were rich (5.132-134). The satirist is very involved in the satire but for reasons of anger and moral judgement rather than humour. There is no light banter with an interlocutor but constant moral criticism and anger about the characters' behaviour. For Juvenal, the satirists' role is not to present a humorous depiction of a satirical scene but to use this type-scene as a starting point for a tirade about a decline in morals, specifically the relationship between patron and client.

The issue of silence and powerlessness is also a critical one. The character of Trebius is a powerless figure in that he is constantly humiliated at the hands of Virro but can offer no retaliation. The Juvenalian satirist, although not silent, is also a powerless figure. In *Satires* 1, he asks if he must always be a listener and never speak himself (1.1-2). Here he speaks throughout the satire but it is merely to instruct Trebius in the ways of parasitism and his complaints yield no results. While Horace's *Satires* 2.8 is told from the point of view of the friend of the guest of honour, in Juvenal 5, the satirist is much more akin to one of Maecenas' shadows. As Freudenberg states, "like Trebius in Juv. 5, the poet himself hungers for the full, rich fare of satire, but he is not entitled to it. Thus he cannot provide it to us. Instead he is stuck with leavings and scraps that are a pale, parodic "shade" of satire's rich Lucilian feast."⁴³ While the guests at the Horatian feast depart in silence and their desire to offer satiric discourse is similarly repressed, there is no issue of repressed anger or indignation, with which the Juvenalian satire is so rife.

Finally, perhaps the most significant comparison between the two satires is the description of the hosts. In Horace, the host is Nasidienus and although many of his actions reflect some social incompetence, he is mostly humorous and non-threatening.

⁴³ Freudenberg (2001): 265-266.

His demeanour is somewhat overbearing and he prevents his guests from engaging in normal conversation by constantly reminding them of the expense and quality of his food.⁴⁴ However, he is also clearly insecure about self-presentation and the way his banquet is received and remembered by his guests.⁴⁵ While his antics are often foolish and overstated and eventually drive his guests away, the impression is not of a tyrannical or cruel host. Rather, his foolishness enhances the comedic nature of the satire.

The host in the Juvenalian satire is much different; rather than harmlessly annoying and foolish, Virro is presented as sinister and cruel. While Nasidienus shows no hostility to his guests, Virro is the essence of a tyrannical host.⁴⁶ The dinner itself is not a friendly invitation but it counts as an exchange for all previous service (*primo fige loco, quod tu discumbere iussus / mercedem solidam veterum capis officiorum*, 5.12-13); this notion of formal exchange rather than friendly interaction between host and guest immediately underlines Juvenal's main theme, the degradation of the proper relationships between patron and client.

The subsequent progress of the feast and the comparison between the meal of Virro and that of Trebius serves to highlight Virro's cruelty. At the end of the satire, it is even stated that Virro's sole purpose for inviting Trebius to his dinner was to make the client suffer since there is nothing more humorous than to observe a frustrated and

⁴⁴ For example, when a boar from Lucania is brought out, he brags about it being caught in a soft southern breeze (*in primis Lucanus aper: leni fuit austro / captus, ut aiebat cenae pater*, 2.8.6-7) and he discusses the dish of lamprey in great detail: how it was caught while pregnant, the fine ingredients in the sauce and his own special way of cooking it.

⁴⁵ He offers different types of wine to Maecenas in fear that what he presents first is not good enough (*hic erus "Albanum, Maecenas, sive Falernum / te magis adpositis delectat, habemus utrumque*, 2.8.16-17). Also, when Vibidius and Balatro, the shades of Maecenas, ask for bigger cups, Nasidienus turns very pale because he is worried not only that their humour will get out of hand but also that their palates will be dulled and they will not enjoy his fine dishes (*vertere pallor / tum parochi faciem nil sic metuentis ut acris / potores, vel quod maledicunt liberius vel / fervida quod subtile exsurdant vina palatum*, 2.8.35-38)

⁴⁶ This is highlighted by the fact that Nasidienus is referred to by moderate titles such as *pater cenae* (7) or *parochus* (36) while Virro is called *dominus* (49, 71, 81, 92, 147) and *rex* (14, 130, 161).

humiliated client (5.156-160).⁴⁷ Although there are patrons and clients together at dinner in Horace—Balatro and Vibidius are the hangers-on of Maecenas and Nomentanus and Porcius are the clients of the host—all the diners appear to be on an equal plane with everyone eating and drinking the same products. The only character that suffers any humiliation in Horace is perhaps Nasidienus because he is clearly the object of mockery and the guests all leave before the meal is over. Juvenal, however, uses the banquet scene only to highlight the poor treatment of Trebius and the general inequality of the patron-client relationship.

The performative aspect of *Satires* 5 deserves attention in its relationship to tyranny. While the guests in the Horatian banquet all seem to be participating equally in the banquet, the sense in the Juvenalian one is that Trebius is required to put on a performance for Virro; this is made explicit in lines 153-155, where he is compared to a performing monkey. This relates to descriptions of tyranny, the most extreme example being events in Nero's reign where his subjects are forced to watch the displays of the emperor in the theatre; their reactions to his performance are subject to his evaluation and often serve as criteria for punishment. While it is Nero performing on stage, the role of performer and spectator is reversed because the members of the audience know that they are being watched by a superior and must perform according to the emperor's expectations. Under the reign of Domitian, while the emperor did not actually perform on stage, he would still watch and punish the audience's reactions to shows in the arena and

⁴⁷ Freudenberg (2001): 268. These complaints echo those of Umbricius in *Satires* 3, that poverty is harshest in its ability to make men into buffoons (Juvenal 3.147-153).

punish them if he did not like their responses.⁴⁸ In Tacitus particularly, this theatrical exchange is reproduced offstage as a model for interactions with the emperor in all facets of life.⁴⁹ The incessant need to perform under the watchful eye of the emperor is one of the ultimate representations of tyranny and this is mirrored in Trebius' need to perform for Virro. The fact that Virro shows up again in *Satires* 9.33ff, a poem about the woes of a male prostitute which will be discussed later in the chapter (pg. 39), as a miserly client, drooling over the size of the gigolo's penis, is not coincidental.

The sense of *amicitia* in decline in comparison with Horace's *Satires* 2.8 is therefore quite obvious, with many aspects of the Horatian satire inverted to highlight the unequal and inferior relationship between patron and client that exists in Juvenal's age. Like the other instances in Juvenal's first book of satires, it presents a rather dark view of *amicitia*, the devolution of a friendship based on respect and mutual exchange into one based entirely on meagre financial compensation and humiliation. The placement of *amico* as the last word in the satire serves, as in *Satires* 3, to highlight the extent of the debasement of the *amicitia* relationship.

It is important to also look at the political criticism in *Satires* 5, which is much sharper than anything in Horace and which fits with the premise that decline in *amicitia* reflects a decline in the rights of senatorial men under tyrannical rule. First, as already discussed on pg. 29 is the relevance of the Domitianic *Satires* 4 to the banquet in *Satires* 5; Virro can be read as a Domitian-like character in his tyrannical behaviour and his guests are like Domitian's powerless courtiers. Juvenal is using this banquet to

⁴⁸ See Pliny *Pan.* 33.3-4, where he contrasts the freedom of response to gladiatorial shows under the new emperor Trajan with the restraint under Domitian, where peoples' reactions were always under the watchful gaze of the emperor and they could even be charged with treason for hating one of Domitian's gladiators.

⁴⁹ For a detailed discussion of Nero and the Theatrical Paradigm, see Bartsch (1994): 1-35.

commemorate the loss of social and political liberty.⁵⁰ Furthermore, in the description of Virro's wine, we see that he is drinking a vintage similar to that which Thrasea and Helvidius—Stoic philosophers in the reign of Nero and Vespasian—drank on the birthdays of the Bruti and Cassius, all men who died fighting against the autocracy. While in Juvenal's time, these men symbolize the virtues of a lost republic, here a tyrant is unknowingly drinking their wine, marking an incongruity between the personification of republican ideals and this host who is meant to reflect the tyrannies of despotic rule. Furthermore, in the description of Virro's beautiful African slave boy, we see that he is worth more than the assets of two early kings of Rome, Tullus Hostilius and Ancus. This reflects a discrepancy between old and current Rome. Through these references to Rome's glorious past, Juvenal is charting the course of Roman decline, leading to the pinnacle of vice that defines his current age.

While the main focus of *Satires 5* seems to be to highlight the decline in the relationship of *amicitia* as well as the general decline in Roman morals under the principate, it is possible that this satire is meant to offer some parody or mockery of its Horatian counterpart, particularly when considering the relationship between the poet, the interlocutor and Maecenas. It has been argued that while in his first book of satires, Horace is focusing on philosophical questions of how to live and how to justify his position in Maecenas' circle, in the second book, he downgrades his questions to those of a gastronomical nature, indicating that he is content with his position and has received an amendment for previous misfortune.⁵¹ In particular, the mockery of Nasidienus' obsession with status and his failed attempts to impress Maecenas are meant to contrast

⁵⁰ Gowers (1993): 218.

⁵¹ Oliensis (1998): 57-63; Oliensis (1997): 104.

with the outsider Horace—notably not present at Nasidienus’ banquet—who is secure in his relationship with Maecenas.

However, there are some problems with this view of the secure poet, lightly retelling the humorous story of a bumbling and ultimately humiliated host of a banquet, attended by many of the poet’s friends. The first point is that in his exposé of Nasidienus’ foolishness, Horace is getting delayed vengeance on the host for not inviting the poet to a dinner, to which all his friends were invited.⁵² There is some uncertainty as to why Horace was not invited as his friends Fundanius, Maecenas, Varius and Viscus were; perhaps the answer is that the freedman’s son is still not important enough to be invited to the dinner of the nouveau riche Nasidienus.⁵³ Therefore, the comically failed banquet symbolizes both Horace’s revenge and vindication, since the one night Nasidienus had with his friends was ruined while Horace enjoys a day-to-day intimacy with them, as reflected by Fundanius’ recounting the story to him. However, the question remains: why should Horace feel the need for vindication? If he were truly secure in his position, it would not bother him that he was slighted by so trivial a figure as Nasidienus.

Furthermore, *Satires* 2.8 shows some attention to status, which is perhaps meant to reflect badly on the diners at Nasidienus’ banquet. Fundanius recounts who each diner was and where they were sitting, information that says something about the guests’ relative status since the position on a couch had various social values, reflected by the fact that Trebius was only asked to Virro’s dinner party to fill the third position on his lowest couch (*ergo duos post / si libuit menses neglectum adhibere clientem / tertia ne*

⁵² Oliensis (1998): 60.

⁵³ Oliensis (1998): 60.

vacuo cessaret culcita lecto, Juvenal 5. 15-17).⁵⁴ In contrast, in Horace's description of the banquet at his Sabine farm in *Satires* 2.6 and the banquet he attended on the way to Brundisium in *Satires* 1.5, he neglects to inform us of the seating arrangements, indicating that the guests are too busy conversing and enjoying a truly convivial atmosphere to recount where each one sat. In *Satires* 1.9, he even mentions to the social climber that all Maecenas' *amici* know and are happy with their assigned places (51-52), painting the picture of a circle of friends blissfully unaware of social hierarchies.

However, this attempt at proving his superior relationship with Maecenas presents some difficulties. The focus on vindication and idealization shows, at the very least, Horace's consciousness of and also likely some insecurity about his position with Maecenas, for which he over-compensates by repeatedly claiming his obliviousness to social hierarchies. For example, the parasitic social climber in *Satires* 1.9 can be likened to an alter ego of Horace; while Horace wants to convince people that he is on an equal plane with Maecenas, here we see his concern about his position through his difficulty in disengaging with the accusations that he has weaseled his way into Maecenas' circle.⁵⁵ Both the social climber and Nasidienus are all too eager to display their qualifications to be in Maecenas' circle, which Horace claims he no longer needs to do; while Nasidienus' foolishness potentially reflects Horace mocking the man from a position of security, it also could reflect some of his own anxieties.

The name Nasidienus comes from the word *naso*, meaning nose, and is associated with taste.⁵⁶ Nasidienus is desperate to impress Maecenas with the elegance of his banquet but he fails miserably. He has no actual interaction with Maecenas and his

⁵⁴ Oliensis (1998): 58.

⁵⁵ See Henderson (1999): 202-227.

⁵⁶ For example, see Persius *Satires* 1.33 and 1.116-118 and Horace *Satires* 1.4.8

banquet ultimately results in his own humiliation and, of course, Maecenas emerges with no embarrassment. Similarly, Horace is also desperate to please his patron with the offerings of poems. Nasidienus' failure to impress Maecenas could reflect Horace's own concerns about the possibility of his poetry being rejected. Ultimately, Maecenas is an inaccessible figure to both Nasidienus and the parasite in *Satires* 1.9 and while Horace tries to avoid being like them, he is operating from a disturbingly similar position; Nasidienus offers the gift of a banquet and Horace offers the gift of a poem in which this banquet is described.

In light of Horace's sensitivity regarding his position within Maecenas' circle, Juvenal's fifth satire could be read as something more than a tirade on Flavian decline in contrast with the idealized *amicitia* relationships of the Golden Age. By focussing on an extreme example of a failed *amicitia* relationship, he could be pointedly acknowledging that there were aspects of Horace's relationship with Maecenas which were not as ideal as the poet may have liked.

The theme of *amicitia* in decline is revisited in the third book. In *Satires* 7, the concern is specifically about the lack of patronage for literature and the arts. *Satires* 7 begins with the statement that all hope for writers lies with the emperor, as other patrons no longer exist and intellectuals are not receiving their due. There is no appreciation for fine literature since everyone is composing their own works—a complaint that is also stated in *Satires* 1.1-18—and patrons are not providing proper recital spaces for their author-clients (7.36-47). The speaker explicitly states that writers such as Horace and Virgil were provided with the major amenities of life—food, shelter and slaves—and therefore could produce literary masterpieces (7.62-71) while a writer burdened by

financial hardship does not have the same opportunities. The concerns over the decline in literary patronage are mirrored in *Satires* 9, the last satire in Book 3, which describes a worn-out male prostitute who is not being paid enough to support himself. He laments that, despite his patron's wealth, his pay is insufficient and his services undervalued.

Together, *Satires* 7 and 9 offer a very mercenary view of the world, both physical and literary. By mirroring literary production with prostitution, the satirist gives the impression that the world of inspired literary production no longer exists due to a lack of beneficent patrons and, as a result, poets like prostitutes are practicing their art purely to gain basic sustenance. As in Longinus, the sense that good art cannot be produced and appreciated under tyrannical rule applies here as well. Equating literature with prostitution shows Juvenal's fears over literature's inevitable decline when there is no patron such as Maecenas to provide the writer with the basic amenities of life and when the poet is forced to practice his craft under autocratic rule. Due to a lack of support, literature has not only become something for sale (7.8-12) but its true value is not even realized. The issues at stake here are both the literal interpretation that in the post-Augustan world, there is no longer the potential for inspired literary production because the poet cannot attain the support he needs to survive, much less produce something worthy of immortality, and the metaphorical concerns about society's inevitable change under the principate, namely the feeling of disenfranchisement and powerlessness of men of a senatorial class. This will provide a contrast to Martial, who accepts the place of literature in cultural exchange and sees a more hopeful role for his epigrams in immortalizing the activities of his social circle.

1.3: *Amicitia* in Martial

Like we have seen in Juvenal's satires, Martial also has many epigrams that contain a view of *amicitia* in decline. Perhaps one of the best examples for this essay is *Epigrams* 12.18, which is actually addressed to Juvenal and contrasts the duties of the urban client that Juvenal must perform—wandering in the Subura, treading the hill of Diana, waiting on the thresholds of great man, and climbing the Mons Caelius—with Martial's life in leisure after he has returned to his native Spain.⁵⁷ However, it is obvious from this poem that while Martial may too have been obligated to serve a demanding patron, in Spain at least, he got the life of leisure that he so desired.

While Martial expresses many of the same concerns as Juvenal and the state of his world also requires him to write in the lower genres, when taken as a whole rather than selectively, his epigrams offer a more positive view of the world than Juvenal's satires; therefore, they often serve as a foil for the negative view of *amicitia* provided by Juvenal. It is true that Martial often characterizes himself as impoverished, especially in Book I and II where he laments that he cannot afford a beautiful slave boy (1.58), he has to curry the favour of arrogant patrons (2.55 and 2.68), the doles for clients are very small (1.49), the rewards for poetry are simply empty praise, not financial gain (1.76), he has to beg for dinners (2.18) and borrow money (2.30, 2.44) and his clothing, food and sexual pleasures are all less than he deserves (2.43, 2.58). This sets the tone for similar complaints in the later epigrams and it is easy to assume that Martial was a chronic beggar who relied on miserly patrons for support; he refers to himself as *pauper* (poor) in 2.90, 5.13, 5.18. He talks about the poverty of poetry in 11.3 and refers to himself as

⁵⁷ *Epigrams* 12.18 will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3 (115ff.)

an object of pity in 6.82. His lodgings are cold with broken windows (8.14) and sparsely furnished; his guests have to bring their own furniture when they come to visit him (5.62).⁵⁸

However, Martial also writes many epigrams in praise of generous patrons: the younger Pliny in *Epigrams* 10.20—Pliny also speaks of his friendship with Martial in his *Epistles* 3.21 while he was consul—and the consuls, Licinius Sura, Stertinius Avitus, Silius Italicus and L. Arruntius Stella, whom he refers to affectionately as *Stella meus* (1.71). He also enjoys the generosity of Decianus of Emerita (1.39), M. Aquilius Regulus (7.16), and writes poetry in praise of many other wealthy men.⁵⁹ There is also evidence that he not only asked for but also received gifts, most small but some quite substantial: a loan of 100 000 sesterces (6.20), a place in the country (12.31), a slave boy or girl (8.73), Saturnalia gifts and silver tableware (7.53), a toga (9.49), a cloak (6.82), roofing tiles (7.36), mules (11.79), a travelling chariot (12.24), a drinking vessel (8.51), a boar (7.27) and a basket of food (9.72).⁶⁰ *Epigrams* 4.37 and 10.14 show requests for money, while 4.61, 4.76, 6.30, 10.11 and 12.36 mention the receipt of monetary gifts or loans, the two of which were not always distinguished. Another important thing that Martial sought, and apparently received, was the protection of important men against those who would disparage his poetry (7.26, 7.72, 10.33).

Nauta (2002) discusses Martial's epigrams, their modes of reception, function and evidence within them for both imperial and non-imperial patronage, according to the three key points in Saller's definition of patronage: asymmetry, duration and reciprocity. What is particularly striking is the diverse list of people mentioned in the epigrams.

⁵⁸ Sullivan (1991): 27-28 brought this list to my attention.

⁵⁹ See Nauta (2002): 58-73 for a discussion of Martial's relationships with his many addressees.

⁶⁰ White (1978): 86-87 brought this list to my attention.

While Martial certainly wrote epigrams addressed to those with greater political and financial resources than himself, he also addressed others to men with equal resources. One particular epigram that deserves attention in this context is 10.48, where he invites several guests to dine with him: Stella, Nepos, Canius, Cerialis, Flaccus. Stella has already been mentioned as one of Martial's consular patrons, and Flaccus is the same man to whom Martial's epigram on Maecenas (8.56) is addressed, which will be discussed later (pg. 47). However, the other men, Nepos, a neighbour of Martial's in Nomentum, Canius, a poet, Julius Cerialis, also a poet, and Lupus were all likely Martial's social equals. Furthermore, at least four of these men practiced poetry, giving the indication here that the dinner is less about maintaining a social hierarchy—the ever-significant positions on the cushions are not mentioned, for example—and more about creating an atmosphere of reciprocity and exchange amongst a supportive group of poets and wealthy friends. This flexibility between superiors and inferiors sets Martial apart from Juvenal and offers a more positive view of *amicitia*.⁶¹

It is also significant that several points in Martial's writing directly undermine the evidence for the decline in *amicitia* as presented in Juvenal. One of the main things that Juvenal laments is the substitution of the meagre *sportula* for the patron-client dinner. As previously stated, in *Satires* 1, Juvenal discusses the distribution of the *sportula* and states that the humble client must compete for this meagre offering with foreigners, magistrates and wealthy freedmen. Juvenal presents this ceremony as occurring in the morning.⁶² Martial, on the other hand, states several times that the *sportula*, consisting of a hundred quadrantes, a small sum, was delivered in the tenth hour or in the late

⁶¹ See Nauta (2002): 58-61 for a discussion of *Epigrams* 10.48 and 58-73 for a thorough analysis of the diverse list of friends listed in the Epigrams.

⁶² Cloud (1989): 209.

afternoon (10.70). Since the *sportula* was intended to replace the dinner, it follows that its distribution would occur around the dinner hour. Perhaps Juvenal has melded the actions of the *salutatio*, or the client's morning greeting of the patron, with the distribution of the *sportula*.⁶³ It is also significant that while the speaker in *Satires* 1 talks about the *sportula* with indignation, there is no evidence to suggest how actual clients felt. To some, the cash might be a welcome acquisition. One factor that would suggest clients appreciated the *sportula* more than a dinner is Domitian's attempt at reinstating the dinner around 88 AD—which Martial mentions in 3.7 and 3.30—an action that was extremely unpopular and repealed soon after.⁶⁴

Despite the broader picture of some positive aspects of *amicitia*, like Juvenal, Martial had expectations of his patrons—often expressed in relation to the experience of the Augustan poet-clients—that were not fulfilled. These were based largely on a notion of social exchange that was integral to Roman friendship. One party would give a gift to another and in so doing, attempt to create a bond based on trust, or *fides*; the receiver would have to reciprocate or lose status and prestige.⁶⁵ Gift exchange was an essential aspect of establishing *fides* and this type of bond is reflected in Martial, who was always trying to cultivate it with his friends and enhance it through his poetry. As mentioned earlier in this chapter (pg. 18), a large part of *amicitia* was based on reciprocity and as a poet, Martial would write poems for his patrons and would expect gifts in return.

While the life of an ordinary client may not have actually changed drastically over time, neither Juvenal nor Martial thought they should be required to perform the duties of the ordinary client. As White argues, the poet had the potential to enhance the prestige of

⁶³ Sullivan (1991): 160.

⁶⁴ Mayer (1989): 17.

⁶⁵ Spisak (2007): 46-49. For Martial on *fides*, see *Epigrams* 5.42.

his wealthy *amici* by immortalizing their names in literature. For example, Martial wrote many epigrams for wealthy aristocrats to commemorate special occasions such as the birth of a child, a wedding or a death and it was not always clear what he received in return (1.31; 6.3, 21, 38, 52, 68, 76 and 85; 7.8 and 96; 8.66, 10.63 and 71; 11.13). Since a poet could perform different and perhaps more valuable services than an ordinary client, it is reasonable to assume that he would expect greater in return than what other clients could hope for: food, small amounts of money or gifts. Disappointment could ensue when these poet-clients did not receive their due.

Martial's hopes and expectations for his patrons are much more clearly expressed than anything in Juvenal—the only real evidence in Juvenal for the treatment of poets could come from *Satires* 7 in which the plight of intellectuals is compared with the idealized circumstances of Golden Age authors. Martial, however, clearly elaborates in many epigrams the trials of being a client and what he expected from his patrons. Apart from the requests for gifts, which have already been mentioned, Martial's complaints about how the duties of waiting on his patron interfere with his life and writing provide information about the life of the poet-client.

In *Epigrams* 1.70, Martial asks his book to visit the patron in his stead, insisting that no one can write poetry if he has to attend the daily *salutationes*. *Epigrams* 1.108 has a similar message, that Martial sends his book in the morning in order to allow time for his own leisure but he will come to visit the patron Gallus at the dinner hour. In 10.70, he refutes the accusation of Potitus that Martial is lazy because he only writes one book a year with the argument that given the many tasks he has to perform throughout the day—including waiting on patrons morning and night and waiting for the *sportula*—it is

impressive that he can even write one book. In 10.74, the concerns are similar, that as a poet he earns the meagre salary of the weary client while a winner of a chariot race carries off fifteen bags of gold. He does not expect great rewards for his book, just the ability to sleep! In 10.82, he says to his patron, Gallus again, that if the poet's servility would benefit the rich man, he would perform the exhausting trip in order to wait in him; however, since such a task provides no benefit, Martial asks to be left alone, directly recalling the Horatian desire to have a separate space for literary production. Finally, in 11.24, he says that while he is responsible for escorting Labullus, listening to him and praising him, Martial's own writing has suffered and in order that the number of Labullus' clients can increase, Martial's poetic productivity must decrease.

