

## **MONEY AND MORALITY IN JUVENAL'S TWELFTH SATIRE**

**MORALITY AND MATERIALISM:  
A LITERARY ANALYSIS OF JUVENAL'S TWELFTH SATIRE**

By  
SPENCER JOHN GOUGH, B.A.

A Thesis  
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies  
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements  
for the Degree  
Master of Arts

McMaster University

© Copyright by Spencer Gough, September 2008

MASTER OF ARTS (2008)  
(Classics)

McMaster University  
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Morality and Materialism: A Literary Analysis of Juvenal's Twelfth Satire

AUTHOR: Spencer John Gough, B.A. (Mount Allison University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Paul Murgatroyd

NUMBER OF PAGES: v, 108

## ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines how Juvenal, in his Twelfth Satire, critiques greed. Caused by human stupidity, a principle theme of the Fourth Book of Satires, greed destroys society by corrupting core values of friendship and religion, and by consuming those characters that Juvenal characterizes negatively throughout the poem. Emphasis is placed on interpreting Juvenal's attitude to and the relationships between the characters of the poem. The mocking portrayal of the narrator's "friend" Catullus, a merchant, characterizes him as being consumed by the same materialism which drives legacy-hunters, the targets of the diatribe at the end of the poem. Greed, as exhibited by Catullus and the *captatores*, spreads vice throughout society by attacking friendship, kinship, religion, and the fundamental values of the state.

I argue that Juvenal discusses the corruption of his contemporary society as a concrete illustration of the universal human stupidity outlined in Satire Ten, thus providing a more cohesive reading of Book Four as a whole. I also analyse Juvenal's command of intertext and allusion, through the examination of the poet's play on the poetic storm as a literary motif of the epic genre (Chapter 3), and also by comparing and contrasting the treatment of legacy-hunting in Satire Twelve and in Horace's Satire 2.5 (Chapter 4). These philological discussions elucidate the poem's various points, complementing the line by line, section by section textual analysis (Chapter 2). Specifically, my literary analysis contributes to our understanding of how Juvenal contextualized himself in his own genre, in Latin literature, and in his own society.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My debts are large. It is my pleasure to thank my supervisor, Professor Paul Murgatroyd, for his guidance in the composition of this work, for his unflagging encouragement and support, and for his meticulous attention to matters great and small. Having spent the last year under his keeping, I have learned that academia need not be a lifelong enterprise of masochism. Many thanks also to the School of Graduate Studies at McMaster University for its generous financial support, *sine qua non* [*edere possum*].

To my committee members, Professors Daniel McLean and Sean Corner, I owe a great debt for the arduous task of reading the drafts. I would also like to thank the other professors of the McMaster Classics department, especially Evan Haley and Claude Eilers, for their assistance and for their commitment to the graduate program. However, the kindness of these individuals suggests neither concurrence with any of the views expressed in this dissertation nor responsibility for any of its shortcomings. I have also received a great deal of compassion from my fellow graduate students, which has eased the burden. To many others who have supplied information or advice, or offered praise or prayers, I thank you.

My main debt inevitably is to my family, who have put up with my complaints and supplied me with reassuring words and cold beverages when needed, and above all to Jessica, who has been endlessly encouraging, offering the occasional motivational push when needed.

For Kay, John, and Dorothy,  
*genitoribus optimis, quamquam non cognitis.*

## CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Literary Analysis.....	21
Chapter 3: Juvenal's <i>Poetica Tempestas</i> .....	65
Chapter 4: <i>Captatio</i