Epigrams 12.18, as already mentioned, compares the tasks of Juvenal to Martial's life of leisure, although not necessarily a literary one, in Bilbilis. *Epigrams* 12.68 also discusses the trials of the urban client; Martial is grateful to have escaped from Rome and to now be able to eat and sleep. The general impression from these select epigrams is that the trials of the client prevent Martial from writing and generally tire him out while his return to Spain facilitates a life of leisure although his literary productivity actually declined upon his return, partially due to the lack of an appreciative audience and men to critique his work, something that he often requests of his friends in Rome, such as Severus in 5.80.⁶⁶

In addition to the daily tasks that a client must perform, the general concerns of the city could also provide further distractions from writing, which is clear in the epigram to Juvenal. One of the major themes of Augustan poetry, which will be discussed in Chapter 2, is the importance of separate space for poetic production and inspiration,

⁶⁶ Saller (1983): 248.

which was often created by actual physical and geographical separation from the city. Horace's Sabine farm, which was given to him by his patron Maecenas, is an example of place of leisure in the countryside, which permitted him the ability to write in isolation from the distractions and expectations of the city. Although the realities of Horace's relationship with his patron and the circumstances of his poetic production are complex and will be discussed more fully in Chapter 3, it is evident from Martial's poetry that he wanted a patron similar to Maecenas and a similar country retreat, which a farm at Nomentum and his later return to Spain provided for him; however, his productivity declined upon his return to Spain and the general impression from his writing is that he does not resolve in an obvious way the tensions between literary autonomy and the social context of its production and dissemination.

Martial mentions his desire for another Maecenas in several epigrams. In 1.107, he states—in response to the accusations by Lucius Julius that the poet is lazy because he does not engage in a large-scale poetic project—that he would write something great if he had the sort of *otium* that Maecenas provided for Virgil and Horace. In 8.56, a similar statement is issued, that if he enjoyed the patronage of a Maecenas, he would become not a Virgil but a Marsus, who was a satirical epigrammatist of the Augustan age. Although this epigram offers a slightly different perspective in that Martial claims he would remain an epigrammatist even with a patron such as Maecenas and the ramifications of this statement will be discussed in Chapter 3 (pg. 81), the familiar motif of the inferiority of contemporary *amicitia* remains. In 11.3, Martial hails Nerva as a new Augustus and says again that he would be able to write an immortal, large-scale work if another Maecenas could also come to Rome. Finally, in 12.4, the mention of Maecenas again appears

although this time, Martial seems to have received his ideal patron in Terentius Priscus, who creates his genius (*ingenium*) by allowing the right of idleness.

While Juvenal offers a largely negative view of *amicitia* in the Flavian world, Martial softens this with examples of supportive patrons, gifts received and his eventual retreat to the country in his later years. However, what becomes evident from the writing of both poets is the constant worry over how poetry is supported, which is not nearly as obsessive a concern in Augustan poetry. The concern reflects a world in which poetry is increasingly becoming a professional pursuit and the hopes and fears that accompany this.

For Martial especially and the Juvenalian poet of *Satires 7*, his poetry is his livelihood, indicated by the fact that he directly equates writing with the hope for money, gifts and recognition in return. Furthermore, through immortalizing the activities of his circle of friends, Martial also hopes to gain his own poetic immortality in return, every time his poems are read, shared and passed on by members of this circle. Therefore, in order to immortalize these activities, he needs to have a place firmly within the circle and his role as the poet has to be acknowledged and celebrated. Literature has to be accepted as a favour and a gesture of friendship and exchange and not trivialized or marginalized. With the constant concern over literature's social function comes the possibility that poetry turns into a mercenary activity, with the poet always trying to identify and assert its value.⁶⁷ In Juvenal, we see the concerns over literary prostitution clearly asserted in

⁶⁷ See Spisak (2007): 35-51 on the specific workings of *amicitia* in Martial and the potential for his epigrams being read as mercenary poetry. Spisak argues that the lines between altruistic and utilitarian friendships were not as clearly defined in the Roman world as they are to us and that to read Martial's poetry as mercenary is to ignore the fundamental aspects of reciprocity and social exchange which were integral to ancient Roman friendship.

Book 3, indicating that literature has lost any artistic value and, more disturbingly, a society to appreciate its production.

However, in Martial, the concerns over literature's mercenary role, while still evident are presented in a more positive light; he even uses it as an assertion of independence and literary quality in direct contrast with Augustan ideals. To begin, while Martial bemoans the lack of a Maecenas to be his one patron, he obviously had several patrons to support his work. While this could indicate a misfortune, that no patron could provide everything the poet needed, it also shows a level of freedom from the expectations of one or two powerful men. While Horace enjoyed the patronage of Maecenas, it is also possible that he had insecurities about their friendship, as previously mentioned. Furthermore, in *Epistles* 1.7, we see Horace politely answering an apparent criticism from Maecenas about staying too long in the countryside, showing that the expectations of his patron were always on his mind.

We will see in Chapter 2, on the *recusatio*, that in accordance with their ideals of immortality and literary quality, many Augustan poets asserted their independence from imperial expectations by writing works that were crafted according to a fine literary aesthetic rather than big works that also praised the emperor. However, it is also true that Horace and Virgil, two major reference points for the Flavians, wrote big works interspersed with imperial themes: the *Aeneid* of Virgil and the *Odes* and *Epistles* of Horace. In Horace's *Odes* 3.30 and in *Aeneid* 9.446-449, it is also clear that the poets' expectations for immortality are directly intertwined with the immortality of the Roman political regime, showing the further inextricable and problematic link of their literary aspirations with the Roman state.

For Martial however, it is a different story. He denies the importance of the Augustan aesthetic, preferring the content of real life for his epigrams and states that glory after death is not appealing to him (*si post fata gloria, non propero*, If glory comes after death, I am in no hurry for it, *Epigrams* 5.10). Although he says that he could write a large-scale work given the patronage of a Maecenas, he also states that he would continue in the satiric genre even if he did have a patron such as Maecenas, indicating his dedication to the small-scale genre and its value within society. This is opposed to Horace or Virgil who, despite their assertions in their *recusationes*, also wrote in higher, politically influenced genres.⁶⁸ Furthermore, while Horace and Virgil were obviously answerable to the expectations of their patrons and the political regime, through his direct recording of aspects of aristocratic friendship, Martial is charting his own course through the world of upper class society. Martial enjoyed the patronage of several men, as already discussed. He also openly discusses his direct relationship with not one emperor but two⁶⁹ and appears to not need the mediating presence of a Maecenas to prevent him from becoming too entwined in political affairs. The Augustan literary aesthetic involves a separation from political affairs to ensure literary quality and immortality⁷⁰ but for Martial, these concerns are not relevant.

The purpose of Martial's epigrams was to record the events of the everyday and the interactions of a particular circle of people, mostly his elite friends. The epigrams meant to commemorate certain events such as the birth of a child or those that serve a direct role in gift exchange—specifically the Saturnalia poems, which will be discussed

⁶⁸ The notion of high and low genres will be discussed at the beginning of Chapter 2.

⁶⁹ Book 5 opens with an address to Domitian for example and Book 8 is explicitly dedicated to him while epigrams praising the emperor are also evident in Books 4, 6 and 9. Book 11, published after Domitian's death, contains praise of the new emperor Nerva.

⁷⁰ See Chapter 2.

in greater detail in Chapter 3—are admittedly ephemeral and defy many of the ideals of the Augustan literary aesthetic. However, Martial enjoys a different kind of literary reward. He operates from within a social network, rather than trying to deny his connections and assert his independence, and therefore enjoys the immediate rewards of commemorating the actions of this network—gifts from wealthy friends, inclusion in an elite circle etc. Furthermore, in recording the actions of a society, he is actually creating a version of that society, and his role in it, that will be immortalized as long as the verses are passed down and shared by its members and descendants. This is ensuring a different, and perhaps more feasible, path to immortality than the Augustan one whose value is conferred by the state and can exist only as long as the political regime does.

While Martial's material concerns over support for his literature could perhaps be read in a gloomy way—while he continues to create verse in a world of constant exchange, he does not ever receive the support he needs for this poetic production—overall the sense is that he is creating something different from the Augustans but not in a negative way. The conception of literary production as ephemeral and purpose-driven in Martial shows a greater concern over the professionalization of literature as does the mirroring of prostitution and literature in Juvenal's third book. While this is in direct defiance of the Augustan ideals of poetic autonomy, the assertion of literature's value as a commodity and not dependent on the imperial regime it celebrates is perhaps the ultimate assertion of independence. Literature is their livelihood and not circumscribed by aesthetic concerns or a political regime. The rewards for writing, especially in Martial's case, are concrete and immediate, and in most cases, received.

Chapter 2: The *Recusatio*

This chapter will begin with a discussion of the major points of the Callimachean aesthetic credo and its deployment in Augustan poetics. Through several examples of Augustan *recusationes*—refusals in the genres of pastoral, lyric and elegy to write in the genres epic or panegyric—it will become clear that these rejections, while ostensibly on the basis of Callimachean aesthetic concerns are more politicized than their Callimachean predecessor. They involve a separation of the poetic sphere from the public one in which aesthetic exclusivity becomes a foundation for social exclusivity, with the poets involving their noble addressees in the poetic realm but also carefully defining the role these addressees can play. The *recusatio* plays a paradoxical role in Augustan literature in that it is simultaneously a posture of humility (refusing to honour the great man due to the slenderness of the talent or genre) and autonomy, a refusal to play the game of panegyric and a mechanism of creating an alternative hierarchy or social dynamic in which the exclusivity of the poet's relationship with his noble addressee is highlighted.

The next section will discuss the satiric *recusatio*, which also involves a rejection of the higher genres, not due to aesthetic concerns but rather a preference for the language of the every day. Satire as a genre is grounded in reality and thus, the satiric *recusatio* rejects grandiloquent mythologically themed poetry not in favour of the precious highly-wrought genres of lyric or elegy, but the humble stuff of real life. Social exclusivity remains in Horatian satire, however, since even while the poet questions satire's role as poetry, he still finds a place for the emperor within this satiric sphere. This aspect of social exclusivity is even found in Persius—albeit to a much smaller degree,

since he defines his audience as limited to one or two appreciative people. In Juvenal, however, the satiric *recusatio* takes a different form, in that it involves a rejection of mythological themes in favour of discussing modern vice. He often sees this vice in epic terms, however, and in rehashing epic scenarios, what often ensues is a degraded version of epic. Like his predecessor Petronius' *Satyricon*, Juvenalian satire shows a desire for the sublimity of epic but cannot achieve it, reflecting the futility of attempting to produce good art under political oppression as mentioned in Longinus and discussed in the last chapter. For Juvenal, poetry is embedded in society and cannot live up to the aesthetic standards set up by his Augustan predecessors. Unlike his Augustan predecessors, the Juvenalian *recusatio* is not a gesture of autonomy or a declaration of social exclusivity. He sees no distinctive space or audience for his poetry and his refusal is not made on aesthetic grounds but rather a dedication to the thankless task of recording modern vice.

As in his views of patronage, Martial's *recusatio* again provides a foil for Juvenal's. While Martial also rejects the higher genres, he says that he does so for financial rather than aesthetic reasons—he has no patron to support his art—but also says that even if he had such a patron, he would continue to write epigram. He sees a valuable role for his poetry in social exchange; his poetry becomes the society it describes and as such will survive as long as it is accepted and celebrated within this society. His *recusationes* go even further than the satiric ones to involve a specific rejection of Callimacheanism. By embracing fame during his lifetime and denying the necessity of autonomy in the production of quality poetry, Martial offers a new, perhaps more feasible path to poetic immortality than his Augustan predecessors.

2.1: The Callimachean and Augustan *Recusatio*

In the Augustan age, the poetic *recusatio* is a refusal to write in higher genres, of which epic was the pinnacle. The contrast between high and low genres is described in some ancient texts. Quintilian outlines the hierarchy of genres in Greek and Latin poetry with epic, specifically Homer, being at the top of the list (*Institutio Oratoria* 1.10.46-101). Horace, in the *Ars Poetica* 77ff, states that epic is the proper genre for describing the feats of kings, heroes and battles whereas the verses of elegy are called *exiguos*, meaning small, wanting, or trivial. Furthermore, in *Satires* 1.4.38ff, which will be discussed later in this chapter (pg. 67), he questions whether satire is even poetry as all, especially when contrasted with high epic (56-62). The hierarchy of genres can even be mapped out in the career of Virgil, who rises from the small bucolic *Eclogues* to the grand imperial epic *Aeneid*.⁷¹

It is important to understand that the *recusatio* does not involve a rejection of Homeric epic. For Callimachus, as we shall see, it does not involve a rejection of hexameter epic—although the bad rehash of Homeric poetry is a problem—but rather overblown, self-important poetry of all kinds. It is in the Augustan age that it specifically starts to involve a rejection of a certain kind of epic.⁷² The Roman poet Ennius wrote his *Annales* during the second century BCE. While not the first to compose epic in Rome and on Roman topics, he was the first to introduce the meter of Homer, dactylic hexameter,

⁷¹ See Farrell (2002) for a discussion of how the Roman literary career took shape from the ideologies of the political career and how Virgil's ascension from bucolic to epic follows this pattern. See also Harrison (2002): 85-86 for a discussion of Ovid's generic ascent from "love-elegy to elegiac Callimachean antiquarianism" in the *Fasti*.

⁷² This is a version of Callimachus that the Romans have chosen to remember, and in a sense have created, since Callimachean poetry never preached against the writing of hexameter epic. See Hunter (2006): 1-4 for a discussion of this.

into Roman literary sphere.⁷³ His *Annales* were considered the pinnacle of epic achievement in Rome, due to their stylistic recollection of Homer and the fact that they covered the entirety of Rome's history up until Ennius' present day. Since Ennius could not be rivalled, to write anything new in the epic genre at Rome was to praise contemporary achievements, and since this was seldom done well, these types of epics became a laughing stock.⁷⁴ For the Augustans, the type of poetry Callimachus rejects has become equivalent with epic and to attempt to try something new in the genre was a phenomenon.⁷⁵

Instead of the monumental quality and panegyric associations of epic, and the inevitable fate of producing something bad, the Augustan poets favour more finely-wrought, well-crafted poetry, which is in keeping with the Callimachean aesthetic code of stylistic refinement⁷⁶, the main points of which are contained in the prologue to Callimachus' *Aetia*,⁷⁷ also known as the Reply to the Telchines. The Telchines were a group of primitive magicians and metalworkers who generally symbolized malicious jealousy and specifically the literary enemies of Callimachus.⁷⁸ In the first few lines Callimachus states that he knows the Telchines dislike his poetry because he does not

⁷³ Goldberg (2006): 434.

⁷⁴ Goldberg (2005): 436.

⁷⁵ Goldberg (2005): 439. Virgil was obviously the exception to this and the phenomenon of a skilled and respected poet writing an epic was palpable even in the poetry of the time. See Propertius *Elegies* 2.34.61-66.

⁷⁶ The preference for Alexandrianism at Rome in the 60s BCE arises from the stylistic and thematic deficiencies in modern epic. Poetry was to become highly-wrought with many references to other texts, both Hellenistic and Roman. Furthermore, while Callimachus' *Aetia* consisted of four books each over a thousand lines, the fine-spun Callimachean poem in Rome is a short one. See Goldberg (2005): 438: "A compact, learned narrative on a mythological subject – what modern scholars call an epyllion ("little epic")—promised escape from the bombast and obsequiousness to which longer hexameter narratives were increasingly prone"

⁷⁷ The *Aetia* was an elegiac poem in four books, which contained stories about the origins of Greek history, customs and rites. Trypanis (1958): 2. All references to the *Aetia* come from this translation. References to the Hymn to Apollo come from the Mair (1960) translation.

⁷⁸ Gutzwiller (2007): 33.

write one continuous poem that consists of thousands of line and describes kings and heroes; his small-scale poetry is inappropriate to his advanced years. He goes on to say, however, that upon the comparison of two poems of Philitas of Cos and two of Mimnermus of Colophon,⁷⁹ the shorter poem of each of the authors is deemed superior.⁸⁰ While other things may be long such as the crane flight or the shot of an arrow, poetry is sweeter for being short. Poetry should be judged by skill not length and Callimachus says that it is not his task to thunder or write loud-sounding poetry.

Callimachus then describes how he was visited by the god Apollo who told him to feed the sacrificial victim fat but to keep his poetry, the Muse, slender. The god also advised him to choose an uncommon path which other carriages do not trample and to avoid following in the tracks of others; this means that his duty is not to re-write common epic themes, or retrace the worn path of those who imitate Homer, but to find his own narrowed-down subject matter and voice. This fragment ends with a reference to an audience that prefers the sweet sound of the cicada—a metaphor for Callimachean poetry—rather than the loud braying of asses, which represent poems that are not only loud sounding but also stylistically heavy.⁸¹

At the end of his Hymn to Apollo, Callimachus expresses more of his aesthetic concerns. Envy speaks to Apollo and tells him that she does not admire poets who sing of things that do not equal the number of the sea. This is a reference to the fact that Homer was known as the font of all rivers and streams, the ocean,⁸² and therefore things that number the sea would be epic aspirations. Apollo scoffs at her and says that although the

⁷⁹ Philitas of Cos was the founder of the Alexandrian school of poetry and Mimnermus of Colophon introduced the amatory element into early Greek elegy.

⁸⁰ Hunter (2006): 35.

⁸¹ Gutzwiller (2007): 34.

⁸² Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 1.10.46.

Euphrates river is huge, its water is filled with dirt and refuse whereas pure, clean water from a small trickling stream is preferable to the priestesses of Demeter. The essence of this speech is that while large works such as epic may be impressive, they can also be filled with a lot of low quality material. A small and greatly refined work is to be preferred.

Therefore, the Callimachean aesthetic encompasses a preference for small carefully-crafted works opposed to large scale ones, poems that are sweet and soft rather than loud and weighty and ones that are refined and polished rather than large and vulgar. For a description of the Hellenistic aesthetic in general, a very important word is *leptos*—etymologically meaning peeled or stripped off—which, when appropriated for poetry, means delicate and thin.⁸³ The Latin word *tenuis*, meaning humble or slender, is a corresponding term. It is also crucial too remember the personal aspect of the Reply to the Telchines particularly—he is writing about his own process of poetic production and reception—as this became very important for the Roman adaptation of the Callimachean aesthetic.

For Callimachus, the commandment from Apollo to feed the animal fat but keep the Muse slender presents an opposition to writing in more prestigious but also bombastic genres, epic particularly but perhaps some elevated forms of elegy as well.⁸⁴ In the Augustan deployment of the Callimachean aesthetic, however, some things change. First of all, the Augustan *recusatio* is often phrased as a posture of aesthetic independence in an answer to a patron's pressure—real or imagined—to write panegyric poetry.⁸⁵ Callimachus's *recusatio* was not responding to pressures from a patron but rather, in the

⁸³ Gutzwiller (2007): 33.

⁸⁴ Nauta (2006): 24.

⁸⁵ Lowrie (2009): 215-216.

Reply to the Telchines, his critics. The aesthetic concerns to which the Augustans could ascribe their refusals were conveniently placed in the context of a renewed interest in Hellenistic poetry at the time. However, while Callimachus' claims create a world of aesthetic exclusivity, the Augustans extend this to include social exclusivity as well. They often name their noble addressee and in this way, praise him and cast themselves within his elite social circle. However, in naming the addressee but refusing to praise his deeds in epic form, they also circumscribe the role he plays in their poetics by insisting on the autonomy of their poetic and aesthetic sphere, where they are free to create small-scale personal poetry. While the opposition of genre is important, what is perhaps more significant is the opposition of this small, private sphere to the grand public one, since public poetry had become overblown and unusable. For the Augustan poets, the politicization of the Callimachean aesthetic is an important element in the *recusationes*, where there arises the issue not just of poetic style but also of content and prestige. In the Roman world, epic is a nationalized and politicized genre, especially in its ability to tell the story of Rome's golden past and celebrate contemporary achievements. Therefore a rejection of this involves not just a rejection of the bombastic genre, but also a rejection of social and political prestige. The rejection of politically-themed poetry was partially due to the reasons listed above but also because with poetry embedded in its social and political surroundings came fears about the authenticity and aesthetic value of the poetic product.

The first example of an Augustan *recusatio* can be found in Virgil's *Eclogues* 6, where he echoes Callimachus directly (*Eclogues* 6.3-8):

*cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthia aurem
vellit et admonuit: "pastorem, Tityre, pinguis*

pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen”.
nunc ego (namque super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes,
Vare, tuas cupiant et tristia condere bella)
agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam:

When I was singing kings and battles, Cynthius pulled my ear in admonition: ‘A shepherd, Tityrus, should feed his flock fat, but recite a thin-spun song.’ I now (for you’ll have many eager to recite your praises, Varus, and compose unhappy wars) will meditate the rustic Muse on slender reed.⁸⁶

Here, like in Callimachus, the contrast is between the small and grand, specifically the genres of bucolic versus epic and rustic themes versus martial ones. There is also the additional element of a refusal to write panegyric poetry. However, while refusing to write panegyric epic in praise of Varus, the simple mention of his name means that his deeds cannot be far from the reader’s mind.

Similar in theme is Horace’s Ode to Agrippa, who was a general in the service of Augustus. In *Odes* 1.6, Horace writes that Agrippa will be honoured in the poetry of Varius, but Horace is too modest a poet to write such grand poetry (*Odes* 1.6.1-12):

Scriberis Vario fortis et hostium
victor, Maeonii carminis alite,
quam rem cumque ferox navibus aut equis
miles te duce gesserit:
nos, Agrippa, neque haec dicere nec gravem
Pelidae stomachum cedere nescii
nec cursus duplicis per mare Ulixei
nec saevam Pelopis domum
conamur, tenues grandia, dum pudor
imbellisque lyrae Musa potens vetat
laudes egregii Caesaris et tuas
culpa deterere ingeni.

Varius, a bird of Maeonian song,⁸⁷ will write of you as a brave man who has conquered our enemies, recording all the feats that your fierce troops have performed on shipboard or horseback under your command. I do not attempt to recount such things, Agrippa, any more than the deadly rancour of Peleus’ son

⁸⁶ Trans: Lee (1984): 71.

⁸⁷ “A bird of Maeonian song” means that Varius is an epic poet worthy of Homer, who was born in Maeonia.

who was incapable of giving way, or the wily Ulysses and his journeys over the sea, or the inhuman house of Pelops;⁸⁸ such themes are too grand for one of slender powers. Diffidence, and the Muse who controls the unwarlike lyre, forbid me to diminish the exploits of glorious Caesar and yourself by my inadequate talent.⁸⁹

Here the opposition of a small genre to epic is similar to Virgil, although lyric replaces bucolic as the genre he chooses to compose in. In addition to the refusal to praise Agrippa in epic, and subsequently exalting him in the lyric genre, he adds the element of personal modesty to the Virgilian topos; his talent is too *tenuis* to sing the great deeds of Agrippa. At the end of the ode, he adds that he is better equipped to sing of love and the fierce battles of lovers rather than epic battles. As in the poems of Callimachus and Virgil, again we have the element of divine intervention, in the form of the Muse rather than Apollo, directing Horace to write in a smaller genre.⁹⁰

In addition to the Virgilian bucolic *recusatio* and the Horatian lyric one, Propertius, writing in the genre of love elegy, also offers a refusal to write epic (*Elegies* 3.3.1-20):

*Visus eram molli recubans Heliconis in umbra,
Bellerophontei qua fluit umor equi,
reges, Alba, tuos et regum facta tuorum,
tantum operis, nervis hiscere posse meis;
parvaeque iam magnis admoram fontibus ora
(unde pater sitiens Ennius ante bibit,
et cecinit Curios fratres et Horatia pila,
regiaque Aemilia vecta tropaea rate,
victricisque moras Fabii pugnamque sinistram
Cannensem et versos ad pia vota deos,
Hannibalemque Lares Romana sede fugantis,
anseris et tutum voce fuisse Iovem),*

⁸⁸ For the house of Pelops as a stereotypical tragic theme, see also Persius *Satires* 5.

⁸⁹ Trans: Rudd (2004): 35-37.

⁹⁰ Apollo does make an appearance in the Horatian *recusatio*, however. In the beginning of *Odes* 4.15, which praises the deeds of Augustus, Horace states that earlier in his career, Apollo had told him not to write epic (1-3) although he does go on to praise the deeds of Augustus directly in this, the last of his lyric poems.

*cum me Castalia specularans ex arbore Phoebus
 sic ait aurata nixus ad antra lyra:
 'quid tibi cum tali, demens, est flumine? quis te
 carminis heroi tangere iussit opus?
 non hinc ulla tibi sperandast fama, Properti:
 mollia sunt parvis prata terenda rotis;
 ut tuus in scamno iactetur saepe libellus,
 quem legat exspectans sola puella virum.*

I dreamed that lying in the soft shade of Helicon, where flows the fountain of Belerophon's horse, I possessed the power to proclaim to my lyre's accompaniment Alba's kings and their deeds, a mighty task. I had already put my puny lips to that potent spring (whence father Ennius once thirstily drank and sang of Curian brothers and the spears of the Horatii, and Jupiter saved by the cackling of geese; the victorious delays of Fabius, the calamitous battle of Cannae, gods that turned to answer pious prayers, and the Lares that drove off Hannibal from their abode in Rome, and royal trophies transported on Aemilius' galleys), when Phoebus observed me from the Castalian wood, and said, as he leaned upon his golden lyre beside the cave:

Madman, what business have you at such a stream? Who bade you touch the task of heroic song? Not from here, Propertius, may you hope for any fame: small wheels must run upon soft grass, so that your book be oft paraded on the bench for a lonely girl to read as she awaits her man.⁹¹

Here the dream that Propertius is recounting is that of Ennius, who, like Callimachus in the second fragment of the *Aetia*, had a dream on Mt. Helicon, and the events listed are from Ennius' historic epic, the *Annales*.⁹² This signifies the potential for Propertius' epic ambitions but it is clearly not the path he is destined to follow, due to Apollo's admonitions.⁹³ While he does not mention a noble addressee in this particular poem, in *Elegies* 2.1, Propertius says that were it not for the constant inspiration of his girl that forces him to create love poetry, he would sing the deeds of Maecenas and Augustus (1-26). The directive to trace his wheels upon soft grass is reminiscent of the untrodden path that Callimachus is meant to guide his carriage down, with the softness in this case

⁹¹ Trans: Goold (1990): 259-261

⁹² Goold (1990): 259.

⁹³ Similarly, in *Elegies* 2.1, Propertius says that were it not for the constant inspiration of his girl that forces him to create love poetry, he would sing the deeds of Maecenas and Augustus (1-26).

perhaps referring to the softness of the feminine subject of love elegy. Propertius goes on to describe an elaborate grove, where the Muses again speak to him and tell him to write love elegy (*Elegies* 3.3.27-34):

*Hic erat affixis viridis spelunca lapillis,
Pendebantque cavis tympana pumicibus,
Orgia Musarum et Sileni patris imago
Fictilis et calami, Pan Tegeaeae, tui;
Et Veneris dominae volucres, mea turba, columbae
Tingunt Gorgoneo punica rostra lacu;
Diversaeque novem sortitae iura Puellae
Excerent teneras in sua dona manus*

Here was a green grotto lined with mosaics and from the hollow pumice timbrels hung, the mystic instrument of the Muses, a clay image of father Silenus, and the pipe of Arcadian Pan; and the birds of my lady Venus, the doves that I love, dip their red bills in the Gorgon's pool, while the nine Maidens, each allotted her own realm, busy their tender hands⁹⁴

This is reminiscent of an earlier grove in his *Elegies* 3.1, where he asks permission to enter from the shades of Callimachus and Philitas of Cos (*Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae, / in vestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus*, 1-2) and where again he states his preference for elegy over epic (7-20) and his trust that he will gain fame after his lifetime, even if he does not have it currently (*at mihi quod vivo detraxerit invida turba, / post obitum duplici faenore reddet Honos*, 21-22).⁹⁵ In both cases, the grove is a poetic construct where divine forces of inspiration are present to justify the poet's choice of genre. In the case of *Elegies* 3.3, the doves of Venus join other divinities associated with poetry to reflect the poet's choice of love elegy. In the grove, the poet is answerable only to the Muses and divinities; the separation of the site of poetic production from everyday pressures will be discussed more in Chapter 3.

⁹⁴ Trans: Goold (1990): 261.

⁹⁵ The desire for fame after death is one that Martial will consciously invert.

As a final example of Augustan *recusationes*, we come to Ovid. The first example of the Ovidian *recusatio* is in *Amores* 1.1, although it comes in the form of a parody of Callimachus and his Augustan predecessors. While he too receives divine intervention telling him to write in the smaller genres, in a humorous substitution appropriate to his theme of love elegy, the divinity involved is Cupid rather than Apollo (*Amores* 1.1.1-6):

*Arma gravi numero violentaque bella parabam
edere, materia conveniente modis.
par erat inferior versus –risisse Cupido
dicitur atque unum surripuisse pedem
“quis tibi, saeve puer, ded hoc in carmina iuris?
Pieridum vates, non tua turba sumus.”*

My epic was under construction—wars and armed violence in the grand manner, with metre matching theme. I had written the second hexameter when Cupid grinned and calmly removed one of its feet. ‘You young savage’ I protested ‘poetry’s none of your business. We poets are committed to the Muses.’⁹⁶

Ovid also has a *recusatio* in 3.1, where he is wandering in a grove, reminiscent of Propertius *Elegies* 3.3, with its cave (*spelunca*, 3), overhanging rock (*pumice pendens*, 3) and birds, although here the nightingales of elegy (*dulce queruntur aves*, 4) replace the doves of Venus.⁹⁷ The untouched wood (*stat vetus et multos incaedua silva per annos*, 1) is reminiscent of the untrodden path of both Callimachus and Propertius. Here the poet receives a visit from Elegy and Tragedy who argue over what poetic course Ovid is to follow. He ultimately again chooses elegy, as in *Amores* 1.1, although he admits a greater work may be on the way; this is likely a reference to his *Metamorphoses*, a poem in dactylic hexameter about the various transformations that have occurred in Greek and

⁹⁶ Trans: Lee (1968): 3.

⁹⁷ The birds are sweetly complaining, and the word for elegy, *elegia*, also derives from the word for lamentation. Hunter (2006), 29-30.

Roman mythology from the formation of the world to the deification of Caesar (*a tergo grandius urget opus*, 70).

From these examples of Augustan *recusationes*, several key points are to be noticed. First, there is a general opposition between writing in small, personal genres versus writing in a more elevated one, specifically epic and, except in the case of Ovid, also panegyric.⁹⁸ Secondly, while the poet may actually be engaging in epic discourse, a divinity intercedes to convince him to choose a smaller genre instead.⁹⁹ Thirdly, a noble addressee is often central to the *recusatio* along with the poet's refusal to honour him in large-scale verse. What emerges from the mention of the addressee, however, is that while refusing to serve the great man's expectations for large-scale verse, the *recusatio* also honours the addressee by the dedication itself as well as the acknowledgement that his heroic victories are too great to be expressed in the modest verse of the lower genres. This saved the poets from reusing the worn-out words of praise while also expressing in a few carefully crafted words the achievements of their great patrons and placing them in the context of epic heroes. It also allowed them to act in accordance with the Callimachean aesthetic by avoiding the overblown and artistically limited genre of epic.¹⁰⁰

It is important to consider what is at stake in these *recusationes*. The refusal to write on public subjects and praise the deeds of a political figure in large scale verse serves to distance the poet not only from a certain kind of literary activity but also from the sphere of public importance and political involvement. By adhering to the

⁹⁸ Even in Ovid *Amores* 1.1, however, the description of the epic under construction recalls the *Aeneid*, which, while epic, is also panegyric in praise of Augustus, making this *recusatio* also, obliquely, a refusal of panegyric.

⁹⁹ Or, in Horace's case, the Muse functions as a personification of the rules of the lyric genre.

¹⁰⁰ Fantham (1996): 64-76.

Callimachean aesthetic of literary rigour and small-scale verse and by separating himself from the political domain, the poet is asserting the independence of his art from the wishes of an esteemed patron. This represents a paradox within the *recusatio*, that while it poses as a gesture of humility and courtesy, it is simultaneously a posture of independence. As already mentioned, this involves the careful negotiation on the part of the poet, who invites the patron into his poetic realm but also needs to define the role the patron plays in order to maintain his poetic autonomy.

The *recusatio* also involves a rejection of a certain kind of poetry, namely that which is political in theme and whose value is tied not to its aesthetic quality but rather to its involvement with the regime it celebrates. For political literature, assertion of a literary work's immortality was often directly related to the continuance of the Roman political regime. In Virgil's *Aeneid*, the poet recounts the death of Nisus and Euryalus at the hands of the Rutulians and says that their memory will survive as long as the sons of Aeneas live on the Capitol and as long as the Father of Rome retains command over his people (*Aeneid* 9.446-449). Similarly in *Odes* 3.30, Horace states that he has built a literary monument more lasting than bronze and that his verse will survive as long as the priest climbs the Capitol with the Vestal virgin (8-10). The reference in the first line to his work as a monument reflects a cultural practice of building stone monuments such as tombs that had inscriptions on them; the memory of the person associated with the monument would live on not only through the enduring quality of the monument itself but also through the inscription, whenever it was read aloud. Horace, in relocating himself within this epigraphical tradition, intends for his text to assume the qualities of such inscriptions: longevity, prestige, placement within a community and the primacy of

the authorial presence.¹⁰¹ Furthermore, by associating text with the immortality of Roman cultural and political practices, both authors expect their works to last as long as Roman cultural imperialism.¹⁰²

However, for literature that is apolitical in theme such as the prior examples of *recusationes*, the path to immortality comes in a different way. All of the texts mentioned eschew the work's connection to a political regime and therefore must also reject the hopes of immortality through connection to this regime that are espoused by the authors of political literature. Instead, these authors hope to gain literary value purely through dedication to the aesthetic quality of the work.¹⁰³

A significant quality for Hellenistic and also much of Augustan literature is the work's orientation towards posterity rather than its immediate usefulness in its current age, which was seen specifically in Propertius *Elegies* 3.1.¹⁰⁴ Separation from immediate social and financial gain—which could come from panegyric verse, for example—ensures poetry's enduring quality for the future. Corresponding to this is the poet's dedication not only to humble poetry but also to a humble existence. The word *tenuis*—meaning poor or insubstantial¹⁰⁵—takes on an ethical connotation as the poet orients himself towards private life rather than chasing wealth and status in the public sphere; without the distractions of political expectations or pressures, he can dedicate himself

¹⁰¹ Habinek (1998): 109-114.

¹⁰² See Lowrie (2009): 117-122 for a discussion of *Odes* 3.30 and the conflict between the poet's fixing his poetry within the epigraphical tradition and his desire that it surpass the temporal and spatial limitations associated with epigraphs and monuments. By abstractly placing *Odes* 3.30 within the context of ritual performance (the priest leading the Vestal virgin up the Capitoline) but not within a specific instance of this performance, he associates it more broadly with Roman cultural practice, thus enabling its continuance as long as this practice continues but not embedding it within a physical monument or temporal event which will inevitably erode or be forgotten.

¹⁰³ A notable example of a poet occupying the middle ground of poetry is Horace's statement in *Odes* 1.1 that he hopes to be included in the canon of lyric poets. The genre of lyric occupies a nice middle ground between poetry that is too panegyric and that such as elegy which is too obsessively self-absorbed.

¹⁰⁴ Roman (2001): 116.

¹⁰⁵ For example, the talent of Horace in *Odes* 1.6.9 or the clothing of Elegy in Ovid *Amores* 3.1.9.

solely to the aesthetic quality of his work.¹⁰⁶ The creation of a separate space for literary production is also important; this can be achieved by a physical withdrawal from the public sphere through retreating to a secluded country estate such as Horace's Sabine farm. The venue for poetic production can also be a highly-wrought poetic product itself, such as the poetic grove created by Propertius in *Elegies* 3.3. Whatever the means of separation, and this will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter, by creating a separate space for poetic production, the poet shows his dedication to literary quality, ensuring the work's autonomy and, subsequently, immortality. Therefore, in these Augustan examples, the *recusatio* represents the poet's deliberate marginalization from public significance and his dedication to creating a world of art that is separate from the public or political sphere.

2.2: The Satiric *Recusatio*

While the *recusationes* already discussed occur in several different genres, their unifying principle is the same: the preference for small-scale personal verse over bombastic large-scale verse. The satiric *recusatio* similarly involves a rejection of high prestige genres and focuses on the persona of the poet's insignificance, although its parameters are quite different. While the elegiac *recusatio* embraces the finely-wrought poem, the satiric one rejects artifice and the importance of a separate space for poetic inspiration and production. In fact, in *Satires* 1.4, Horace questions whether satire is even poetry at all, since it is written in the language of daily life (38-48). Satire is a genre that is intimately connected to the society in which it is produced and in the satiric *recusatio*,

¹⁰⁶ This is, of course, complicated by the fact that in order to concentrate on the aesthetic quality of poetry, the poet needs the financial support of a patron, thus creating a tension between the patron's expectations and the poet's need for independence. This will be discussed more in Chapter 3.

the concept of divine inspiration does not take the foreground. Furthermore, as we shall see with Persius and Juvenal whose satire is couched firmly in the material and language of the everyday, the poet does not offer an alternative environment such as the poetic grove as a foundation for his autonomy and the production of poetry.¹⁰⁷ Instead satire is grounded in its society and replaces epic with real life rather than precious art.

In *Satires* 2.1, Horace revisits the opposition between martial and domestic themes, as in the other *recusationes* already discussed. He describes his need to write satire, despite the arguments from his interlocutor, Trebatius who offers two literary alternatives: epic or Lucilian-style satire which commemorated aspects of the poet's day-to-day life with Scipio. However, Horace says that he lacks the power to sing the triumphs of Caesar and he does not want to offer an ill-timed satire in praise of Octavian's virtues since it might cause offense to the emperor or compromise his own poetic integrity.¹⁰⁸ Furthermore, he recognizes that his own status—the son of a freed slave in a post-Actian world—is very different from that of Lucilius—a man of senatorial rank in a late-Republican world—and subsequently, he could not write the same version of satire that Lucilius does.¹⁰⁹

Octavian's rejection of an untimely compliment is phrased in a way which associates him with Apollo and throughout the satire he is cast as an aesthetic judge.¹¹⁰ Praising the deeds of Caesar is not rejected due to a desire to create more personal literature but rather it is depicted as dangerous; like an angry horse who kicks when

¹⁰⁷ Persius uses the *verba togae*, language of the everyday, as a description for his satire (*Satires* 5.14) and Juvenal offers no reason for writing satire except that it arises from his indignation (*Satires* 1.79), which is a disavowal of art entirely.

¹⁰⁸ Freudenberg (2001): 82-92. Freudenberg argues that Horace's references to bristling spears are ultimately reminiscent of Ennius—through Lucilius and Virgil—and discusses the possibly disastrous effect of panegyric epic on a poet's voice.

¹⁰⁹ Freudenberg (2001): 96.

¹¹⁰ Clauss (1985): 201.

rubbed the wrong way, untimely praise of an unreceptive emperor can cause similar physical damage. However, in mentioning Augustus at all, like in the elegiac *recusatio*, the patron is still praised through mention of his name and the lack of proper talent to sing his deeds in epic song.

Here the poet is justifying his choice to write satire and his abandonment of politically-motivated poetry but also expressing his anxiety over satire's embeddedness within society. By casting Caesar as a judge/Apollo figure, and placing the delivery of satire within his court (*Satires* 2.1.83-86), the satirist is capitulating to the emperor's ultimate authority over literary quality. Furthermore, he is creating an elite audience for his poetry, namely the members of Caesar's court; he will not write large-scale epic to be appreciated by a vast audience but he is obviously expecting to be accepted by this small elite group.

The creation of a small audience who can appreciate his writing is Callimachean in nature and expresses the elitist tendencies of Horatian satire.¹¹¹ While satire is founded in real life, there is no appeal to the masses in this poem, but rather the small exclusive community he writes for adheres to the exclusivity of the Callimachean aesthetic. As with his lyric poems which occupy a middle ground between the political involvement of panegyric and the obsessive self-absorption of elegy,¹¹² here Horace also occupies a middle ground. His contribution to satire, like his Letter to Augustus (*Epistles* 2.1)—in which he seeks to moderate the roughness of the Roman farmer with excessive Greek refinement, finding a space between indigenous simplicity and Alexandrian refinement—

¹¹¹ See Callimachus *Epigrams* 28.1-2 (ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν, οὐδὲ κελεύθωι χαίρω τίς πολλοὺς ὧδε καὶ ὧδε φέρει, I hate the cyclic poem, nor do I take pleasure in the road which carries many to and fro) which is referenced in Horace's *Odes* 3.1.1 (*odi profanum vulgus et arceo*, I hate the uninitiated crowd and keep them far away).

¹¹² See Lowrie (1997), 85-93 for a discussion of Horace finding the generic mean between high and low genres.

is a melding. This satire is not embedded in the depths of the city, like Juvenalian satire, nor is it refined to an audience of one or two as we shall see with Persius. There is no favouring of satire as an esteemed genre in itself, since, as already mentioned, he questions whether satire is even poetry; however, in *Satires* 1.10, he expresses the value of his satiric verse and lists an elite group of friends who will enjoy his writing (81-89). In *Satires* 1.9, where he counteracts the advances of a social climber trying to find a way into Maecenas' circle, Horace is also expressing his inclusion in a privileged world. While satire may not be one of the most esteemed genres, in these programmatic statements, Horace is expressing a place for his poetry within an elite group, where the law of Caesar takes place over common law and where he can write his satiric poems for an appreciative audience.

However, his relationship to political themes is still one of avoidance; in *Satires* 1.5, he recounts the journey to Brundisium where there was a summit conference between Antony and Octavian, which ultimately led to the postponement of civil conflict for six more years.¹¹³ While this was certainly a significant political event in reality, in the poem, Horace operates from a sphere of marginalization and his focus is not on politics at all, but rather the physical and everyday concerns more typical of satire: an eye infection, a fight, a fire that nearly engulfs a house, sex, food, the weather, and urban legends.¹¹⁴ This can be contrasted with an epic poet such as Ennius, who recounted his patron's military accomplishments while accompanying him on such journeys.

We see another example of the satiric *recusatio* in the works of the Neronian satirist, Persius. In *Satires* 5, he bemoans the epic pretension of asking for a hundred

¹¹³ Rudd (1997): 61.

¹¹⁴ Freudenberg (2001): 51-58.

mouths to sing a glorious song (1-2). He would like to commemorate his friendship in sublime language but he recognizes that this rhetoric is now bankrupt; he thinks that the genre of epic is overused and insincere while the language of the everyday is morally authentic (7-18). The address to a patron or friend, in this case, Cornutus, is reminiscent of the *recusationes* that we have seen already but the satirist does not assert an inability to do justice to his friendship in epic language but rather he prefers the small genre of satire since the language comes from his soul (19-29).

In his *Prologue* and in *Satires* 1, Persius also expresses his commitment to the everyday language and themes of satire; for example, the stomach is the great definer of poetics (*Prologue* 10-14) and he rejects all types of mythological poetry, including epic and tragedy, in *Satires* 1. His contrast is between everyday subjects and language opposed to swollen themes of mythological poetry.¹¹⁵ Persius' favour of the *verba togae*, the language of everyday, while reminiscent of Horace's preference for the *sermo pedestris*, represents a satiric *recusatio* of a slightly different vein than Horace. While Horace rejects praising the deeds of Caesar in epic or panegyric, he still constructs an audience for himself within Caesar's court. However, while Persius similarly rejects the high genres and hopes for a higher level of literary appreciation, he does not find a place within an elite aesthetic community as Horace does. Throughout *Satires* 1, he bemoans the lack of wit and literary taste amongst his fellows but he has no alternative location or audience for his satires; he states that his audience will be limited to one or two readers only (1-3). He distinguishes himself from common criticism and this distance from popular literature and the desire for a competent readership is shared with Horace but he cannot imagine a readership like Horace does. While his physical and literary

¹¹⁵ Nauta (2006): 39.

marginalization is much more extreme than in the elegiac *recusationes* or Horace's satiric one, the contrast between high and low genres, the need to purge the poetic community and the desire to shun epic and mythological themes is consistent with the other *recusationes*.

Juvenal's *recusatio* comes in *Satires* 1 where he complains that everyone has become a writer and all rehash the generic themes of epic and tragedy; he bemoans the vices of society and says that amongst such vice, it is impossible not to write satire (*difficile est saturam non scribere*, *Satires* 1.29). He states that the themes of mythological epic are bankrupt since they are overused by all poets and as an alternative, he uses satire to describe the epic level of Rome's corruption; this is meant to reveal what is wrong with epic, namely its overblown nature, but also the pinnacle of vice that defines Juvenal's society. What can ultimately result from this is the creation of a degraded version of epic.

2.3: Satire and Epic

While the elegiac *recusationes* focus on the creation of a separate space for literary production, satire relies on society for its inspiration. The production of satire is not circumscribed by a divine veto which conveniently allows the poet to completely avoid the high genres and write small-scale personal poetry. Since satire writes about real life and the satirist's world is filled with bad versions of epic and tragedy (Persius *Satires* 1; Juvenal *Satires* 1.1-21), often we see the poet rehash themes of these higher genres within the satiric sphere. This rehashing is often exercised in the form of epic parody, which is particularly evident in Petronius' *Satyricon*, an extended first person satiric

narrative written under the reign of Nero. The *Satyricon* follows the exploits of Encolpius and throughout the narrative, we see him place himself in humorous situations which he sees as epic and often it seems that the intention is to cut these epic scenes down to size. For example, when Encolpius is upset over his friend Ascyltus' thievery of his boy lover, Giton, we see him withdraw to the beach and mourn the loss (*Satyricon* 81). Here he says that in his seclusion (*locum secretum*), he beat his breast with blows and uttered shrill groans. This passage is noteworthy because it mimics a similar scene in the *Iliad* where Achilles, after Agamemnon had unjustly taken away his slave girl, Briseis, retreated from his companions to a seaside location in order to express his sorrow (*Iliad* 1.348-50).

Another scene that has epic connotations occurs when Encolpius encounters his old acquaintance Lichas. This plays upon the famous recognition scene of Odysseus' nurse, Eurycleia, who recognizes a unique scar on the hero's leg although he is disguised as a beggar (*Odyssey* 19.466-480).¹¹⁶ However, the satiric scene is amusing and rude compared to its epic counterpart; Lichas recognizes Encolpius not by a characteristic attribute such as hands or face but by groping his genitals (*Satyricon* 105.9). Encolpius even makes the comparison between himself and Odysseus explicit by asking how anyone could be surprised that Odysseus' nurse recognized his scar after twenty years since a similar phenomenon has just happened to him. We also see a hint of Encolpius' disappointment that Lichas does not follow the proper heroic etiquette; this reveals the extent to which the hero cannot differentiate between his own life and its epic "model".

While these situations appear as parodies of their epic *exempla*, there is also another way to read them, that they—along with the satiric *recusatio*—represent a

¹¹⁶ Conte (1996): 53. Conte argues that this is one of many examples of Encolpius recalling one of the scholastic *exempla* that he was taught in school and applying it to his own ordinary and humorous situations and "cloak[ing] the events of his personal life in literature."

somewhat more complicated opposition to epic, namely a failed attempt to reach its sublimity. While admittedly satiric poets such as Petronius or Juvenal do not attempt to write epic, they do insert within their satires debased versions of epic situations. Because satire is immersed in the realities of the world rather than an elevated epic landscape, the reality always resists the epic aspirations. There is the stock complaint in the Silver Age that nothing new can be written due to the saturation of the genre but Petronius exposes the bankruptcy of this complaint by having characters that constantly have epic aspirations but are not able to reach them partially due to the constant setbacks of their own society but mostly due to their own hypocrisy.¹¹⁷

After, and even to some degree during, the Augustan era, there was a sense that all literature had reached its zenith; all the subject matter had been exhausted and to write something new in the genres of poetry or oratory was to compete with models that were sublime.¹¹⁸ This is elaborated by Horace as literary critic in his *Epistles* 2.1 where he talks about modern versus Greek theatrical performance. While he stresses the importance of valuing Roman art throughout the rest of the epistle, in the section on tragedy, he says that while modern theatre may offer a great deal of spectacle, the effect is tawdry; it is impossible to rival or recreate the greatness of Greek tragic theatre which

¹¹⁷ An example of such a complaint is found in the exchange at the beginning of the *Satyricon* where Encolpius complains that no one appreciates quality literature anymore since children are not taught to recognize it in school. His companion Agamemnon complains that parents rush their children to learn oratory but expect their progress to be so quick that it forces them into public life before their intellects get a chance to mature (*Satyricon* 1-4). Later, Encolpius reveals his hypocrisy in his inability to appreciate fine art; he comments merely on its realism and immediately tries to relate the epic images to his own life (*Satyricon* 83). He talks with the poet Eumolpus who has similar complaints about the lack of appreciation for the arts but it is revealed that Eumolpus was brought into a home as a tutor only with the intention of seducing his pupil, demonstrating his own hypocrisy (*Satyricon* 84-88).

¹¹⁸ As already mentioned in the Introduction, Longinus, a Greek literary critic who most likely lived in the first century AD wrote a treatise on how to write sublime poetry entitled *On the Sublime*. In chapter 44, he has an interlocutor argue that while democracy is the nurse of genius, in the current age, people are growing up as slaves under despotic rule, and henceforth do not develop a taste for eloquence and liberty but rather for flattery. The cliché is acknowledged that Roman poetry is defined by coming too late.

Horace admits has a profound effect on him, wringing his heart at one moment, inflaming it, calming it and terrifying it the next and transferring him in space to Thebes or Athens (210-213). This represents a longing for the sublime and an acknowledgment of a modern sense of inadequacy.¹¹⁹

The aforementioned scenes within the *Satyricon* show a protagonist longing for the sublimity of epic. Encolpius would have been exposed to the models of great literature in the schoolroom and he constantly tries to apply these *exempla* to his own life. While the protagonist may think his enthusiasm and an acute remembrance of schoolroom *exempla* may be enough to capture for himself the essence of great literature, Petronius uses the irony of these situations to reveal the opposite; if a character such as Encolpius is the only seeker in a quest for the sublime, it must mean that it is truly lost.¹²⁰

A similar model can be applied to the Juvenalian persona. While the two authors write very different satirical literature, there are hints of futile epic aspirations in Juvenal as well. One example of Juvenal's relationship with epic is his portrayal of his satiric predecessor, Lucilius. In *Satires* 1, where Juvenal denounces epic themes in favour of a satirical account of Roman vice, the poet characterizes Lucilius as an epic hero. In the last ten lines, he states that it is easy and acceptable to rehash the stories of epic heroes (162-164). However, he says that it is Lucilius who is truly heroic, raging as if on a battlefield, with a sword in hand, and bringing fear and discomfort to a listener (165-167). Juvenal is essentially staging an epic battle with a satiric poet as its hero. However, he himself can never live up to this example. While *Satires* 1 is full of an epic-like fury, it

¹¹⁹ Conte (1996): 41.

¹²⁰ Conte (1996): 67.

ultimately falls flat as Juvenal admits his only targets are those that are already dead (170-171), which undermines his heroic willingness to take up arms.

Perhaps the most significant instance of sustained epic allusion in Juvenal comes in *Satires* 3—already discussed in Chapter 1 (pg. 25ff)—where the voyage of the poet’s friend Umbricius recalls the heroic journey of Virgil’s Aeneas. Umbricius meets the poet at the Capena gate of Rome, where the Camenae, the Roman spirits of poetic inspiration, once lived but have now been ejected (*omnis enim populo mercedem pendere iussa est / arbor et eiectis mendicat silva Camenis*, For as every tree nowadays has to pay toll to the people, the Muses have been ejected, and the wood has to go a-begging¹²¹ 15-16).

Umbricius declares that he intends to move to Cumae, the gateway to the Underworld, a voyage that reverses Aeneas’ journey from Troy to Rome, also via Cumae where the hero enters the Underworld. It is significant that Umbricius, like Aeneas, is fleeing a city overrun by Greeks (*non possum ferre, Quirites, / Graecum urbem*; I cannot abide, Quirites, a Rome of Greeks¹²² *Satires* 3.60-61). The major event of Aeneas’ visit to the Underworld is a vision of Rome’s future heroes from his father, Anchises (*Aeneid* 6.756-884). On the other hand, Umbricius recounts a list of all the worst men in Roman society: liars (41), patricides (43), accomplices in crime (51), foreign flatterers (86-108), thieves and corrupt governors (46-47) and the list goes on.

Furthermore, while Aeneas leaves the burning city of Troy in order to forge a Roman identity, Umbricius describes Rome burning in flames in words that allude to Virgil. In his description of a house-fire, Umbricius names the Trojan elder Ucalegon as

¹²¹ Trans: Ramsay (1999): 33.

¹²² Trans: Ramsay (1999): 33.

one of the people in the fire, trying to put out the flame and salvage his possessions as the fire works its way up the building from the bottom floor (*Satires* 3.198-202):

*...iam poscit aquam, iam frivola transfert
Uvalegon, tabulata tibi iam tertia fumant:
tu nescis; nam si gradibus trepidatur ab imis,
ultimus ardebit quem tegula sola tuetur
a pluvia, molles ubi reddunt ova columbae.*

Ucalegon below is already shouting for water and shifting his chattels; smoke is pouring out of your third-floor attic, but you know nothing of it; for if the alarm begins in the ground-floor, the last man to burn will be he who has nothing to shelter him from the rain but the tiles, where the gentle doves lay their eggs.¹²³

The use of *ultimus ardebit* provides a satiric sequel to Virgil's lines about the original fire in Troy (*Aeneid* 2.310-312):

*iam Deiphobi dedit ampla ruinam
Volcano superante domus, iam proximus ardet
Ucalegon*

Even now the spacious house of Deiphobus has fallen, as the fire god towers above; even now his neighbour Ucalegon blazes.

It is important here that in his description of this fire, Umbricius is cast as an epic-hero narrator like Aeneas in Dido's court.¹²⁴ However, instead of recounting heroic acts and journeys, he only tells the vices of his city's inhabitants.

There is a further intertextual reference in this passage. The Latin *Volcano superante* recalls Horace's *dilapso... Volcano* in his *Satires* 1.5. As already mentioned, *Satires* 1.5 describes a journey in which Horace accompanied Maecenas to a summit conference in Brundisium; this phrase specifically is used in his mock-epic account of a

¹²³ Trans: Ramsay (1999): 47.

¹²⁴ Baines (2003): 222. In this article Baines convincingly argues that the presence of epic material in satire is not only intended to be mock-epic or parodic, noting the various ways Umbricius' character can be interpreted: a hero like Aeneas, a character who honestly sees himself and his world in epic terms, and a moralizing satirist.

kitchen fire in Beneventum (73). Since Virgil was also on the voyage, it is likely that his *Volcano superante* is a nod to Horace.¹²⁵ Therefore, Juvenal here is looking back nostalgically to the Golden Age of these Augustans, where epic was still a viable genre and comradery existed between poets. Juvenal's satiric reference to Ucalegon shows an inferior version of the myth to fit with his own inferior society.

There is another scene within *Satires* 3 that deserves further attention for its role as a bad version of epic. In addition to his description of all the contemptible characters in Rome, Umbricius also describes the struggles that a Roman poor man (*pauper*) encounters in a single day, one of which is a nocturnal fight between the *pauper* and a thug he encounters on the street (278-301). This passage begins with a comparison between the thug's insomnia and that of Achilles, mourning for Patroclus (*Iliad* 24.9-12). Like Achilles, the thug is doomed to toss and turn all night (*Satires* 3.278-280):

*Ebrius ac petulans, qui nullum forte cecidit,
dat poenas, noctem patitur lugentis amicum
Pelidae, cubat in faciem, mox deinde supinus*

Your drunken bully who has by chance not slain his man passes a night of torture like that of Achilles when he bemoaned his friend, lying now upon his face, and now upon his back¹²⁶

This immediately places the following events on an epic plane, by comparing this lowly character to an epic hero. While it is possible that this comparison is meant to highlight the thug's lack of heroism by juxtaposition, to merely bring more humour to the episode, or to equate the physical and moral ruin in Rome to the destruction of Troy,¹²⁷ it is also clear that there is an *Encolpius*-like desire here to make an everyday situation epic.

¹²⁵Connors (2005): 140.

¹²⁶Trans: Ramsay (1999): 53.

¹²⁷Baines (2003): 226.

The brawl itself could also be read as an attempt at staging an epic fight between heroes. By naming the thug as Achilles, the suggestion is that the opponent is also an epic warrior, possibly a figure like Hector. However, what ensues is far from epic. The *pauper* tries to avoid fighting but the thug is set to brawl (290-292). The *pauper* has no real choice in the matter; the thug is stronger so he must obey and even if he does not, he will be beaten up and then taken to court for fighting (297-299). This situation is framed in epic terms. It is a battle; there is a challenge between opponents, an exchange of violence, albeit an unequal one, and one victor. However, the combat is not heroic, such as that of Achilles and Hector or Aeneas and Turnus. There is no equality in the opponents, the fight is due to drunkenness and belligerence rather than enmity in war and there are no acts of bravery, noble victories or deaths; at the end the *pauper* is beaten and begs to go home with just a few teeth (299-301). What the satiric poet has established is a narrator who sees his world in epic terms but the reality is only a debased version of the epic model.

This shows how the general structure of *Satires* 3 interacts with its epic model and how this epic model is not intended merely for parodic effect; rather, by contrast, it reveals the extent of vice in the Roman city and how this is the inescapable reality for the satiric poet. While Umbricius—whose name is a play on the word *umbra* or ghost, implying that his trip to Cumae is perhaps a descent into the Underworld—is able to leave the city, Juvenal must stay; his poetry depends on the city and the country retreat so essential for Horace was not available to him.¹²⁸

¹²⁸ The ending of *Satires* 3 is somewhat problematic in that Umbricius offers to visit Juvenal and hear the poet read his satires in “your [Juvenal’s] Aquinam” (*tuo Aquino, Satires* 3.319), indicating that Juvenal did have a country retreat available to him. However, since his satire is so embedded in the city, it is difficult to

What this all entails for the Juvenalian satirist is a loss of separation between poetic community and real life. What was essential to the earlier Augustan *recusationes* and even the satiric *recusationes* of Horace and Persius was the creation of a separate space for poetic production or at least a separate audience. However, for Juvenal, satire is merely the creation of an inferior version of epic and he cannot perceive his city in non-mythological terms. Reality is just the rehashing of epic forms in a world saturated in literary topoi. Life and art have become the same thing and there is no discrete space for artistic production and therefore no hope of producing quality literature. While all satiric *recusationes* claim their separation from epic and their commitment to everyday verse, here Juvenal implies that he is just producing a degenerate version of epic and his everyday verse has no value other than acknowledging the corruption of his environment.

2.4: The *Recusatio* in Martial

As with his epigrams on patronage discussed in Chapter 1, Martial in his *recusationes*, provides a foil for Juvenal and offers a more hopeful view for a world in which art mimics life. Like Juvenal, for Martial, poetry is also the stuff of life and there is no separation between life and art. However, the outlook is more optimistic and it seems that Martial is creating a new aesthetic standard based on the tastes of an elite social group, whose activities his poetry both records and immortalizes.

One example of Martial's *recusatio* comes in epigram *Epigrams* 1.107, where against the accusations of a certain Lucius Julius, who complains that Martial does not write anything great, he states that if he were given the type of leisure that the patronage

imagine him even reciting, much less writing, satire in the country. This relationship between the locus of poetic creation and the type of poetry created will be discussed in Chapter 3.

of Maecenas granted to Virgil and Horace, he would build works that would last through the ages (*otia da nobis, sed qualia fecerat olim / Maecenas Flacco Vergilioque suo: condere victuras temptem per saecula curas / et nomen flammis eripuisse meum*, 1.107.3-6). This represents a departure from the traditional Augustan *recusatio* in that it replaces aesthetic concerns with financial ones, an attitude which is in accordance with Juvenal. However, in another epigram already mentioned in Chapter 1 (pg. 43), 8.56, Martial says that even if he did have the patronage of a Maecenas, he would still be an epigrammatist, indicating his dedication to his small genre (*ergo ego Vergilius, si munera Maecenatis / das mihi? Vergilius non ero, Marsus ero*, Shall I then be a Virgil if you give me the gifts of a Maecenas? I shall not be a Virgil, a Marsus shall I be, 8.56.23-24¹²⁹). The contrast between these two epigrams mark one of the many inconsistencies in Martial's poetics which allow him to be read as both a mendicant poet writing ephemeral verse in exchange for money and gifts as well as a staunch advocate for the value of the small genre of epigram in recording the activities of his social circle.

In *Epigrams* 10.4, he shows his dedication to recording real life, stating that if someone wants to read tragedies, he is not acquainting himself with real life while epigrams allow the reader to truly know himself. The last lines offer Martial's epigrams as an alternative to mythological poetry and involve a direct rejection of Callimachus and thus a rejection of aesthetic framework that was so influential to the Augustans:¹³⁰

*Qui legis Oedipoden caligantemque Thyesten,
Colchidas et Scyllas, quid nisi monstra legis?
quid tibi raptus Hylas, quid Parthenopaeus et Attis,
quid tibi dormitory proderit Endymion?
exutusve puer pinnis labentibus? aut qui
odit amatrices Hermaphroditus aquas?*

¹²⁹ Trans: Ker (1930, Vol. 2): 45.

¹³⁰ Nauta (2006): 40.

*quid te vana iuvant miserae ludibria chartae?
hoc lege, quod possit dicere vita "Meum est."
non hic Centauros, not Gorgonas Harpyiasque
invenies: hominem pagina nostra sapit.
sed non vis, Mamurra, tuos cognoscere mores
nec te scire: legas Aetia Callimachi.*

You, who read of Oedipus and Thyeste neath a darkened sun, of Colchian witches and Scyllas—of what do you read but monsters? What will the rape of Hylas avail you, what Parthenopaeus and Attis, what the sleeper Endymion? Or the boy stript of his gliding wings? Or Hermaphroditus who hates the amorous waters? Why does the vain twaddle of a wretched sheet attract you? Read this of which Life can say: "Tis my own." Not here will you find Centaurs, not Gorgons and Harpies: 'tis of man my page smacks. But you who do not wish, Mamurra, to recognize your own manners, or to know yourself: read the *Aetia* of Callimachus.¹³¹

Perhaps the greatest example of Martial's *recusatio* comes in *Epigrams* 8.3, where he states that he will stop writing epigrams because there is no way that he can possibly become more famous than he already is:

*Quinque satis fuerant: nam sex septemve libelli
est nimium: quid adhuc ludere, Musa, iuvat?
sit pudor et finis: iam plus nihil addere nobis
fama potest: teritur noster ubique liber;
et cum rupta situ Messallae saxa iacebunt
altaque cum Licini marmora pulvis erunt
me tamen ora legent et secum plurimus hospes
ad patrias sedes carmina nostra feret."
finieram, cum sic respondit nona sororum,
cui coma et unguento sordida vestis erat:
"Tune potes dulcis, ingrata, relinquere nugas?
dic mihi, quid melius desidiosus ages?
an iuvat ad tragicos soccum transferre coturnos
aspera vel paribus bella tonare modis,
praelegat ut tumidus rauca te voce magister,
oderit et grandis virgo bonusque puer?
scribant ista graves nimium nimiumque severi,
quos media miseros nocte lucerna videt
at tu Romanos lepido sale tingue libellos:
adgnoscat mores vita legatque suos.
angusta cantare licet videaris avena,
dum tua multorum vincat avena tubas."*

¹³¹ Trans: Ker (1930, Vol. 2): 155.

Five were sufficient; for six or seven books are too much; why do you want, Muse, to frolic still? Let there be some stint and an end; now nothing more can Fame give me; my book is thumbed everywhere; and when Messalla's pavements shall lie shivered by decay, and Licinus' towering marble shall be dust, yet me shall lips read, and many a sojourner shall carry my poems with him to his fatherland." I ended; when thus replied the ninth of the Sisters, her hair and vesture stained with unguent: "Can you, ungrateful man, resign your pleasant trifles? Tell me, what better thing when idle will you do? Wish you to adapt your comic shoe to the tragic buskin, or in even-footed measures to thunder of rough wars, that a pompous pedagogue may dictate you in hoarse tones, and tall girl and honest boy hate you? Let those themes be written by men grave overmuch, and overmuch austere, whom at midnight their lamp marks at their wretched toil. But do you dip your little Roman books in sprightly wit; let Life recognize and read of her own manners. To a thin pipe you may appear to sing, if only your pipe outblow the trump of many.¹³²

There are several things to note in comparing this *recusatio* to one of the Augustan lyric or elegaic ones. First, while the trope of a divinity intervening to dissuade the poet from writing in higher genres is familiar, here Martial was not attempting to write in these genres. Instead, he is considering giving up epigram because he has already achieved as much fame as he could in a lifetime. *Pudor*, modesty, is again at stake, but he is asking for it, rather than having it prevent him from writing! Furthermore, while the Muse rejects the larger genres of tragedy and epic, there is no concern over creating extremely carefully wrought poems like in the Augustans or Callimachus. Instead, Martial's Muse rejects the careful toil needed to produce this kind of poetry—burning the midnight oil—and tells Martial to continue to write humorous poetry and sing of real life. While the motif of the slender reed is definitely reminiscent of Callimachus or Virgil, here the

¹³² Trans: Ker (1930, Vol. 2): 5-7. The Muse's admonishment here is reminiscent of Tragedy's visit to Ovid in *Amores* 3.1.

deployment of the aesthetic is very different, calling direct attention to the contrast between this aesthetic code and Martial's new poetic program.

In terms of immortality, it is also significant that, like in Horace *Odes* 3.30, the comparison between book and monument is made here; however, the implication is that Martial will live on even after the degradation of Rome's pivotal monuments—the repairs done on the *Via Latina* by Messalla, an Augustan literary patron, and the giant tomb of Licinius¹³³—and presumably even its political regime due to the poet's wit and his preference for real life themes. The first few lines contain an important expression of his expectations for immortality. While Virgil and Horace tie their hopes for immortality to the Roman political regime, Martial here expresses an expectation for immortality solely through the quality and appreciation of his literature and he embraces fame and celebrity in his lifetime.¹³⁴

Martial, like Horace, also seeks to define a community of readers; in *Epigrams* 8.3, his books are thumbed everywhere and will be carried back to the fatherland by a non-Roman reader. While Martial does not define his specific audience in 8.3, in poems celebrating special events, we see the group of people with whom he is interacting: a society defined by its wealth and participation in the events Martial commemorates. For example, in 6.3 he expresses his hope for the birth of a son to the emperor, Domitian, and in 6.21, he commemorates the wedding of the patrician and poet, L. Arruntius Stella.¹³⁵ He has epigrams addressed to a huge number of friends, patrons, politicians, fellow poets,

¹³³ Trans: Ker (1930, Vol. 2): 5.

¹³⁴ For the preference of fame in his lifetime over glory after death, see also epigram 5.10. This is reminiscent of elegiac concerns over love for the mistress and friends rather than the Roman state.

¹³⁵ For other epigrams commemorating special occasions such as a victory in battle, the birth of a child, a wedding or a death, see 1.31, 6.38, 6.52, 6.68, 6.76, 6.85, 7.8, 7.96, 8.66, 10.63, 10.71, 11.13. See also Chapter 1, pg. 45ff.

as well as wealthy men of leisure.¹³⁶ In *Epigrams* 6.64, he mentions the types of people who like to read his books: Silius Italicus, an epic poet, M. Aquilius Regulus, an orator, Sura, a consul under Domitian and Trajan, and even the emperor himself (10-15). Similarly, in 10.48, he mentions a dinner party he held at his Nomentum estate where he entertained several guests, amongst them wealthy friends, politicians and poets.¹³⁷ In commemorating the daily activities of Rome's wealthy elite and including himself in them, Martial, like Horace, makes his own claim to social elitism; his poetry, while popular, cannot be intimately appreciated outside of the group whose actions it immortalizes, hence why the Muse in *Epigrams* 8.3 dissuades him from writing for certain kinds of readers, such as the *grandis virgo* or *bonus puer*.¹³⁸

However, this assertion of quality through appreciation by an elite group of people is more extreme than Horace in that society becomes poetry. For Martial, like Juvenal, there is no separation between life and art; life is the subject of his art and the two collapse into one. However, his attitude towards his poetry and his society is different than Juvenal's; he embraces his popularity and sees a future for his writing within his society. Mythological poetry has become entirely irrelevant and since the poetry becomes the society it describes, it follows that the writings will be appreciated by this society as long as it continues and as long as his place as a poet within this social group is accepted and celebrated.

For both Martial and Juvenal, the *recusatio* is not based on an avoidance of higher genres for purely aesthetic reasons. This represents a significant departure from Augustan

¹³⁶ See Nauta (2002): 38-90, for a list and discussion of Martial's many addressees.

¹³⁷ Included in the guest list are L. Arruntius Stella, Nepos, Canius Rufus (poet), Flaccus (poet and/or rich friend), Lupus and Julius Cerealis. See Chapter 1, pg. 42ff., for a discussion of this epigram.

¹³⁸ Nauta (2006): 39.

ideals. There is no dedication to poetic autonomy, no poetic grove and alternative space for poetic production separate from the daily pressures of city life; similarly, there is no expectation for immortality tied to the rituals of the city and state. Both Martial and Juvenal instead embrace poetry of the everyday; however, the everyday differs between the two. For Juvenal, it is the city itself and the vices which have overcome it, which can only be described in the language of degenerate epic. For Martial, it is the daily life of a certain social group, who ultimately appreciate his writing and will immortalize it through their continued appreciation.

Satiric poetry is intimately connected to the circumstances of its production for both men. While Juvenal longs for the sublimity of epic, he is ultimately embedded in a vice-ridden city and can only write degenerate epic which reflects the corruption of his city. While Martial also has no separate space for poetic production, he does have a place within a social milieu that offers an alternate value and an alternate path towards immortality. He will never write a giant epic since, ostensibly, he does not have the leisure afforded by a generous patron such as Maecenas; however, this is not a bad thing since in 8.3, he clearly states that he has achieved a great deal of fame and his poetry will survive long after the monuments of Rome.

Martial's independence from the expectations of a patron or a regime is also important because it allows a certain type of poetic integrity. While Horace and Virgil both claim their adherence to small, personal poetry, they also both wrote poetry that was politically motivated and their hopes for immortality seem to have ultimately rested with literature's political affiliations. However, Martial refuses to play the game of producing immortal political poetry. Instead he records the thoughts of one segment of society and

his poetry, a pursuit which is ultimately ephemeral, will survive because it is valued by the community it reflects. Martial's acceptance of the interconnectedness of life and art, while it rejects the Augustan criteria for aesthetic value, creates a new criteria and a new path to immortality.

Chapter 3: Locating the Poetic Feast

Chapter 3 will discuss the relationship between the locus of poetic production and its consumption. As we saw in Chapter 2, the poetic grove and other postures of separation were important to Augustan poetics in that they ensured the integrity of the poetic product, created apart from societal and political pressures. There are tensions inherent in this separation, however, due to poetry's involvement within the political realm and the poets' need to answer to their patrons' requests and expectations. In keeping with the desire for separation, there is a contrast in Augustan poetry, Horace particularly, between the rusticity and moral integrity of the country opposed to the urbanity and over-sophistication of the city. A common way of expressing this was through food metaphors; in Horatian satire, the poet stresses the moral superiority of the rustic diet as well as aiming for satisfaction rather than excess in both poetry and dining.

In Martial and Juvenal, the separation through withdrawal to a rustic retreat is not achievable since the genre of satire relies on the nourishment of the city for its inspiration. Juvenal, like Horace, uses metaphors to describe his poetics although unlike Horatian satisfaction and simplicity, his poetics are a mixed bag and he focuses on over-stuffing his poetry to test the limits of the genre and to contain the vices he sees around him. Food is a moral marker and it reflects the decline in both poetics and the patron-client relationship. Furthermore, in his contrasts between rusticity and urbanity, we again see the notion of decline related to city living but also the inescapability of his satiric product from the city which it reflects. However, there are also modifying parodies of the

simple country existence which call into question the circumstances of the Augustan postures of separation.

Similarly, Martial also uses food to highlight inequalities in the patron-client relationship and the city is contrasted with an idealized rustic existence. However, while he does attain this idealized existence in his return to Spain, in poems written after his return, it is apparent that his type of poetry is inextricable from the urban society that inspires and appreciates it. Like Horace and Juvenal, Martial also uses food metaphors to describe his poetics and while on the surface they represent his epigrams as small or low-quality, we also see that they are appreciated by those of good taste. Similarly, epigrams commemorating feasts may represent his dinners and his epigrams as meager but they also highlight the social interactions surrounding these feasts and would be appreciated by those within his social circle. Finally, the Saturnalian poems contribute to an understanding of Martial's depictions of food and poetics since they are about the food items and gifts associated with the Saturnalian holiday. Once again, the materiality of these epigrams and their association with the brevity of the Saturnalia make them appear ephemeral and disposable. However, in mimicking the Saturnalian sphere, we see the poet creating a world separate from the regular world but also a part of it; his poems vaunt their autonomy in their ability to act as a substitute for holiday activity. Through direct recollections of Virgil and Horace, the epigrammatist deals with the themes of poetry's embeddedness in social activity and the imperial regime but does so with ease and comfort. His poetry presents a new and perhaps more realistic path to immortality than his Augustan predecessors. By taking into its domain many of the quotidian themes

of its surroundings, his poetry ensures that it will last due to the continued enjoyment of the social circle it immortalizes.

3.1: The Grove

Like the *recusatio*, the rustic retreat is an important motif in Augustan poetry and represents the site of poetic production and inspiration. The retreat is a geographical representation of the *recusatio* and like the *recusatio*, the retreat represents the independence of the poet from societal pressures as well as his separate obligations to the Muse. The concept of the rustic retreat can occur in many forms such as the Sabine farm granted to Horace by Maecenas or the stock motif of the otherworldly poetic grove which, as we have already seen, is sometimes the site of the poetic *recusatio*.

As already mentioned in the chapter on the *recusatio*, the creation of a grove as the locus of poetic production represents the otherness of this production. The grove in Propertius has already been discussed and it is here that we see the powers of divine inspiration at work, encouraging the poet to write in smaller genres rather than tread the epic path. This creation of a grove to facilitate the gesture of refusal is also found in Ovid 3.1, which was discussed briefly in the last chapter as well, Virgil, Tibullus and this example from Horace, where he says that while other activities—such as chariot racing, politics, farming, serving in the army or hunting—please other men, he takes pleasure in the triumphs of poetry (*Odes* 1.1.29-36):

*me doctarum hederæ præmia frontium
dis miscent superis, me gelidum nemus
Nympharumque leues cum Satyris chori
secernunt populo, si neque tibiās
Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia
Lesbom refugit tendere barbiton.*

*quodsi me lyricis uatibus inseres,
sublimi feriam sidera uertice.*

As for me, the ivy crown, the reward of poetic brows, puts me in the company of the gods above; the cool grove and the light-footed bands of Nymphs and Satyrs set me apart from the crowd, provided Euterpe does not cease to pipe and Polyhymnia does not refuse to tune the Lesbian lyre. But if *you* rank me among the lyric bards of Greece, I shall soar aloft and strike the stars with my head.¹³⁹

Here the grove is an area separate from the pressures and pursuits of daily life, where divine forces—nymphs, satyrs and the Muses, Euterpe and Polyhymnia—are at work. The otherness of the poetic space is represented both by the presence of Muses and other mythical figures as well as the fact that here poetry is not even a Roman pursuit. The Muses have Greek names and it is the group of Greek lyric bards to which Horace hopes to belong. However, a conflict arises in that while Horace hopes to be set apart from the crowd by his poetic skill, ultimately it is the approval of Maecenas which validates this skill, revealing poetry's dependence on his patron's support.

Similar tensions arise in the description of Horace's farm. The Sabine farm, while an actual place, also followed in the poetic tradition of the grove in that it symbolized the poet's autonomy and the separation of poetic pursuits from the daily pressures of life in Rome. The Sabine farm is mentioned in *Satires* 2.6, where Horace says that it was the answer to a prayer (1-5). In *Epistles* 1.7, after requests from Maecenas to return to Rome after a prolonged stay in the country, the poet expounds upon the health benefits of life in the country. In *Epistles* 2.2, he notes the impossibility of producing poetry in Rome, given the constant pressures of daily life (67).

However, an obvious uneasiness exists here, evident in Horace's need to excuse his long absence to Maecenas. While the rustic retreat is essential for the production of

¹³⁹ Trans: Rudd (2004): 25.

poetry, ultimately the poet still had obligations to his patron, strengthened by the fact that the farm itself was granted to him by Maecenas. The idyllic rustic existence was dependent on Horace's place in the imperial circle and all its ensuing obligations. The question of Horace's actual autonomy will arise in both Martial and Juvenal.

Similar tensions exist in Virgil's *Eclogues* where we also see an idealized rustic existence which is ultimately dependent on its urban counterpart. The *Eclogues* are modeled after Theocritus' *Idylls*, written in about 275 BC.¹⁴⁰ Virgil's selective imitation of Theocritus, namely the imitation of the poems set in the country while ignoring those set in the city is largely what creates the genre of pastoral; however, while the rustic landscape of the *Idylls* exists in a sphere independent from politics, in the *Eclogues*, the intrusion of political events is all too obvious. In *Eclogues* 1 for example, there is a dialogue between two shepherds, Tityrus and Meliboeus. Meliboeus begins the dialogue, questioning why Tityrus is calmly playing his pipe while other men are fleeing their homeland. He references a countryside in turmoil (11-12) which places the poem within the context of the recent civil wars following the death of Julius Caesar in 44 BC and the subsequent land confiscations.¹⁴¹ Tityrus is lucky enough to have been granted a farm while Meliboeus was evicted from his (46-72). It is also important that Tityrus' farm was only given to him because he went to Rome and asked for it (40-45), indicating that the idyllic rustic existence is dependent on the city.

In addition to the ravages of civil war and the intrusion of Rome on the pastoral landscape in *Eclogues* 1, other political intrusions appear throughout the poems, contrasting sharply with the simplicity of the Theocritean rustic landscape. In *Eclogues*

¹⁴⁰ Lee (1984): 14.

¹⁴¹ Lee (1984): 19.

9, for example, the partner poem to *Eclogues* 1 and actually written earlier than it,¹⁴² we see the shepherds, Lycidas and Moeris, suffering in the aftermath of the previous land confiscations; Moeris is now living as a tenant on land he had owned (2-5). Lycidas mentions a rumour that Moeris' friend, Menalcas, had managed to save the district from confiscations with his songs (10) but Moeris says that songs count for little in a violent world and that he and Menalcas had almost been killed in a quarrel (11-16). The two exchange some of Menalcas' songs, a mixture of contemporary and Theocritean themes; for example, one is a few lines addressed to Varus in hopes of saving Mantua (26-29) and one is about Polyphemus the cyclops's love for Galatea the sea nymph, reminiscent of Theocritus' *Idylls* 6 and 11 (39-43). However, when Lycidas urges Moeris to recite one of his own songs that he had overheard the older shepherd singing one evening, Moeris says that he cannot remember the words (44-55). The poem ends with the two of them waiting for Menalcas so they can sing again, but it is uncertain if he will come and night and rain are threatening to fall (63-67). This poem reflects a failure of poetry and song due to the stress of displacement and recent political upheaval; while the land confiscations that permeated the first *Eclogue* are now over, peace is not joyous or hopeful but rather dismal and dreary.¹⁴³ Finally, the introduction of darkness and shadows into the familiar country space is new to Virgil; in addition to the imminence of rain and darkness in *Eclogues* 9, the falling of night in *Eclogues* 10 as well as its allusion to an earlier darker time of land confiscations of *Eclogues* 1 indicates the fragility of the escape offered by the pastoral space.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴² Claussen (1994): 266

¹⁴³ Claussen (1994): 266-268.

¹⁴⁴ Claussen (1994): xxxvi. *Eclogues* 10.75-77: *Surgamus: solet esse gravis cantantibus umbra, iuniperi gravis umbra, nocent et frugibus umbrae. Ite domum saturae, venit Hesperus, ite capellae* (Let us arise: for

3.2: Food and Satire in Horace

The farm should also be read in the Roman moralizing tradition of the simple country life. Rustic simplicity was contrasted with urban excess and these contrasts extended to other issues as well, namely the contrast between good, simple food and luxurious or excessive consumption. These contrasts also mirrored two phases of Rome's mythological development: a rustic idealized past versus an over-sophisticated urbanized present.¹⁴⁵ In Horace, the moral superiority of the country is often expressed through the consumption of simple rustic food. The poet devotes several satires to the contrast between the urban and rural life and, in turn, the contrast between the foods associated with such existences. Just as the simplicity of country life is code for its moral integrity, so too is the simplicity of a country diet. In *Satires* 2.2, Horace uses the peasant Ofellus to philosophically expound upon the glories of a country life. He first chides a person who chooses to eat peacock or giant mullets simply because they look impressive; common food appeases a stomach just as well and to choose anything else is pure gluttony (23-30). Enjoyment is diminished by excess and greed since the stomach is upset by too much food and will crave simpler things like radishes and sharp pickles (36-44). A simple diet is different from a stingy one, however, since there is no point in avoiding extravagance if he just turns to the opposite vice (53-55). Furthermore, a simple country diet means a healthier lifestyle, better sleeping patterns and a soul unencumbered by the body's excessive consumption (70-79).

singers heavy is the shade, Heavy the shade of juniper; and shade harms fruit. Go little she-goats, hesper comes, go home replete). These lines echo *Eclogues* 1.74: *ite meae, felix quondam pecus, ite capellae* (Go, little she-goats, go, once happy flock of mine) and *Eclogues* 1. 83: *maioresque cadunt altis de montibus umbrae* (And down from the high mountains taller shadows fall).

¹⁴⁵ Gowers (1993): 18.

In the last part of the satire, Ofellus describes his own diet, that of a poor tenant farmer, although he states that he ate the same when he was rich: smoked ham, greens, home-grown chicken or goat rather than imported fish, and a dessert of raisins, nuts and figs. All these items can be produced on a self-sustained farm rather than imported, indicating their connection with Rome's rustic Italian past. The concern over self-sufficiency, modest consumption and avoiding imported goods is a metaphor for concerns over Roman expansion and identity. As the empire expanded to include the farthest reaches of the globe, the idea of writing against excessive consumption and gluttony served to express concern over Rome's uncontrolled appetite for power and the corrupting influence of the cultures it embraces and consumes.¹⁴⁶ While the excessive consumption of imported food was frowned upon in itself, more importantly, food is a language to describe Rome's experience in becoming an imperial city. As the Roman empire expanded over the centuries, the city also became an amalgam of all the cultures with which it came into contact. As the body politic becomes open to foreign imports and is exposed to all the negatives associated with these imports, it loses its distinctly Italian flavour.

Satires 2.4 is also concerned with food and has Horace's companion, Catius, offer a long discourse on gastronomy; the intellectual attention he gives to the preparation of eating and food comes across as foolish, since the *mos maiorum*—customs of the ancestors—do not focus on food as an aspiration of the good Roman. Similarly, in *Satires* 2.6, a satire all about the pleasures of the country contrasted with the strains of the city, the fable of the city mouse and country mouse is told by Horace's acquaintance Cervius. In it, the city mouse visits his friend in the country and shuns the offerings of grains and

¹⁴⁶ Gowers (1993):19.

even the more luxurious bacon and raisins. The country mouse then visits the city and is in awe of the luxury of his friend's existence but when their feast is interrupted by a giant dog, the country mouse decides that no luxury is worth the strain of living in constant fear; although simple, his country life will always provide enough food for him.

In the final satire of Book 2, Horace has another companion, Fundanius, describe a meal that he had at the home of a certain Nasidienus. *Satires* 2.8 has already been discussed in Chapter 1, due to its relationship to Juvenal *Satires* 5; in it, we see a host obsessed with status, trying to impress his important guest, Maecenas, with lavish food and descriptions of it and ultimately his pretentious efforts are in vain since the banquet is ruined by a falling tapestry.¹⁴⁷ The exaggerated epic language of this event—and the ultimate stylistic failure of epic pretension attempting to usurp satire—serves to highlight the host's presumption and foolishness in his obsession with the presentation of his food and status.

The morally pure rustic diet as outlined in Horace can also be directly related to poetry. Horace's poetic project, as clearly stated in the Letter to Augustus, was to align the Greek aesthetic of literary quality with Italian simplicity, naturalizing this foreign aesthetic by aligning it with its simple, rustic Italian counterpart (*Epistles* 2.1.139ff). To

¹⁴⁷ Compare this obsession with status to Horace's statement of what dining should be about in *Satires* 2.6.65-76: *o noctes cenaequae deum, quibus ipse meique / ante Larem proprium vescor vernasque procacis / pasco libatis dapibus. prout cuique libido est, / siccat inaequalis calices conviva solutus / legibus insanis, seu quis capit acria fortis / pocula seu modicis uvescit laetius. ergo / sermo oritur, non de villis domibusve alienis, / nec male necne Lepos saltet; sed, quod magis ad nos / pertinet et nescire malum est, agitamus, utrumne / divitiis homines an sint virtute beati, / quidve ad amicitias, usus rectumne, trahat nos / et quae sit natura boni summumque quid eius* (Ah, these evenings and dinners. What heaven! My friends and I have our meal at my own fireside. Then after making an offering, I hand the rest to the cheeky servants. Every guest drinks from whatever glass he likes, big or small. We have no silly regulations. One goes for the strong stuff like a hero, another mellows more happily on a milder blend. And so the conversation begins—not about other folks' town and country houses, nor the merits of Grace's dancing; we discuss things which affect us more nearly and one ought to know about: what is the key to happiness, money or moral character? In making friends are our motives idealistic or selfish? What is the nature of goodness and what is its form?). See Hudson (1989): 82. This meal bears a resemblance to the symposium described by Plato.

associate completely with the good Italian poetry is to ignore the highly-wrought Greek counterpart but this foreign poetry came with the other associations of corrupting foreign imports. Some foreignness was required to create significant literature and by aligning it with Italy's simple rustic beginnings, Horace was creating an amalgam that could be both finely-wrought but also fed on Italian diet and thus not liable to the charge of being too foreign. Poetry created in the country, and fed on a good Italian diet will be of greater quality than poetry created in the city and fed on a corrupt diet of foreign imports. The Callimachean aesthetic of literary quality also comes into play in descriptions of food and literature. A text can be *pinguis* (fat) or *tenuis* (slender) and descriptions of food within a text can also ascribe to the same qualities. Food or literature that is *tenuis* follows the Callimachean ideals of slenderness, while food and literature that is *pinguis* would be overstuffed with poor quality ingredients, such as the book of Callimachus' rival, Antimachus', which Callimachus himself describes as a fat book. A *tenuis* text or diet is appreciated by those with a discerning palate and represents a stand against materialism and conspicuous consumption.¹⁴⁸

Food metaphors were important to the satirists' descriptions of their poetic program. As already mentioned in the chapter on the *recusatio*, Horace was acutely aware, or so he likes to represent the case, of the greater freedom of expression enjoyed by his Republican predecessor, Lucilius, and this extends to food metaphors as well. While Lucilius was an overflowing river and a lesson in excess, writing 200 lines standing on his head (*Satires* 1.4.9-11), Horace seeks moderation in his writing, promoting satisfaction rather than excess; his resulting oxymoronic *tenuis satura* (slim fat

¹⁴⁸ Gowers (1993): 44. The ethical connotations of *tenuis* were discussed on pg. 66.

dish) directly contrasts to the full books of Lucilius.¹⁴⁹ The phrase from *Satires* 1.1, *iam satis est*, “now that is enough” (120) well defines the notion of moderation. Similarly, the image in the preceding line relating a dinner guest (*conviva satur*) leaving a meal after he has had his fill to someone who has lived a contended life is also programmatic. Putnam (1995) points out the intertextual connections between the language of fullness in *Satires* 1.1 and Virgil’s *Eclogues* and *Georgics* as well as Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura*.¹⁵⁰ Particularly striking is the *conviva satur* of Horace and the *saturae capellae* at the end of Virgil *Eclogues* 10, which marks the only use of the word *satur* in both authors; the placement of this adjective at the end of their respective works associates the notion of fullness/satisfaction with the measured composition of a poem.¹⁵¹ Such intertextual play within Horace demonstrates the production not of a Lucilian book but a Callimachean one; the fact that Horace’s satire is full of carefully placed references to pastoral and didactic works demonstrates its adherence to the Callimachean aesthetic of producing a polished, highly-wrought work.¹⁵² Horatian satire therefore fits well within the Augustan ideas of literary quality, despite its initial appearance of dealing with the everyday. This will contrast with Juvenal later in that his works are also stuffed, but in a different way.

In addition to the *conviva satur* image in *Satires* 1.1, which describes the proper way of living life and writing poetry, Horace uses the human appetite as a proper measure of limits at other points in the poem: the boundaries of appetite (50), the human stomach (46), and the granary (53) all hold the potential for greed. These images are intertwined

¹⁴⁹ Gowers (1993): 126.

¹⁵⁰ Putnam (1995).

¹⁵¹ Putnam (1995): 314-315. See also Freudenberg (2001): 35-44 for further discussion of this material, particularly the negotiation between creating something thick and thin at the same time, which recalls the admonition from Apollo in Callimachus’ *Aitia*, to feed the goats fat but keep the muse slender.

¹⁵² For culinary descriptions of this type of varied and many-layered poetry, see Hutchinson (1988) on Callimachus: “one ingredient in a richer mixture” (28) and “a piquant contrast in flavour” (31).

with a tirade against the excessive consumption of words: Horace will not delay the reader (*ne te morer*, 14), a story he uses for an example is not a long one (*nec longa est fabula*, 95) and, as already mentioned, he ends when it is enough (*iam satis est*, 120).¹⁵³ In the autobiographical *Satires* 1.6, he describes his modest consumption of food (modest diet, 115; consuming a light lunch, 127) which matches his modesty with words (56-57). Therefore in addition to the simple food metaphors of the satires in Book 2 which express the moral superiority of country life and subsequently the aesthetic quality of poetry produced in the country, the programmatic relationship of modest consumption to modest literary production demonstrates that Horatian satires are an exercise in satisfaction and moderation; they are meant to leave the reader content but not overstuffed in comparison to their Lucilian counterpart.

What is important here though, and will be discussed in the section of Juvenal, is that the poetry is acutely aware of its reception within society. The first few lines of Horace's second book discuss these problems, his concern over being either too harsh or too impotent (*Satires* 2.1.1-4):

*Sunt quibus in satira videar nimis aceret ultra
legem tendere opus; sine nervis altera quidquid
composui pars esse putat, similisque mearum
mille die versus deduci posse.*

Some people think I'm too sharp in my satire and stretch the form beyond its legitimate limits; the rest maintain that whatever I write is slack and that a thousand verses like mine could be wound off every day.¹⁵⁴

Here *nimis acer* can be read as a food metaphor, with *acer* meaning sharp to taste and other food metaphors pervade in Horatian satire, constantly reminding us of the

¹⁵³ Gowers (1993): 129.

¹⁵⁴ Trans: Rudd (2004): 85.

connection between actual and literary taste.¹⁵⁵ Book 2 focuses on gastronomy and the overwhelming idea from the satires already discussed is the avoidance of excessive consumption and the moral superiority of the country diet. However, while he praises the moral superiority of the country and claims to be satisfied with his lot, other criticisms in Book 2 suggest that he was indecisive about his choice of country over city and he only liked simple dinners when he was not included at Maecenas' dinner parties (*Satires* 2.7.22-33). While he claims the importance of control and moderation in a literary context, the loss of Republican *libertas* in many ways forced this more controlled style upon him and one wonders if he is in fact nostalgic for the harsher style—the Italian vinegar (*Satires* 1.7.30-31)—of his Republican counterpart.¹⁵⁶ While the poet does indeed acknowledge possible criticisms of his lifestyle in Book 2, which could arise from him finally being content with his position in life, the acute awareness of these criticisms could also reflect his own insecurities.

3.3: Food and Satire in Juvenal

Like Horace, Juvenal also uses food to describe his poetic program and it similarly represents an aesthetic or ethical marker as in Horace. However, while his Augustan counterpart strove to find satisfaction rather than excess in his literary style, Juvenal is all about overstuffing and testing the limits of the genre. He adopts the high style of epic and claims he is returning to the style of Lucilius since only epic terms can be used to describe the vice that has pervaded Rome. Since Rome itself has come to

¹⁵⁵ Gowers (1993): 132-133. For example: *acer* (sharp), *dulcis* (sweet) and *sapiens* (tasty, tasteful, wise). *Putidus*, *integer*, *vitiates* are used of wholesome or rotten food or judgement. *Vitium* is a moral or literary fault, a breach of etiquette or a putrefaction in food. *Sal* means salt and wit; *ius* is both sauce, gravy and the law.

¹⁵⁶ Gowers (1993): 135.

encompass the whole world only the highest diction and the fullest genre will do to describe it.¹⁵⁷ His writing excludes nothing just as the city and the empire expand to their greatest extent. This is evidenced in *Satires* 4, which uses the metaphor of finding a dish large enough to hold Domitian's huge fish to describe the corruption of the emperor and the dangers of imperial expansion.

In terms of food, Juvenal describes his poetry as a *farrago*, a mixed mash of animal feed (*Satires* 1.86), and both the hungry poet (*Satires* 7) and his greedy notebooks (*Satires* 1.63) are waiting to be stuffed. Instead, he is forced to read and listen to recitations from the overstuffed, anti-Callimachean fat books of other contemporary writers (*Satires* 1.4-6).¹⁵⁸ His use of the high diction of epic and tragedy as well as low language gives an impression of heterogeneity as well as fullness.¹⁵⁹ However, this heterogeneity is very different from that in Horace. Juvenal incorporated the high style into his poetics and mixes it with his own form of degraded epic but the issue is not choosing selectively from a variety of genres in order to create an elaborately and densely written satire as it was in Horace.¹⁶⁰ Instead, it is an issue of a fall from literary quality; Juvenal uses the overstuffed language of mythic poetry but fails to attain their sublimity and his resulting degraded epic cannot rival the densely written poetry of Horace.¹⁶¹

The concept of decline is also found in poetry describing food, particularly where food is used to highlight the inequalities of society. We have already seen an example of this in the discussion of *Satires* 5 in Chapter 1 (pg. 26ff), where the greatest thing the poor client can hope for is a half-eaten hare, a morsel of boar's haunch and a mini capon

¹⁵⁷ Gowers (1993): 188.

¹⁵⁸ Gowers (1993): 193.

¹⁵⁹ Gowers (1993): 191.

¹⁶⁰ Putnam (1995). See above n. 11.

¹⁶¹ See the section on Juvenal, epic and satire in Chapter 2, pg. 73ff.

(167-8) and will subsequently endure great humiliation at the hands of a rich patron in order to be fed. Similarly in *Satires* 3, the bully in the street mocks the poor diet of his adversary (292-294): *Cuius aceto / cuius conche tumes? quis tecum sectile porrum / sutor et elixir vervecis labra comedit?* (Whose vinegar, whose beans have blown you out? With what cobbler have you been munching cut leeks and boiled wether's chaps?¹⁶²). While the consumption of a simple diet was a point of pride for Horace, Juvenal here perverts several points of the simple diet into a disgusting one and uses it as grounds for indignation.¹⁶³

While the poor can only hope for scraps, the rich are characterized by their unending capacity for gluttony.¹⁶⁴ In addition to the many courses consumed by Virro in *Satires* 5, in *Satire* 2, a eunuch priest of Cybele is noted for his extreme greed (111-114): *hic turpis Cybeles et fracta uoce loquendi / libertas et crine senex fanaticus albo / sacrorum antistes, rarum ac memorabile magni / gutturis exemplum conducendusque magister* (You will hear all the foul talk and squeaking tones of Cybele; a grey-haired frenzied old man presides over the rites; he is a rare and notable master of mighty gluttony and should be hired to teach it¹⁶⁵). Similarly in *Satires* 4, the courtier Montanus is described by his huge gut (107): *Montani quoque uenter adest abdomine tardus* (There too was present the unwieldy paunch of Montanus).¹⁶⁶

3.4: Juvenal in the City

¹⁶² Trans: Ramsay (1999): 55.

¹⁶³ Gowers (1993): 191.

¹⁶⁴ Gowers (1993): 197.

¹⁶⁵ Trans: Ramsay (1999): 27.

¹⁶⁶ Trans: Ramsay (1999): 65.

While the concept of creating poetry in a separate rustic retreat was important to the Augustan poets, Juvenal relocates his poetry within the city. In *Satires* 3, we see a potential poetic grove and a link to Rome's glorious past in the description of the meeting place of Numa and Egeria, Rome's first lawmaker and his nymph lover (10-20):

*Substitit ad veteres arcus madidamque Capenam
hic, ubi nocturnae Numa constituebat amicae,
nunc sacri fontis nemus delubra locantur
Iudaeis, quorum cophinus faenumque supellex
(omnis enim populo mercedem pendere iussa est
arbor et eiectis mendicat silva Camenis).
in vallem Egeriae descendimus et speluncas
dissimiles veris. Quanto praesentius esset
numen aquis, viridi si margine clauderet undas
herba, nec ingenuum violarent Marmora tofum.*

My friend halted at the dripping archway of the old Porta Capena. Here Numa held his nightly assignations with his mistress; but now the holy fount and grove and shrine are let out to Jews, who possess a basket and a truss of hay for all their furnishings. For as every tree nowadays has to pay toll to the people, the Muses have been ejected, and the wood has to go a-begging. We go down to the Valley of Egeria, and into the caves so unlike to nature: how much more near to us would be the spirit of the fountain if its waters were fringed by a green border of grass, and there were no marble to outrage the native tufa!¹⁶⁷

The language here recalls the language of the poetic groves of Propertius and Ovid, with its holy fountain (*sacri fontis*), wood (*nemus*), shrine (*delubra*), cave (*speluncas*) and even potential divine forces at work (*numen aquis*). However, while the Augustan groves were the sites of poetic inspiration, here the Muses have been ejected and the wood must go begging, indicating Juvenal's separation from the grove's natural roots and the proper sources of inspiration. The presence of foreign imports and people also indicated the extent of empire, that this once definitively Roman place has been ruined by corrupting non-Roman influences. This invasion represents the selling out of the countryside and

¹⁶⁷ Trans: Ramsay (1999): 33.

epitomizes the general sense of decline found in much of Juvenal's poetry. If the Muses have been ejected from their poetic grove, the prospects for writing inspired poetry are quite bleak.

Juvenal constantly refers to himself as creating poetry within the city. In the programmatic first satire, he depicts himself as standing in the city, watching a stream of the most despicable examples of humanity pass him by. He uses these people as an explanation for why he must write satire (*Satires* 1.63-64): *nonne libet medio ceras implere capaces / quadrivio, cum...* (Would you not like to fill up a whole note-book at the street crossing when...). The people targeted in this satire include a forger, a woman who poisons her husband, a lying husband seeking the dole for a non-existent wife, corrupt patrons, a eunuch who gets married, a noblewoman who appears in the spectacles of the arena, social climbers, an overweight lawyer, gigolos, debauchers and defrauders and a husband who prostitutes his own wife. While this picture is obviously exaggerated, it is only in a bustling metropolis such as Rome that such a collection of people could feasibly exist, rather than a small country town, for example, and therefore, Juvenal as a satirist is tied to this metropolis in order to come up with satiric material.¹⁶⁸ While the satiric poet constantly complains about his urban existence throughout most of the satires, we understand that he is also unable to escape it.

The mixture of human vice becomes the fodder for Juvenalian satire. As Rome has expanded its borders to consume the entire world, these foreign imports become part of Rome. In relocating his satire into an urban context, particularly a Roman one, stuffed with many examples of humanity, the issue is that poetry loses its purity, its sense of separation from daily life that was so important to the Augustans. The shape of society

¹⁶⁸ Braund (1989): 25.

inevitable imposes itself on art and therefore, the poet is concerned with the constraints of his society. Therefore, as he defines his poetry, it becomes a mixed bag, a *farrago*, an accumulation of all that he sees in the urban context of Rome, the bustling hub of a giant empire.

The vices of the city are compared directly to the country at several points in the *Satires*. In *Satires 2*, concerning effeminate men, transvestitism and homosexual practices in Rome and their inevitable effect on the rest of the empire, Juvenal uses the country and its chaste rustic inhabitants as a foil for the disgraceful practices in Rome. In lines 64-81, he describes a lawyer who dresses in gauzy, transparent garments while defending cases, blaming his attire on the sweltering July weather (70-71). The satiric poet imagines the rustic people's reaction to such apparel: *en habitum quo te leges ac iura ferentem / vulneribus crudis populus modo victor, et illud / montanum positis audiret vulgus aratris* (A pretty garb yours in which to propose or expound laws to our countrymen flushed with victory and with wounds yet unhealed; and to the mountain rustics who had laid down their plows to listen to you!,¹⁶⁹ 72-74). Obviously such corruption would not occur amongst these hard-working rustic people. Similarly in lines 126-127, he refers longingly to Rome's pastoral origins in a tirade about men being married to other men: *O pater Urbis / unde negas tantum Latiis pastoribus?* (O, father of the City, whence came such wickedness among thy Latin shepherds?¹⁷⁰).

Passages of *Satires 3* have already been discussed in Chapters 1 (pg. 25ff) and 2 (pg. 76ff) and the entirety of the satire concerns the corruption of the city and its

¹⁶⁹ Trans: Ramsay (1999): 23.

¹⁷⁰ Trans: Ramsay (1999):27.

inhabitants as outlined by Umbricius. These examples are sometimes contrasted with an idealized rustic existence. In lines 171-179, he outlines such an existence:

*Pars magna Italiae est, si verum admittimus in qua
nemo togam sumit nisi mortuus. ipsa dierum
festorum herboso colitur si quando theatro
maiestas tandemque redit ad pulpit notum
exodium, cum personae pallentis hiatum
in gremio matris formidat rusticus infans,
aequales habitus illic similesque videbis
orchestram et populum, clari velamen honoris
sufficiunt tunicae summis aedilibus albae.*

There are many parts of Italy, to tell the truth, in which no man puts on a toga until he is dead. Even on days of festival, when a brave show is made in a theatre of turf, and when the well-known after-piece steps once more upon the boards; when the rustic babe on its mother's breast shrinks back affrighted at the gaping of the pallid masks, you will see stalls and populace all dressed alike, and the worshipful aediles content with white tunics as vesture for their high office.¹⁷¹

The simplicity of the rustic apparel is contrasted with its Roman counterpart in lines 180 (*hic ultra vires habitus nitor*, In Rome, everyone dresses smartly, above his means¹⁷²). In general there is a contrast between a relaxed unpretentious life in the country with everyone living equally, free from competition and life in Rome, where the opposite is true; everyone is trying to one-up one another even if they have to become impoverished to do so (*commune id vitium est, hic vivimus ambitiosa / pauperte omnes*, This failing is universal here: we all live in a state of pretentious poverty, 182-183¹⁷³). While the country life scene is an idealized one, just as the city is an exaggeration, it is the contrast itself which reveals Juvenal's attitudes towards the city.

3.5: Juvenal's Rustic Parody and Augustan Ideals of Separation

¹⁷¹ Trans: Ramsay (1999): 45.

¹⁷² Trans: Ramsay (1999): 45.

¹⁷³ Trans: Ramsay (1999): 45.

However, in some of Juvenal's later satires, we see a different dynamic at play, where he offers several ironic portrayals of the rustic existence which seem to call into question the ideals of separation so important to the Augustans. *Satires* 6 offers another view of the idealized rustic existence. The satire concerns the corruption of women and it is introduced by a new version of the idealized rustic life, this time in the Golden Age of Saturn, the only time when modesty still lingered on earth (1-20):

*Credo Pudicitiam Saturno rege moratam
in terris uisamque diu, cum frigida paruas
praeberet spelunca domos ignemque laremque
et pecus et dominos communi clauderet umbra,
siluestrem montana torum cum sterneret uxor
frondibus et culmo uicinarumque ferarum
pellibus, haut similis tibi, Cynthia, nec tibi, cuius
turbauit nitidos extinctus passer ocellos,
sed potanda ferens infantibus ubera magnis
et saepe horridior glandem ructante marito.
quippe aliter tunc orbe nouo caeloque recenti
uiuabant homines, qui rupto robore nati
compositiue luto nullos habuere parentes.
multa Pudicitiae ueteris uestigia forsan
aut aliqua exstiterint et sub Ioue, sed Ioue nondum
barbato, nondum Graecis iurare paratis
per caput alterius, cum furem nemo timeret
caulibus ac pomis et aperto uiueret horto.
paulatim deinde ad superos Astraea recessit
hac comite, atque duae pariter fugere sorores.*

In the days of Saturn, I believe, Chastity still lingered on the earth, and was seen for a time – days when men were poorly housed in chilly caves, which under one common shelter enclosed hearth and household gods, herds and their owners; when the hill-bred wife spread her sylvan bed with leaves and straw and the skins of her neighbours the wild beasts – a wife not like thee, O Cynthia, nor to thee, Lesbia, whose bright eyes were clouded by a sparrow's death, but one whose breasts gave suck to lusty babes, often more unkempt herself than her acorn-belching husband. For in those days, when the world was young, and the skies were new, men born of the riven oak, or formed of dust, lived differently from now, and had no parents of their own. Under Jupiter, perchance, some few traces of ancient modesty may have survived; but that was before he had grown his beard, before the Greeks and learned to swear by someone else's head, when men feared not thieves for their cabbages or fruits, and lived by unwall'd gardens.

After that Astraea withdrew by degrees to heaven, with Chastity as her comrade, the two sisters taking flight together.¹⁷⁴

What is significant about this passage is that it is obviously a parody of the rustic existence. Similar to *Satires* 3, where the rustic infant cannot tell the difference between tragedy and comedy, the scorn over lack of culture is also present here, with Juvenal alluding to Cynthia and Lesbia, the literary mistresses of Propertius and Catullus and mentioning the hairy wife and her acorn-belching husband. Juvenal is a product of the city and here, while he acknowledges the irrevocable loss of innocence, there is also the sense that with sin came culture and some accommodation between something that is too primitive and something that is too urban. In offering these extreme views of country life, Juvenal is recalling the tensions of Horace's *Letter to Augustus*, where he acknowledges the necessity of fusing the delicacy of the Callimachean grove with the roughness of ancient Roman countryside. The discussion of Italy's primitive early history also reflects an obsession with a time before Rome was corrupted by foreigners. Just as the city has consumed sources of vice, so too has Juvenalian satire. It is a type of poetry fed on foreign imports and subsequently, it needs these vices as a source of poetic inspiration. The city is a corrupt place but it is also the only site of culture and in offering a humorous depiction of an idealized rustic existence, Juvenal is perhaps mocking the Augustan ideals of separation, offering some necessary accommodation between city and country and acknowledging the absurdity of celebrating a society that lacked all form of culture. This also offers some parallelism between Juvenal and Horace, who are usually so diametrically opposed; just as Horace acknowledges the importance of finding a midpoint

¹⁷⁴ Trans: Ramsay (1999): 83-85.

between primitivism and over-sophistication, here too Juvenal is reflecting on the problems inherent in an extreme moralist stance.

These themes are also evident in *Satires* 11, which describes an idealized rustic feast that mirrors similar ones in Horace, focusing on homegrown, simple fare from the poet's farm, rather than gluttonous imported goods (65-76):

*De Tiburtino ueniet pinguissimus agro
haedulus et toto grege mollior, inscius herbae
necdum ausus uirgas humilis mordere salicti,
qui plus lactis habet quam sanguinis, et montani
asparagi, posito quos legit uilica fuso.
grandia praeterea tortoque calentia feno
oua adsunt ipsis cum matribus, et seruatae
parte anni quales fuerant in uitibus uuae,
Signinum Syriumque pirum, de corbibus isdem
aemula Picenis et odoris mala recentis
nec metuenda tibi, siccatum frigore postquam
autumnnum et crudi posuere pericula suci.*

From my Tiburtine farm there will come a plump kid, tenderest of the flock, innocent of grass, that has never yet dared to nibble the twigs of the dwarf willow, and has more of milk in him than blood; some wild asparagus, gathered by the bailiff's wife when done with her spindle, and some lordly eggs, warm in their wisps of hay, together with the hens that laid them. There will be crapes too, kept half the year, as fresh as when they hung upon the tree; pears from Signia and Syria, and in the same baskets fresh-smelling apples that rival those of Picenum, and of which you need not be afraid, seeing that winter's cold has dried up their autumnal juice, and removed the perils of unripeness.¹⁷⁵

However, at the end of the poem, we find out that this feast is not happening at a country retreat such as the Tiburtine farm but rather in the city (193-201):

*interea Megalesiacae spectacula mappae
Idaeum sollemne colunt, similisque triumpho
praeda caballorum praetor sedet ac, mihi pace
immensae nimiaeque licet si dicere plebis,
totam hodie Romam circus capit, et fragor aurem
percutit, euentum uiridis quo colligo panni.
nam si deficeret, maestam attonitamque uideres*

¹⁷⁵ Trans: Ramsay (1999): 225-227.

*hanc urbem ueluti Cannarum in puluere uictis
consulibus.*

Meantime the solemn Idaean rite of the Megalesian napkin is being held; there sits the Praetor in his triumphal state, the prey of horseflesh; and (if I may say so without offence to the vast unnumbered mob) all Rome to-day is in the Circus. A roar strikes upon my ear which tells me that the Green has won; for had it lost, Rome would be as sad and dismayed as when the Consuls were vanquished in the dust of Cannae.¹⁷⁶

Like *Satires* 6, this poem also seeks to find a midpoint between an idealized, moral rustic existence and a corrupt urban one. Similarly, while Juvenal also uses this poem to glorify the good old days, an acknowledgment also comes that even in early days, banquets were already getting lavish, even if here they are used as an idealized example (77-78).

Therefore, there are already shifting standards of morality and an idealized simple existence from long ago is not necessarily contrasted with a modern sophisticated and corrupt urban one. The fact that the banquet is offered to a Persicus (“Mr. Luxurious”) and that it includes imported pears also calls into question the simplicity of this feast.¹⁷⁷

Furthermore, the mockery of urban life—for example, using the term “perils of unripeness” to describe the possibility of bitter apples and the extreme view that a sporting event is as important as the defeat at Cannae during the Punic wars, one of the greatest defeats in Roman history—shows that extremes of urbanity, like rusticity, are also fodder for satire. Juvenalian satire, usually black and white, here presents shades of grey and demonstrates the possibility for accommodation between the opposing poles of Augustan vs. Juvenalian poetics, moral vs. immoral, city vs. country.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁶ Trans: Ramsay (1999): 235.

¹⁷⁷ Littlewood (2007): 412-413.

¹⁷⁸ See Weisinger (1972) for a discussion of Juvenal’s ironic attitude towards his position as moral spokesman in *Satires* 11. See also Littlewood (2007), 413 for a discussion of these blurred moral oppositions.

The concept of decline can be modified slightly by looking at *Satires 7* as well, already discussed in Chapter 1 (pg. 39ff). In it, Juvenal reduces the comparison with the Augustans to its lowest level by saying that Horace wrote great works because he was full, while poets in Juvenal's time do not have that privilege (*satur est cum dicit Horatius "euhoe!"*, Horace's stomach was well filled when he shouted his cry of *Evoe!*, 62¹⁷⁹). This exaggerates concerns over separation already present in Horatian poetry and questions the degree of separation that was available to Horace. Horace had a farm granted to him by Maecenas and was full from the products of this farm and the social opportunities afforded him by his relationship with Maecenas. This comment by Juvenal revisits the tension that exists between the poetic ideals of Horace—writing in complete isolation, making poetry that is not bound by social constraints, having poetry fed on a good moral diet—and the social pressures he must have felt being in the circle of a man such as Maecenas and the emperor Augustus himself.¹⁸⁰ While the poetry of Juvenal is most definitely not otherworldly, in this comment, he is perhaps asking if it ever was and if a poet such as Horace was ever autonomous. These insecurities have already been addressed in the relationship between Juvenal *Satires 5* and Horace *Satires 2.8* in Chapter 1.

3.6: Martial

In Martial, several themes already at play in Juvenalian satire become more clearly elaborated. In the first section, I will give an overview of Martial's description of

¹⁷⁹ Trans: Ramsay (1999): 143.

¹⁸⁰ See Oliensis (1998): 127-128 for a discussion of the exclusionary rule of literary space in the *Odes*. Any literary space occupied by Augustus cannot be simultaneously occupied by Horace's authorial persona since the emperor as a subject of the poem moulds that poem around his own authority, leaving no room for poetic authority.

the city, which like Juvenal's, is often one of decline in relation to its Augustan predecessor. However, also like Juvenal, the relationship is more complicated because the poet relies on the city not just for inspiration but also for reception of his poetry, demonstrated clearly by Martial's lack of productivity following his return to Spain, discussed in the second section. Both Martial and Juvenal wrote a type of poetry inextricably linked to the site of its production and both demonstrate some compromise between the extremes of city and country life, which was also a goal that Horace was trying to achieve. In their moderating between city and country life, these later poets are perhaps also looking at the extent to which their Augustan predecessor achieved his goal. They occupy their place within a city and, in Martial's case especially, within an imperial circle without the tension and concern that this relationship brought to Horace. The final section will look at these themes, as they are represented in some of Martial's Saturnalian epigrams.

3.6a: Decline in Martial

In Martial, while the conception of society in decline is much softer than in Juvenal, it is still present and food is also used to highlight the inequalities between patron and client. For example, in *Epigrams* 3.60, Martial describes an unequal feast like that of Juvenal *Satires* 5. He bemoans the fact that he has been invited apparently as an equal—no longer a purchased guest (*venalis*) since the dole has been abolished—but does not enjoy the same quality of food that his patron, Ponticus, does. The patron eats oysters, mushrooms, turbot, and turtle dove while the inferior mussels, hog funguses, brill and a magpie are served to the guest. Similarly, in *Epigrams* 6.11, against Marcus' complaints

that there is no Pylades to his Orestes, the epigrammatist uses the example of oysters and mussels as well as other points of inequality to point out that their friendship is not an equal one based on love. *Epigrams* 2.43 also bemoans an unequal friendship where one dines on mullet while a small crab or crayfish is served to the other. In 4.85, the patron Ponticus serves wine in two different types of cups, earthenware and glass in order that the different vessels might disguise the different qualities of wine. Different types of wine serving vessels are also mentioned in *Epigrams* 10.49. In 9.2, the friend Lupus' favour of his mistress over his friends or clients is highlighted by the different types of food he gives to them.

The trials of city living also highlight decline in Martial's poetry. As in Juvenal 3, where Umbricius catalogues the difficulties of daily life in the city, Martial also mentions such trials. In *Epigrams* 9.68, he discusses how a noisy schoolmaster keeps him up all night, while in 12.57, he talks about various professions in the city—moneychangers, coppersmiths, beggars and peddlars—who also prevent him from sleeping. He also complains about his poverty and the trials of a poor man in the city: he cannot afford a handsome slave boy (1.58), he has to court arrogant patrons (2.55, 2.68), the client's doles are too small (1.49), his lodgings are poor with drafty windows (8.14), his guests must bring their own furniture when they come to visit him (5.62), he has to sell off gifts because he is so poor (7.16), he has to beg for dinner invitations (2.18), he has to borrow money (2.30, 2.44) and his food, clothing and sexual entertainment are all below his station (2.43, 2.58).¹⁸¹ As in Juvenal, the city is a locus of decline, where the inequalities of the client-patron relationship are felt most strongly.

¹⁸¹ Sullivan (1991): 28 brought this list to my attention.

3.6b: Martial in the Country

This notion of the decline in city living is also highlighted when contrasted with an idealized rustic existence. In 1.49, Martial addresses an acquaintance Licianus who visits Martial's hometown of Bilbilis in Spain. He discusses many of the pleasant experiences associated with life in Bilbilis: beautiful scenery, nice places for swimming, wild animals for hunting and cold springs for drinking. Licianus will not have to endure the toga, the smell of purple dye, messengers, complaining clients, commands of widows or defendants interrupting his sleep. A life devoid of such demands is true happiness and contentment for the poet (1.49.31-42). Similar in theme is 1.55, where Martial describes his ideal life to a friend, Fronto:

*Vota tui breviter si vis cognoscere Marci,
clarum militiae, Fronto, togaeque decus,
hoc petit, esse sui nec magni ruris arator,
sordidaque in parvis otia rebus amat.
quisquam picta colit Spartani frigora saxi
et matutinum portat ineptus Have,
cui licet, exuviis nemoris rurisque beato
ante focum plenas explicuisse plagas
et pisces tremula salientem ducere saeta
flavaque de rubro promere mella cado?
pinguis inaequales onerat cui vilica mensas
et sua non emptus praeparat ova cinis?
non amet hanc vitam quisquis me non amat, opto,
vivat et urbanis albus in officiis*

If you want to know in brief the prayers of your Marcus, Fronto—renowned glory of the military and toga—he seeks this: to be the plougher of his own farm, not large. He loves a rough leisure in modest circumstances. Is anyone foolish enough to pay court to the chill of Spartan stone and convey morning greetings when it's possible for him, happy man, to open nets full with the spoils of the woods and countryside in front of the fireplace, and to pull in the leaping fish with trembling line, and to take out yellow honey from a ruddy jar? If his bailiff's plump wife loads the crooked table and unbought charcoal cooks the eggs he owns? I wish

that anyone who does not love me not love such a life, and that he live, pale, among the obligations of the city.¹⁸²

Again we see a desire for a rustic existence and self-sufficiency: catching his own food and living off the produce of his own farm. The life is simple with the hearth and fireplace again emphasized as well as the crooked tables and eating only food that the countryside provides: wild game, fish, honey and eggs. It is also significant that again, the trials of the city are mentioned: paying court to the houses of the wealthy, characterized by the Spartan stone that would have decorated the atria. The foreignness of this corrupting import is contrasted with the local nature of the good, simple, Italian diet that is available in the country. Finally, life in the country is also healthier, as emphasized by the paleness of the city dweller versus the plump country wife.

Finally, *Epigrams* 12.18 must be discussed in light of the themes of the urban-rural antithesis and the trials of the city. This epigram is particularly appropriate because it is addressed to Juvenal. It is written from Spain, after Martial retired there and he contrasts the relaxation of his new life with the inevitable trials of his friend's life in the city:

*Dum tu forsitan inquietus erras
clamosa, Iuvenalis, in Subura
aut collem dominae teris Dianae;
dum per limina te potentiorum
sudatrix toga ventilat vagumque
maior Caelius et minor fatigant:
ne multos repetita post Decembres
accepit mea rusticumque fecit
auro Bilbilis et superba ferro.
hic pigri colimus labore dulci
Boterdum Plateamque (Celtiberis
haec sunt nomina crassiora terris):
ingenti furor inproboque somno*

¹⁸² Trans: Ker (1930, Vol. 1): 65.

*quem nec tertia saepe rumpit hora,
 et totum mihi nunc repono quidquid
 ter denos vigilaveram per annos.
 ignota est toga, sed datur petenti
 rupta proxima vestis a cathedra.
 surgentem focus excipit superba
 vicini strue cultus iliceti,
 multa vilica quem coronat olla.
 venator sequitor, sed ille quem tu
 secreta cupias habere silva:
 dispensat pueris rogatque longos
 levis ponere vilicus capillos.
 sic me vivere, sic iuvat perire.*

While perchance you are restlessly wandering, Juvenal, in the noisy Subura, or treading the hill of Queen Diana; while, amid the thresholds of great men, your sweaty toga fans you, and, as you stray, the greater Caelian and the else wearies you, me my Bilbilis, sought once more after many Decembers, has received and made a countryman, Bilbilis, proud of its gold and iron. Here indolently, with pleasant toil, I frequent Boterdus and Platea (such in Celtiberian lands are the uncouth names!); I enjoy unconscionable sleep which often not even the third hour breaks, and I pay myself now in full for my sleeplessness for thrice ten years. Unknown is the toga; rather, when I ask for it, the first covering at hand is given to me from a broken chair. When I get up, a fire, served with a lordly heap of logs from the neighbouring oak-wood, welcomes me, and my bailiff's wife crowns it with many a pot. Next comes my huntsman, and he too a youth whom you would desire to consort with in some secret grove. The unbearded bailiff gives my slaves their rations, and asks permission to crop his long hair. So I love to live and so I love to die.¹⁸³

Once again the central elements of the pastoral life are stated (a pleasant climate, rest, self-sufficiency, lack of pretension) and opposed to the trials of the city. What is important here and for Martial in general is that such a rustic existence is entirely available to him. While Juvenal is treading the Roman streets, Martial has retired to Spain.

This modifying aspect of Martial's epigrams is evident even before the move to Spain, in Book 12. There is evidence in Martial's writing that he did have some sort of

¹⁸³ Trans: Ker (1930, Vol. 2): 330-332.

country retreat available to him for a long period of time, which was his farm in Nomentum, about 20 kilometres north-east of Rome. This estate is mentioned in many epigrams throughout Martial's corpus. The first allusions come in Book 13, where he criticizes the farm for its lack of firewood (13.15) and mentions that pomegranates grow on his trees there (13.42). He mentions the farm casually again in 2.38, responding to an apparent criticism from a certain Linus that the farm returns nothing to him, except that it does because there Martial does not have to see Linus! In general, the picture of the farm is pleasant, although he mentions that it is very small (9.43) and not self-sufficient since he had to supplement his produce from shopping (7.31, 10.58, 10.94). He found more rest and relaxation there than at Baiae (6.43) and had undisturbed sleep (12.47). The farm produced poultry that he used as gifts (9.54). In 10.92, Martial discusses the sale of the farm, which happened in 97, to Marius, before Martial's departure to Spain, and describes the rustic farm nostalgically, with its pine, holm-oaks, a laurel grove and the simple altars built by his bailiff to commemorate Martial's birthday and other occasions.¹⁸⁴

Therefore, while this rustic residence, although not self-sufficient, was available to Martial for many years and seemed to offer the greatest of the country pleasures which he sought, the question remains why so much of his poetry focuses on life in Rome. The main answer is that he had obligations to patrons that tied him to the city. However, it is

¹⁸⁴ This recalls *Odes* 4.11 where a birthday altar is also constructed, except instead of celebrating Horace's own birthday, the poet is celebrating Maecenas' birthday, indicating the constant presence of his patron even in his autonomous rustic retreat. Similar in theme is Juvenal's *Satires* 12, which revisits the same poem of Horace and the tensions between the rustic retreat and city luxury as well as tensions of genre, namely the idyllic language of Juvenal's sacrifice scene contrasted with the epic storm at sea encountered by Catullus. Here, Juvenal is offering a celebration for Catullus but his friend is not actually present and it highlights the contrast between their lives. See Littlewood (2007) for a discussion of the tensions of genre and the commodification of friendship in Juvenal 12 in light of the poem's relationship with both Horace and Martial.

also true that the content of many of his epigrams, like that of Juvenal's satires, relies on the city for inspiration. It is also clear, from one epigram at least, that city life could be very enjoyable. In 5.20, he again discusses the theme of living life to the fullest and avoiding the tasks of the salutation. However, instead of a life of leisure in the country, here the good life is an urban one: spending time on the promenade, in lounges, in bookshops, on the plan, in the colonnade, in the shade of a garden, in the cold baths of the Aqua Virgo, or in warm baths. In Martial's poetry, the city could be a site of some pleasure as well as inspiration, until the poet's departure to Spain, in 98, a retirement which was not without its difficulties.

Martial's return to Bilbilis on the surface seems to provide the ultimate country retreat that he desired for so long and that the farm at Nomentum never quite provided. From his early epigrams—1.49 has already been discussed—we see an idealized vision of his homeland and his desire to return; in Book 12, we see a fulfillment of this desire. However, it was not without its complications. The first example of his dissatisfaction with life in Spain comes in the preface to Book 12, addressed to Terentius Priscus, a patron who, as we have already seen in Chapter 1 (pg. 47), Martial calls his Maecenas (12.4). The preface starts with an apology for three years of laziness (*scio me patrocinium debere contumacissimae trienni desidiae*) in which Martial has not published a book. He states that even amongst the distractions of the city, such a period would both be excusable but it is even worse that it has occurred here in provincial solitude (*in hac provinciali solitudine*) where he should be writing even more to not only excuse his retirement but also provide solace for it (*nisi etiam intemperanter studemus, et sine*

solacio et sine excusatione secessimus), an ominous phrase suggesting he would rather not be retired at all.

He then gives a list of reasons for not having published something earlier. First, he states that he misses his Roman audience and now feels like someone pleading in a foreign court (*et videor mihi in alieno fore litigare*) because the pleasing content of his books was enriched by his reader (*si quid est enim quod in libellis meis placeat, ditavit auditor*). The phrase suggest that in the city, Martial would have had an audience of friends to whom he could recite epigrams and receive feedback, but here amongst the less-sophisticated provincial audience, he cannot go through the same process. Specifically, he says that he misses the subtle criticism (*illam iudiciorum subtilitatem*), the inspiring subject matter (*illud materiarum ingenium*) and the libraries, theatres and meeting places where he worked on his poems without even knowing it (*bibliothecas theatra convictus, in quibus studere se voluptates non sentiunt*). He says that he abandoned all this because he was too picky (*delicatus*) and hastened to leave but now regrets the decision.

Another reason for his lack of work is the backbiting of fellow townsmen (*municipalium robigo dentium*, literally meaning “the blight of the teeth of provincials”).¹⁸⁵ He also complains that instead of the *iudiciorum subtilitas*—presumably helpful criticism—of his Roman audience, he has to contend with pure envy in the place of criticism (*iudici loco livor*). While the poet had encountered envy before and been able to dismiss it, the fact that there are a lot of envious people concentrated in small place

¹⁸⁵ Howell (1998): 182. Howell draws attention to the generally pejorative meaning of *municipalis*, in Tacitus *Annales* 4.3.4 and Juvenal *Satires* 8.238.

(*unus aut alter mali, in pusillo loco multi*) makes it hard for him to enjoy his writing.¹⁸⁶

Now, what he used to enjoy doing in Rome, he adamantly rejects (*ne mireris igitur abiecta ab indignante quae a gestiente fieri solebant*).

Therefore, the general feeling in the preface is that Martial is not producing as much as he had done in the city, he misses the many encouragements to writing that Rome had to offer and even fears that the books he sends will not be popular in Rome.¹⁸⁷ He even asks Priscus for criticism so that the book he sends back will be *non Hispaniensem librum...sed Hispanum*, meaning a book that is not merely written in Spain, but Spanish, the distinction between *Hispaniensem* and *Hispanum* traditionally used to differentiate between a Spanish-Roman and a native-born Spaniard.¹⁸⁸ The concern over the provincial nature of his writing shows just how tied to the city he was throughout his literary career, both for inspiration and criticism, despite his idealized version of rustic life.¹⁸⁹

Further evidence for Martial's dissatisfaction with Spain comes in 12.68, with a rather ironic turn of fortune. In it he addresses the morning client who wakes him from his slumber and says that the practice was the reason for him leaving Rome (*matutine cliens, urbis mihi causa relictæ*). Martial left because he was tired of performing the morning salutation but now clients are performing it for him and his sleep is still interrupted. It seems that some men of Bilbilis wanted him to plead their cases in courts

¹⁸⁶ For examples of Martial dismissing the envy of others, see 4.27, 8.61 and 10.33.

¹⁸⁷ In 12.3, Martial considers the new status of his books, namely that they were once sent from Rome to the provinces but now must go to the city as a foreigner. While he insists that his book will not be a stranger (*hospes*) or a visitor (*advena*) because of the other books of his already in Rome, the concern was likely that the quality and quantity of his writing had declined while away from the urban centre.

¹⁸⁸ Howell (1998): 182.

¹⁸⁹ Similarly, at the end of Juvenal *Satires* 3, Umbricius references Juvenal's retreat to Aquinum, his birthplace, indicating that he also likely had a rustic retreat available to him. However, since *Satires* 3 is all about the trials of city living, a country retreat would obviously not facilitate much satiric material.

(*non sum ego causicus nec amaris litibus aptus*, No pleader am I, nor fitted for bitter lawsuits¹⁹⁰), which was one of the main services performed by a patron for a client;¹⁹¹ however, these men must not have read any of the epigrams that show how much Martial detested the task!¹⁹² The fact that he was from Rome would have suggested to the provincials that he could give good advice but he tells them to go elsewhere, to cultivate the great halls (*atria ambitiosa*), or people whose egos would be boosted by the needs of a client. He even says at the end of the epigram that he left Rome to gain leisure and sleep and he will leave if this is denied him (*otia me somnusque iuvant, quae magna negavit / Rome mihi; redeo, si vigilatur et hic*). This is a sad contrast with 12.18, where he says he wants to live and die in Bilbilis (*sic me vivere, sic iuvat perire*, 12.18.26). This reveals the extent which Martial defines his literature as a product of his cultural environment and how this literature could be influenced and in turn, immortalize the environment that produces it, a theme that will be returned to later in the chapter.

3.6c: Food and Satire in Martial

Like Juvenal, Martial also uses food to describe his poetic program. Often the epigrams that have to do with food present the genre as trivial and insignificant. In *Epigrams* 10.59, Martial bemoans the picky reader who chooses only select special epigrams to read and would rather a reader who fills up on bread, indicating that the majority of the epigrams are not special delicacies but rather just filler. In 12.48, he asks a friend for hastily prepared meatballs (*subitae offellae*, 17), or potluck since it is the only

¹⁹⁰ Trans: Ker (1930, Vol. 2): 369.

¹⁹¹ Howell (1998): 183.

¹⁹² For example, in 2.90, he says his ideal life involves a day without a lawsuit. In 1.49, he envies Licianus' being free of the complaining client.

type of dinner he could return. Similarly in 13.3, he says that the reader may simply read the heading of each epigram (each one is named for a type of food) and pass by anything that is not to his taste. In 13.1, he employs the classic *topos* of food wrappers to describe the ultimate use of his epigrams, that they are written solely that tuna and olives may not lack a wrapper.¹⁹³ This *topos* is also evident in Horace *Epistles* 2.1.264-270 where he imagines his writing ending up as wrapping paper in the spice market. This is related to the connection between writing and inscriptions, already discussed in Chapter 2 (pg. 65), and the desire to create art that lasts for posterity versus this type of disposable art, that the poets fear might arise from a society that does not privilege the past.

However, other epigrams offer the genre as a meaningful and important alternative to other forms. In *Epigrams* 9.81 against arguments that his poetry is not polished enough, he states his epigrams are dishes that cater to diners rather than cooks, or popular readers rather than poetic critics (*nam cenae fercula nostrae / malim convivis quam placuisse cocis*). In 9.26, upon the insistence that he write poems for the new emperor, Nerva, he modestly states that he is conscious of the slender power of his poetry; however, he also insists on the value of the humble Muse, stating that even a cheap olive is a favoured garnish on top of a dish of fish, or that an epigram might be a welcome distraction or addition, or perhaps even alternative, to another larger form of poetry. In 7.25, he defends his harsh style, saying that no food is pleasant without the bitter taste of vinegar and says that while small children may prefer honey apples or sweet figs, he prefers the tangy Chian fig. Finally, in 10.45, he defends his epigrams in the face of tasteless people who would prefer to gnaw a rib instead of the loin of a fine boar or drink poor vinegary wine in favour of his superior vintages.

¹⁹³ Habinek (1998): 109-114. See Catullus 95.8 and Persius 1.43 for poems destined for mackerel.

Vinegar is just one example of the many inconsistencies in Martial's self-portrayal. On the one hand, he says that it is an emblem for the flavour of his writing but on the other he compares inferior poetry to vinegary wine. Vinegar as an emblem of simplicity and aggression can also be satirized; in Persius 4, the satirist uses the image of a miser eating an onion and drinking expiring vinegar to represent the extreme eschewal of all delicacy. Vinegar foregrounds the complexity of Martial's self-portrayal since ultimately his poetics are a mixed bag (*ex omni macello*, 10.59); high quality epigrams mix with lower ones, offering the reader constant opportunity for browsing and something for everyone's taste (13.3), rather than an impressive dish to be consumed at one sitting (1.118).

For a microcosmic view of food representing the mixed bag of Martial's poetics, it is useful to look at his dinner invitation poems, particularly 5.78. In it traces of Horatian and Callimachean poetics converge with sexual innuendos and self-denigration. From the beginning of the poem, we see a mixture of the idealized rustic fare familiar from Horace with inferior foreign imports; the reference to *viles Cappadocae* is a reference to cheap imported lettuces as well as cheap Cappadocian slave women, both tawdry foreign imports. Similarly, the reference to the *nigra coliculus virens patella* (light green broccoli on a black-ware dish, 7) recalls the *modica patella*, the *puris catillis* and the *angusto catino* of Horace, which are symbols of the small poetic style; here the two diminutives take the modest style to extremes of self-denigration and the *niger* recalls dirty places such as restaurant kitchens, indicating the invasion of the tavern style into Martial's poetics. The *coliculus virens*, while along with beans, bacon, sausage and porridge, look like good Roman food as well as the plain poetic style, is also rife with

sexual innuendo in that *coliculus* is a phallic metaphor and *virens* means at the height of sexual power;¹⁹⁴ similar in tone is the description of the sausage and porridge (*et pultem niveam premens botellus*, and a [male] sausage pressing hard on [female] snowy porridge, 8).

Finally, the pale beans and blushing bacon (*et pallens faba cum rubente lardo*, 10) indicate the audience to whom Book 5 is dedicated, Catos and matrons, blushing at the sexual exploits of the other food.¹⁹⁵ The disclaimer about dismissing the Spanish dancers at the end of the poem is also for the Catos and matrons, but in the very act of banishing them, he describes their exploits lasciviously (*nec de Gadibus improbis puellae / vibrabunt sine fine prurientes / lascivos docile tremor lumbos*, There won't be girls from naughty Cadiz, tickling endlessly, wiggling their hips with practiced manoeuvres, 26-28¹⁹⁶). Similar in tone is Juvenal's description of dancers in *Satires* 11.162-171:

*Forsitan expectes ut Gaditana canoro
Incipiant prurire choro plausuque probatae
Ad terram tremulo descendent clune puellae;
...
Non capit has nugas humilis domus.*

You may look perhaps for a troop of Spanish maidens to win applause by immodest dance and song, sinking down with quivering buttocks to the floor...my humble home as no place for follies such as these.¹⁹⁷

Once again, through the very act of banishment, the dancers take a central role, indicating the playful nature of both these poems as well as satirists' ironic attitude towards morality. The use of a sort of *praeteritio*, highlighting something by saying you

¹⁹⁴ Gowers (1993): 252-253.

¹⁹⁵ The diminutives are also a mode of undercutting and self-denigration. The potential phallic metaphor of the broccoli and the obvious one of the sausage are undermined by the fact that they are a little broccoli and a little sausage—*coliculus* and *botellus*.

¹⁹⁶ Trans: Gowers (1993): 255.

¹⁹⁷ Trans: Ramsay (1999): 233.

are not going to talk about it, allows the poet to be free of blame for the audience who would be offended by such material but also to delight those who would like to read about it.

Martial admits that the supper, like his poetry, is small (*parva est cenula –quis potest negare?*) and the final summary of the meal—*haec est cenula*—has a take it or leave it attitude. However, while the ingredients may be small, they ultimately fill the lines of the epigram, which is quite long in comparison to the others. Similarly, the clichés of Callimachean poetics also enter at the end of the poem; the small flute-player is contrasted with the large book, which indicates an assertion of the value of small-scale poetry. Ultimately, this invitation poem defines Martial's poetics as a mixture of low-brow humour with genuine literary quality and while ephemeral and small scale, the meal and the commemoration of the event of dining itself is the ultimate substance of the poetry, showing Martial's preference for the recording of the everyday acts of a group of people.

The dedication to commemorating dinners and social events is also seen in two other invitation poems, 10.48 which has already been mentioned in its capacity to reveal the patronage connections in Martial's poetry (pg. 43), and 11.52, which is an invitation to the poet Julius Cerialis to join Martial for dinner and uses clichés of food and paper to apparently indicate the trivial nature of his poetry.¹⁹⁸ The literary metaphors at the end also relate to Martial's poetics when he offers to listen to Cerialis read from his *Gigantes*; while he usually expounds against poetry of a mythological theme, this offer

¹⁹⁸ Gowers (1993): 264-266.

indicates his true friendship to Cerealis.¹⁹⁹ The offer is also extended to Cerealis' *Rura*, pastoral poems whose connection to Virgil's pastoral poetry (*Rura vel aeterno proxima Vergilio*, 18) seemingly contrast the eternal nature of Virgil's rustic poems to the ephemeral nature of Martial's urban epigrams. The alternate, and more convincing, reading is that the invitation about the *Gigantes* is ironic and humorous and would be appreciated by people familiar with the works of both Martial and Cerealis. This creation of a mimesis of reality, like the Saturnalian epigrams which will be discussed later, and the inclusion of specific people and events within this created reality ultimately asserts a different kind of autonomy for Martial's poetry outside the realm of Augustan criteria. The reading of the rustic poems in an urban setting also shows an accommodation between the often antithetical city and country.

While Juvenal's food metaphors are all about the fullness of the genre and are not often positive, here Martial offers an alternative. This is not a hard opposition between quality literature and the ephemeral epigram but rather a statement that his form of poetry has a function, is favoured by many people of good taste and serves an important purpose in his social circle. The type of poetry that Martial produces is dependent on social interaction, indicated by his decline in production in the relaxing Spanish retreat. It both immortalizes the social circle for whom it is produced, as already seen in the chapter on patronage, and in a sense creates the society since through writing down the everyday activities of a social circle, he is also creating the version of their reality that will come to the fore whenever the epigrams are read or recited again. This places the poet in a position of great power.

¹⁹⁹ Gowers (1993): 267. This is related to Juvenal 11 and 12, where the poet's mix of genres and themes—a rustic feast set in the city and a pastoral idyll compromised by the narration of an epic storm—reflect a gesture of kindness and acceptance towards his friends, Persicus and Catullus. See Littlewood (2007).

3.6d: The Saturnalian Epigrams

In a discussion of the relationship between food, poetics and Martial's engagement with his Augustan predecessors, it is important to discuss Martial's Saturnalian epigrams, which belong to two of his earliest books, the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*. Both are collections of distichs describing the kinds of objects associated with the Saturnalia, and each epigram is named after the object it describes. The *Xenia*, literally meaning "guest-gifts", contains 127 epigrams, mostly about the food items associated with the Saturnalia. The *Apophoreta*, literally meaning "things carried away", contains 228 epigrams mostly about the gift items one might take away from Saturnalian revelry. The Saturnalia was a holiday held in December in honour of the god Saturn. During this holiday, normal social constraints were not followed; notably, slaves could treat their masters with disrespect. In addition, small gifts would be exchanged, often ephemeral tokens that would be forgotten after the holiday season. The Saturnalia is described in a dialogue by Lucian, a 2nd century AD Greek rhetorician and satirist. In this passage, the god Cronus/Saturn describes the events that occur in his holiday (*Saturnalia*, 1.2):

ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς παραλαμβάνω τὴν δυναστείαν· ἑπτὰ μὲν ἡμερῶν ἢ πᾶσα βασιλεία, καὶ ἦν ἐκπρόθεσμος τούτων γένωμαι, ἰδιώτης εὐθύς εἰμι καὶ τοῦ πολλοῦ δήμου εἷς· ἐν αὐταῖς δὲ ταῖς ἑπτὰ σπουδαῖον μὲν οὐδὲν οὐδὲ ἀγοραῖον διοικήσασθαί μοι συγκεχώρηται, πίνειν δὲ καὶ μεθύειν καὶ βοᾶν καὶ παίζειν καὶ κυβεύειν καὶ ἄρχοντας καθιστάναι καὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας εὐωχεῖν καὶ γυμνὸν ἄδειν καὶ κροτεῖν ὑποτρέμοντα, ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ ἐς ὕδωρ ψυχρὸν ἐπὶ κεφαλὴν ὠθεῖσθαι ἀσβόλω κεχρισμένον τὸ πρόσωπον, ταῦτα ἐφεῖταί μοι ποιεῖν. τὰ μεγάλα δὲ ἐκεῖνα, τὸν πλοῦτον καὶ τὸ χρυσίον, ὁ Ζεὺς διαδίδωσιν οἷς ἂν ἐθέλη.

I take over kingship on set terms. My entire reign is for seven days; the moment this period is over I am a private citizen and, I suppose, one of the common herd. But during the seven days I have agreed to conduct no business whatever, not

even in politics. What I may do is dink and be drunk, shout, play games and dice, appoint masters of the revels, feast the servants, sing stark naked, clap and shake, and sometimes even get pushed head-first into cold water with my face smeared with soot. Such great gifts as wealth and gold Zeus distributes to whomsoever he pleases.²⁰⁰

During the Saturnalia, it was also common to exchange books of light entertaining verse.²⁰¹ An example of such verse is mentioned in Catullus C. 14, which concerns a horrible little book of verses sent to the poet by his friend Calvus (*horribilem et sacrum libellum*, 12). Both the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* fit into this oeuvre. On the surface, the subject matter appears trivial since by definition, a book devoted to a single occasion must be ephemeral. In the introductory epigram of the *Xenia*, which has already been discussed briefly in section 3.8, the poet states that the poetry will likely end up as food wrappers (13.1):

*Ne toga cordylis et paenula desit olivis
aut inopem metuat sordida blatta famem,
perdite Niliacas, Musae, mea damna, papyrus:
postulat ecce novos ebria bruma sales.
non mea magnanimo depugnat tesserae talo,
senio nec nostrum cum cane quassat ebur:
haec mihi charta nuces, haec est mihi charta frutillis:
alea nec damnum nec facit ista lucrum.*

That tunny-fry may not lack a gown, and olives a capote, nor the foul black beetle fear pinching hunger, destroy ye Muses—the loss is mine—papyrus from the Nile: see tipsy winter calls for new pleasantries. No die of mine contends with dauntless weapon, nor does sice together with ace shake my ivory box; this paper is my nuts, this paper is my dice-box; hazard that brings me no loss nor yet any gain.²⁰²

²⁰⁰ Trans: K. Kilburn (1959, Vol. 6), 89-90.

²⁰¹ Roman (2001): 130.

²⁰² Trans: Ker (1930, Vol. 2): 391.

Similarly, in one of the early poems in the *Apophoreta*, the poet offers the reader the option of simply reading the headings of the epigrams even though the epigrams themselves are only two lines each (14.2):

*Quo vis cumque loco potes hunc finire libellum:
versibus explicitum est omne duobus opus.
lemmata si quaeris cur sint adscripta, docebo:
ut, si malueris, lemmata sola legas.*

You can finish this little book wherever you like. Each piece is completed in two lines. If you want to know why headings are added, I will tell you: so that, if you prefer, you may read only the headings.²⁰³

While discussion of the Saturnalian *libellus* did occur previously in Catullus C.14, in that poem Catullus sets it up as a foil to his own *libellus*, describing the authors of such kind of books as the worst kind of poets, burdens on their own age (*incommoda saeculi, pessimi poetae*, 14.23) while his own book, as we see in his programmatic first poem, he hopes will last well into the future (*quare habe tibi quidquid hoc libelli / qualecumque; quod, patrona virgo / plus uno maneat perenne saeclo*, C. 1.18-10). However, it would appear that Martial does not follow in this vein; instead he identifies his own book with the Saturnalian model and treats his poetry as if it were as ephemeral and trivial as the occasion. *Epigrams* 13.1 is written because the season demands it and the tone of self-disparagement is strongly reflected in his calling upon the Muse for the purpose of wasting paper. The connection between the book and gambling also sets it up as part of an ephemeral occasion. *Epigrams* 14.2 goes even further, excusing the reader from the responsibility of reading the entire book. However, the last few lines of 13.1 also hint at a new dramatic kind of autonomy; in stating that his poem is his means of gambling, the poet creates a prolonged mimesis of reality without needing the material objects or facing

²⁰³ Trans: Roman (2001): 136.

the consequences of the reality.²⁰⁴ Martial is establishing his book as a substitute for actual Saturnalian activity, but it occupies the same cultural space as this activity; it can engage the reader and writer in the pleasures of the Saturnalia without playing by any of the rules of the activities it evokes or suffering any material loss that might be associated with the actual activity. Similarly, in the following epigram, 13.3, Martial states that the impoverished reader can offer this book instead of a gift and asks that the reader start by reading headlines alone and skip over any poems that are not to his taste (13.3.5-8):

*haec licet hospitibus pro munere disticha mittas,
si tibi tam rarus quam mihi nummus erit.
addita per titulos sua nomina rebus habebis:
praetereas, si quid non facit ad stomachum.*

These distichs you can send to your guests instead of a gift, if a coin shall be as rare with you as with me. In addition you will get the names of the things on the headings: pass it by if anything is not to your stomach.²⁰⁵

This effectively substitutes literary taste for culinary enjoyment. Therefore, despite the modest claims to the book's poverty, in proposing the book as a substitute for festival activities, gift-exchange and even the enjoyment of food, these statements also reveal the poet's boasts of self-sufficiency.

It is also important to read this Saturnalian literature with the holiday the literature evokes firmly in mind. During the Saturnalia, the rules of daily life are suspended and to recall the holiday within the poetic sphere means to recall the otherness of this holiday. The poetry, like its inspiration, can exist outside the parameters of daily life in that Martial's Saturnalian epigrams relate to the Saturnalian part of the year but can also exist independently from it, whenever someone chooses to read them. However, with this

²⁰⁴ Roman (2001): 131. This epigram also sets up Martial's poetry as his livelihood, which as we saw in Chapter 1, asserts a new quality for literature beyond one that is purely aesthetic.

²⁰⁵ Trans: Ker (1930, Vol. 2), 393.

comes the challenge of being a product of this world—namely ephemeral and disposable once the holiday is done—and presenting something of value that can exist repeatedly outside of the Saturnalian sphere. While on the surface, Martial’s poems hint at their disposability, it is too simplistic to read them entirely in this light since if he honestly felt they had no poetic merit, he would never have written them. Rather, their power is in their ability to recreate the space of the Saturnalia itself, literally and more figuratively; like the holiday, they are a part of, yet separated from, daily life and this role as substitute and alternative presents a new kind of autonomy.

In terms of defining literal and textual space, it is important to look at the closing poem of the *Apophoreta*, also the closing epigram of the entire Saturnalian collection,

14.223:

*Surgite: iam vendit pueris ientacula pistor
cristataeque sonant undique lucis aves*

Arise: already the baker is selling boys their breakfast, and the crested birds of daybreak sound out from all sides.²⁰⁶

The moment of daybreak symbolizes the beginning of a new realm of non-holiday events and this epigram serves to synchronize the close of the Saturnalian holiday with the close of the Saturnalian poetic collection. Immediately, the close association of the poem with the end of the holiday reminds us of its ephemeral nature and, like the opening poems of 13 and 14, announces that the poetry will not last long after the close of the occasion with which it is associated. It is also significant that this epigram recalls another literary closing, that of the last poem of Virgil’s *Eclogues* (10.75ff):

²⁰⁶ Trans: Roman (2001): 132. See also Ovid *Amores* 1.13 where he talks about the separation of the world of the poet and lover while everyone else goes to work.

*Surgamus: solet esse gravis cantantibus umbra...ite domum saturate, venit
Hesperus, ite capellae*

Let us rise: shade tends to be harmful to singers...go home well fed—evening is coming on—go home, goats.²⁰⁷

In recalling the *Eclogues*, Martial is recalling the closing of a literary space rather than a temporal one.²⁰⁸ Whenever the reader opens the *Eclogues*, he is drawn into their literary space regardless of time, location or occasion and perhaps Martial is asserting a similar hope for his own Saturnalian poems. They can be read repeatedly and by immersing himself in the literary Saturnalian space, the reader also opens himself to a special sphere of appreciation and recollection, just like a modern reader might read a story about Christmas at other times of the year and immediately recall the festive nature and feelings associated with the season. While these types of books can be exchanged as Saturnalian/Christmas gifts and sifted through at a reader's leisure, it is not likely that they will be immediately discarded after the close of the holiday. Also importantly, the text even absorbs within its margins events which should properly lie outside them, namely the resumption of non-holiday activity, indicating a "profound mimetic self-sufficiency" where the text's literary realm exceeds the occasion.²⁰⁹

The relationship with Virgil is also significant in that this closure to the *Eclogues* serves as a reminder of the fragility of the pastoral space, as discussed in section 3.1. The introduction of shadows and nightfall along with the political intrusions of the *Eclogues* set them apart from their Theocritean predecessor and the close association of poetry and politics was one that presented some tension to the Augustan poets. In Martial, however, as we shall also see with the closing poem of the *Xenia* and its relationship to a poem of

²⁰⁷ Trans: Roman (2001): 132.

²⁰⁸ Roman (2001): 133.

²⁰⁹ Roman (2001): 133.

Horace's, there is no such anxiety over the resumption of everyday activities. For Martial, the entirety of his epigrams is the work of everyday life, complete with intrusions and demands. This sets up an important contrast between Martial and the Augustan concerns over the interconnectedness of their poetic products and external influences.

Epigrams 13.127, the closing poem in Book 13, immediately recalls the closing poem of Horace's first book of *Odes* (1.38):

*Dat festinatas, Caesar, tibi bruma coronas:
quondam veris erat, nunc tua facta rosa est (Epigrams 13.127)*

Winter gives to you forced garlands, Caesar: that which was once the property of Spring, now the rose has been made yours.²¹⁰

*Persicos odi, puer, apparatus,
displicent nexae philyra coronae,
mitte sectari, rosa quo locorum
sera moretur (Odes 1.38.1-4)*

I hate Persian pomp, boy; garlands bound with the inner bark of the Linden tree displease me; leave off hunting after the location where the late rose lingers.²¹¹

Both these poems mention the garlands of roses—the *coronae rosae*. However, while Horace's poem is convivial and involves a rejection of luxury in favour of simplicity and is written from the independence of his farm, far from political intrusions, Martial's involves a direct intrusion of imperial discourse. The roses are forced to come early by Caesar, indicating his dominion over the entire world, including nature and, in this case, literature. Horace insists on the autonomy of his private sphere of simplicity, apart from the structures of imperial propaganda. However, Martial makes a clear break from this convivial atmosphere to accommodate imperial propaganda. The *coronis*, a Greek word,

²¹⁰ Trans: Roman (2001): 133.

²¹¹ Trans: Roman (2001): 133.

which in Greek epigram stands for the self-containment of the work, here highlights the subordination of literary to imperial discourse.

Once again, this appears to be an inferior version of an Augustan counterpart, where literature has become the property of the emperor and, subsequently, has no chance to gain immortality through the autonomy so crucial to Augustan poets. However, it is significant that this poem of Horace occurs right after an ode about Cleopatra which is distinctly political in tone. Horace, as is often the case, is here engaged in a dialogue of oppositions; while 1.38 asserts the poet's independence from imperial propaganda and political themes, it is impossible to ignore the thematic consequences of its place following the Cleopatra ode. As with Virgil's closure to the *Eclogues*, the poet's anxieties about the intrusion of politics into the separate world of poetics are still evident. Therefore, when Martial calls attention to his Augustan models, it is not meant to show the decline of his poetry in comparison to its predecessor but rather is calling into question the actual autonomy of a model produced by someone so intimately within the emperor's circle, as was the case with Juvenal in *Satires* 5 and 7. By assuming imperial discourse into the realm of poetics, he is not creating an inferior version of art but showing a new model of poetic production that can absorb the former oppositions—art vs. politics—into one domain.

Both the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* appear ephemeral since they are dedicated to a single occasion and if we are to simply read them as the types of *libelli* evident in Catullus *C.* 14, we are also to presume their disposability. However, upon closer examination, it is clear that they are also creating a separate sphere of poetics that are not circumscribed by any occasion at all; the books can be read repeatedly, and will last

outside the realm of the holiday they celebrate since, like the bulk of Martial's epigrams, they would likely have been passed along and enjoyed by people in Martial's social circle. Furthermore, in their dedication to materiality, Martial's Saturnalian epigrams defy the Augustan ideals of an immortal work of poetry but also ensure a different path to immortality by recording the activities of a social circle—in this case, their holiday celebrations—and functioning in the important social practice of gift exchange.

Both Martial and Juvenal have relocated the site of poetic production from a rustic and otherworldly retreat free from politics and everyday intrusions into the city with all its ensuing influences, distractions and pressures. For Juvenal, this relocation often means the creation of a degraded form of poetry; while he admits the inextricable relationship between satire and the city, in the early satires, the opportunities for the creation of immortal works of art are still minimal. However, in the later satires, we see some other themes at play, namely the satiric portrayals of the rustic existence which find middle ground between extreme rusticity and over-sophistication as well as calling into question the autonomy of the Horatian satiric model. Similarly, in Martial, the sense of life and poetry in decline is very evident on the surface, but in his portrayal of poetic production in Spain, we see that his form of poetry cannot exist separately from the parameters of social exchange it immortalizes. The Saturnalian epigrams especially present an immediate view of poetic production as ephemeral and trivial but ultimately can be read as presenting a perhaps more realistic and attainable view of poetic immortality than presented by Horace or Virgil—a type of poetry that can take into its domain the political and everyday themes surrounding its production but still last due to its enjoyment by the social circle it immortalizes.

Epigram and satire are not the first urban genres since elegy could not exist without the city, although it focuses on the affairs of the poet and the mistress, rather than the daily life of its urban surroundings. Martial, however, creates a new space for poetics that is neither the rustic estate nor the bed of the mistress. Furthermore, there is not a sense of anxiety about his involvement with the everyday, which comes with this relocation. He invites the patron and even the emperor into the convivial atmosphere, as evidenced in the *Liber Spectaculorum*, rather than trying to assert his independence from them. Something entirely alien to small scale poetry is being incorporated into it without anxiety. The refusal of the hard opposition between city and country, immoral and moral, immortal poetry and everyday poetry shows a new kind of independence and a different slant on the conception of decline. Like Juvenal, Martial rejects the otherness of poetry but instead of the outlook for his poetry being mostly negative, he celebrates its role in social exchange.

Conclusion

This thesis has examined the relationship between the Flavian authors Martial and Juvenal and their Augustan predecessors, particularly Horace, in two major ways. The first is a discussion of the rhetoric of decline that permeates a great deal of Juvenal's early satires and to a lesser degree, Martial's epigrams. This decline reflects a political decline since the Augustan self-described Golden Age, with the neglected client or mendicant poet reflecting the feelings of disenfranchisement of men of a senatorial class in an autocracy. The second is the embeddedness of Flavian literature in society as it stands in opposition to the ideals of autonomy that pervade much of Augustan literature. While in Juvenal, this embeddedness and the inseparability of life and art often equate to a decline in literary quality, in Martial, we have often seen that this embeddedness ensures the continuance of his poetic product due to it being shared and celebrated by the social circle whose actions it records and creates. It should be clear that for Horace, Juvenal and Martial, descriptions of poetic production and reception are intimately connected with the poets' feelings about their political and social surroundings.

In addition to understanding the ways in which poetic discourse might reflect the circumstances of its production, it is also important to consider what these satiric poets might have hoped to gain in the publication and dedication of their poetry. The literary domain in general is a location for social negotiation.²¹² Habinek discusses literature as the property of the elite, to be guarded carefully lest it lose its aristocratic prestige.²¹³ In changing social and political climates, we see Roman poets using satiric discourse to

²¹² Tatum (1997): 483.

²¹³ Habinek (1998): 103-121.

respond to this notion of literature as elite capital. In creating or subscribing to a poetic or aesthetic program, Horace, Juvenal and Martial create roles for themselves in a social milieu.

To start with Horace, satire functions most importantly in its ability to create his relationship with Maecenas, and to a lesser extent, Augustus. His role in the imperial circle is illuminated through his engagement with his satiric predecessor, Lucilius. Lucilius was a free-born Republican aristocrat who wrote satiric verses to entertain his elite friends. Due to his status, he was able to level attacks on other aristocrats. Horace engages with Lucilius at various points in his satiric corpus. In *Satires* 1.4, Horace refers to Lucilius as an inadequately discriminating satirist, who produced a great deal of unrefined verse. The focus in this satire is also self-improvement and attacks on types of people rather than the personal attacks levelled by Lucilius. In *Satires* 1.10, Horace establishes himself as part of a contemporary literary canon and states that he is following in the footsteps of Lucilius, while acknowledging that he had criticized the latter in *Satires* 1.4. The impression is that he is following in a well-established satiric tradition but producing even better satire than Lucilius did. This poem demonstrates his preference for the Callimachean notion of aesthetic refinement and again relates this Callimachean aesthetic exclusivity to social exclusivity; at the end of *Satires* 1.4, Horace mentions the small but elite group of men who enjoy his verses, including Maecenas, Virgil and Augustus (81-89). Finally, in *Satires* 2.1, the interlocutor, Trebatius, suggests Horace write panegyric verse for Caesar similar to the verse that Lucilius wrote for Scipio. However, Horace states that this is impossible because his own status as the son of a

freedman in the principate is very different from that of the aristocratic and Republican Lucilius.

The fact that Horace casts himself as following in the tradition of Lucilius demonstrates how he is creating a role for himself among the elite. His satiric verse is meant to function as an impersonation of elite speech, recording but also creating his role in an exclusive domain. However, the function of satire as elite conversation plays out differently in Horace than it does in Lucilius, acknowledging the different statuses of the two poets. Horace's assertions that he is aligning Lucilian satire with the Callimachean aesthetic code demonstrate his worthiness to operate within these elite circles due to his skill as a poet. However, in this refinement, he must let go of the poetic carelessness and freedom that marked Lucilius' status. The shift from the invective of Lucilian satire to self-improvement shows the reflexive and self-conscious nature of Horatian satire. It is not just a product of aristocratic exchange amongst friends; instead, it demonstrates how the later poet is negotiating and creating his new place in an elite world and a changing political climate. In his first book of *Satires* especially, he is not immediately operating from a position of inclusion and his negotiation with Lucilius shows him negotiating the social distance and changing political times that separate him from his predecessor.

While his appreciative and exclusive audience amongst the imperial court are advertised in his satires, his operation within this circle is not a given as it was for Lucilius and therefore it must be created and supported through his verse.

Juvenal's satiric project is different from Horace's since, as we have seen throughout this thesis, he denies any exclusive audience for his poetry. He does lay claim to some literary and social authority, such as in *Satires* 1, where he says that he knows

overused literary themes better than anyone and describes his position as an audience member in Fronto the consul's recital hall, which would have been an elite space (7-21). More interestingly, however, is Juvenalian satire's function as actual satire, through his parodying of the social performance of other people. The most obvious example of this is his extended parody of contemporary writers such as Tacitus and Pliny and their attempts to align themselves with tyrannical opposition to Domitian. This was done most obviously through their glorifying of heroic opposition to tyranny. However, the issue with this is that this glorification comes a decade or two too late—all the horrors of tyranny are long over by the time they stage their heroic dissent—and both these men actually prospered under Domitian, making their stance problematic.²¹⁴ In Juvenal's programmatic first satire, however, we see him mocking these positions. The "pummeling" (*vexatus*, 2) he gets from bad literary recitals is like the assaults suffered under tyranny, cemented by the fact that Fronto, the patron of this recital hall, was a consul under Nerva and perhaps appointed by Domitian.²¹⁵ However, at the end of the satire, he actually acknowledges that he is coming too late and will only attack those who are already dead (168-171), an acknowledgment that neither Tacitus nor Pliny ever made. His direct approach to an issue others have tried to handle with discretion and caution would likely have been humorous and surprising to a contemporary audience.

In addition to these parodies of contemporary poets, his engagement with Horace is also parodic. We have seen this at several points such as the connection between the banquets in Juvenal *Satires* 5 and Horace *Satires* 2.8. His examples of parodies of the rustic existence, most notable in *Satires* 6 and 11, also show his humorous attitude

²¹⁴ Freudenberg (2001): 215-234.

²¹⁵ Freudenberg (2001): 238.

towards the satirist's position as moral spokesman, a role which Horace embraces in *Satires* 1.4. While Juvenal contrasts his own lack of satiric power with that of Lucilius as epic hero, it is clear that he is actually performing a similar function, tearing at the insecurities of his contemporaries and predecessors through harsh, but humorous, satiric criticism.

Finally we come to Martial and the function of epigram. While Martial's epigrams follow from the model of Horatian verse satire in many ways, as we have already seen in the introduction, some consideration must be given to the genre itself. Epigram began as a Greek genre with a purely practical function: recording commemorative, dedicative or sepulchral inscriptions.²¹⁶ In the Hellenistic age, epigram gradually began to receive into its domain a wide variety of themes: humorous, erotic, sympotic and hortatory. In Rome, especially with Catullus, it became characterized by the frank use of sexual language and invective. Catullus was Martial's main influence in the genre although the later poet's social role was very different from his predecessor and subsequently, his epigrams function slightly differently. For Catullus, epigram is a casual genre, written for exchange amongst his aristocratic friends. His epigrams have an invective component and contain personal attacks on wealthy political figures of the time, such as Julius Caesar. Like Lucilius, Catullus could stage such attacks because he was operating from within these elite circles.

In some ways Martial's social performance is similar to Horace's with him using poetry as entrance into an elite circle, although his position, like Horace's initially, is that of an outsider. Instead of writing epigram from within a circle of aristocratic friends, Martial uses epigram to actually seek entry into a realm of men whose deeds he

²¹⁶ Watson and Watson (2003): 31.

commemorates but whose acceptance he has to gain.²¹⁷ His impersonation of Catullus, like Horace's of Lucilius, is a performance of someone from a different social status trying to create and justify his role within an elite atmosphere. Therefore, the performative and mercenary aspects of Martial's epigrams are much more pointed than anything in Catullus since poetry is his livelihood and his means of social advancement. While Horace's position was similar, he tried to avoid the direct association between his poetry and social advancement and, more importantly, financial gain. Martial, however, espouses the notion of poetry for profit and relocates his verse from the exclusive imperial court or the farm of Horace into the city and into the marketplace.

For both Catullus and Martial, epigram's role as invective must be considered. Invective is an important element of Catullus' verse and he could level attacks on elite figures due to his own elite status. However, Martial did not share this position and in the preface to his first book of epigrams, he justifies his use of invective, contrasting his program with Catullus' by claiming that his epigrams are not meant to be attacks on specific community members.²¹⁸ He also justifies his use of obscenity and sexual humour by aligning his poetry with the iambic tradition and placing many of his epigrams within a festival context, either the Floralia in this preface or the Saturnalia, in many of the epigrams discussed in this thesis. The effect of this type of blatantly sexual language or obscenity forces an attack on the *gravitas* of Roman society, when carried to an extreme degree, which makes it dangerous to the community.²¹⁹ Like iambic verse, this opens up the community for refreshment, renewal and rebirth and ensures its health and productivity.

²¹⁷ Konstan (2005): 358.

²¹⁸ Spisak (2007): 24.

²¹⁹ Spisak (2007): 27-33.

As we have seen throughout this thesis, Martial ensures his place in his community by commemorating the deeds of its members and ensuring their immortality by producing a type of occasional, light verse that will be passed along due to its entertainment value. In keeping with a world which is different from Horace's is his alternate form of social and literary exclusivity. He is not producing court poetry only to be enjoyed by members of an elite circle such as that of Maecenas and Augustus. Instead, he creates a wide variety of verses, dedicated to a wide variety of people and highly adaptable to the various circumstances he faces and social circles he finds himself a part of. Martial's use of the invective element of epigram demonstrates the role he creates for himself in ensuring the proper functioning of his community, levelling attacks against those who do not behave in a way that benefits those around them, such as attacks on miserly patrons in Chapter 1. Finally, in keeping with this, Martial's role as an iambic poet demonstrates the role he has created as a social moderator, preventing the community from becoming overly austere and ensuring its renewal.

For Horace, Juvenal and Martial, satire reflects the social and political circumstances of its production. However, it also allows them to create a version of their societies and subsequently control how these societies will be remembered. Through depictions of themselves in their verse and the ways in which they interact with literary models or other historic figures, we see what each of these poets hoped to accomplish through the publication of their verse. Whether it is casting himself as a member of the imperial court in Horace, parodying the social performance of other poets in Juvenal or commemorating and moderating even the most trivial of social interactions in Martial,

each of these satirical poets has created a world that will be explored and enjoyed for years to come.

Bibliography

- Anderson, William S. "The Programs of Juvenal's Later Books" in *Classical Philology*, Vol. 57, No. 3 (July 1962), pp. 145-160
- Baines, Victoria. "Umbricius' *Bellum Civile*: Juvenal, Satire 3" in *Greece and Rome*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (October 2003), pp. 220-237.
- Bartsch, Shadi. Actors in the Audience: Theatricality and Doublespeak From Nero to Hadrian (Harvard: 1994).
- Boyle, A.J. "Introduction: Reading Flavian Rome" in Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text. A.J. Boyle and W.J. Dominik, eds. (Brill: 2003), pp. 1-68.
- Braund, Susan H. "City and Country in Roman Satire" in Satire and Society in Ancient Rome. Susan H. Braund, ed. (University of Exeter: 1989).
- Carey, Sorchia. Pliny's Catalogue of Culture: Art and Empire in the Natural History (Oxford: 2007).
- Clauss, James J. "Allusion and Structure in Horace Satire 2.1: The Callimachean Response" in *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 115 (1985), pp. 19-26.
- Claussen, Wendell. A Commentary on Virgil *Eclogues* (Oxford: 1994).
- Cloud, Duncan. "The Client-Patron Relationship: Emblem and Reality in Juvenal's First Book" in Patronage in Ancient Society. Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, ed. (Routledge: 1989), pp. 205-218.
- Connors, Catherine. "Epic Allusion in Roman Satire" in The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire. Kirk Freudenberg, ed. (Cambridge: 2005).
- Conte, Gian Biagio. The Hidden Author: An Interpretation of Petronius' Satyricon. Elaine Fantham, trans. (University of California: 1996).
- Fantham, Elaine. Roman Literary Culture: From Cicero to Apuleius (John Hopkins University Press: 1996).
- Farrell, Joseph. "Greek Lives and Roman Careers in the Classical *Vita* Tradition" in European Literary Careers. Patrick Cheney and Frederick A. de Armas, eds. (University of Toronto: 2002), pp. 24-45.

- Fowler, D.P. "Martial and the Book" in Roman Literature and Ideology: Ramus Essays for J.P. Sullivan. A.J. Boyle, ed. (Aureal Publications: 1995), pp. 199-226.
- Freudenburg, Kirk. Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal (Oxford: 2001).
- Goddard, Justin. "The Tyrant at Table" in Reflections of Nero: Culture, History and Representation. Jas Elsner and Jamie Masters, Eds. (University of North Carolina: 1994), pp. 67-82.
- Goldberg, Sander M. "Early Republican Epic" in A Companion to Ancient Epic. John Miles Foley, ed. (Blackwell: 2005), pp. 428-439.
- Goold, G.P., trans. Propertius: Elegies (Harvard: 1990).
- Gowers, Emily. The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature (Oxford: 1993).
- Gunderson, Erik. "The Flavian Amphitheatre: All The World As Stage" in Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text. A.J. Boyle and W.J. Dominik, eds. (Brill: 2003), pp. 637-658.
- Gutzwiller, Kathryn. A Guide to Hellenistic Literature (Blackwell: 2007).
- Habinek, Thomas. The Politics of Latin Literature (Princeton: 1998).
- Harrison, S.J. "Deflating the Odes: Horace, Epistles 1.20" in *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 38, No. 2 (1988), pp. 473-476.
- Harrison, Stephen. "Ovid and Genre: Evolution of an Elegist" in The Cambridge Companion to Ovid. Philip Hardie, ed. (Cambridge: 2002), pp. 79-94.
- Henderson, John. Writing Down Rome: Satire, Comedy and Other Offenses in Latin Poetry (Oxford: 1999).
- Howell, Peter. "Martial's Return to Spain" in Toto Notus in Orbe: Perspektiven Der Martial-Interpretation. Farouk Grewing, ed. (Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart: 1998), pp.173-186.
- Hudson, Nicola A. "Food in Roman Satire" in Satire and Society in Ancient Rome. Susan H. Braund, ed. (University of Exeter: 1989), pp. 69-88.
- Hunter, Richard. The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome (Cambridge: 2006).
- Hutchinson, G.O. Hellenistic Poetry (Oxford: 1988).

- Ker, Walter C.A., trans. Martial: Epigrams (Harvard: 1930).
- Konstan, David. "Friendship and Patronage" in A Companion to Latin Literature (Blackwell: 2005), pp. 345-359.
- Kilburn, K., trans. Lucian in Eight Volumes (Harvard: 1959).
- Lee, Guy, trans. Ovid's Amores (Viking: 1968).
- Lee, Guy, trans. Virgil: The Eclogues (Penguin: 1984).
- Littlewood, Cedric. "Poetry and Friendship in Juvenal's Twelfth Satire" in *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 128, No. 3 (Fall 2007), pp. 389-418.
- Lowrie, Michele. Horace's Narrative Odes (Oxford: 1997).
- Lowrie, Michele. Writing, Performance and Authority in Augustan Rome (Oxford: 2009).
- Mair, A.W., trans. Callimachus: Hymns and Fragments (Harvard: 1960).
- Mayer, Roland. "Friendship in the Satirists" in Satire and Society in Ancient Rome. Susan H. Braund, ed. (University of Exeter: 1989), pp. 5-22.
- Morford, Mark. "Juvenal's Fifth Satire" in *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 98, No. 3 (1977), pp. 219-245.
- Nauta, Ruurd R. Poetry for Patrons (Brill: 2002).
- Nauta, Ruurd R. "The *Recusatio* in Flavian Poetry" in Flavian Poetry. Ruurd R. Nauta et al. eds. (Brill: 2006), pp.21-40.
- Oliensis, Ellen, "*Ut Arte Emendaturus fortunam*: Horace, Nasidienus, and the Art of Satire" in The Roman Cultural Revolution. Thomas Habinek and Alessandro Schiesaro, eds. (Cambridge: 1997), pp. 90-104.
- Oliensis, Ellen. Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority (Cambridge: 1998).
- Putnam, Michael C.J. "Pastoral Satire" in *Arion*, Third Series, Vol. 3, No. 2/3 (Fall 1995 – Winter 1996), pp. 303-316.
- Ramsay, G.G., trans. Juvenal and Persius (Harvard: 1999).

- Roller, Matthew B. Constructing Autocracy: Aristocrats and Emperors in Julio-Claudian Rome. (Princeton: 2001).
- Roman, Luke. "The Representation of Literary Materiality in Martial's Epigrams" in *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 91 (2001), pp. 113-145.
- Roman, Luke. "Martial and the City of Rome" in *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 100 (2010), pp. 88-117.
- Rudd, Niall, trans. Horace: Odes and Epodes (Harvard: 2004).
- Saller, Richard P. Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire (Cambridge: 1982).
- Saller, R.P. "Martial on Patronage and Literature" in *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (1983), pp. 246-257.
- Saller, Richard. "Patronage and Friendship in Early Imperial Rome: Drawing the Distinction" in Patronage in Ancient Society. Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, ed. (Routledge: 1989), pp. 49-62.
- Spisak, A.L. "Gift-Giving in Martial" in Toto Notus in Orbe: Perspektiven Der Martial-Interpretation. Farouk Grewing, ed. (Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart: 1998), pp. 243-255.
- Spisak, Art L. Martial: A Social Guide (Gerald Duckworth and Co. Ltd: 2007).
- Sullivan, J.P. Martial: the Unexpected Classic (Cambridge: 1991).
- Tatum, W. Jeffrey. "Friendship, Politics and Literature in Catullus: Poems 1, 65, 66 and 116" in *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 47, No. 2 (1997), pp. 482-500.
- Trypanis, C.A., trans. Callimachus: Aetia, Iambi, Hecale and Other Fragments (Harvard: 1958).
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. "Patronage in Roman Society: From Republic to Empire" in Patronage in Ancient Society. Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, ed. (Routledge: 1989), pp. 64-85.
- Watson, Lindsay and Patricia, eds. Martial: Select Epigrams (Cambridge: 2003).
- Weisinger, Kenneth. "Irony and Moderation in Juvenal XI" in *California Studies in Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 5 (1972), pp. 227-240.
- White, Peter. "Amicitia and the Profession of Poetry in Early Rome" in *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 68 (1978), pp. 74-92.

- White, Peter. "Positions for Poets in Early Rome" in Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome. Barbara K. Gold, ed. (University of Texas: 1982), pp. 50-66.
- White, Peter. Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome (Cambridge: 1993).
- Williams, Gordon. "Phases in Political Patronage of Literature in Rome" in Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome. Barbara K. Gold, ed. (University of Texas: 1982), pp. 3-27.
- Wiseman, T.P. "*Pete nobiles amicos*: Poets and Patrons in Late Republican Rome" in Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome. Barbara K. Gold, ed. (University of Texas: 1982), pp. 28-49.
- Zetzel, James E. "The Poetics of Patronage in the Late First Century" in Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome. Barbara K. Gold, ed. (University of Texas: 1982), pp. 87-102.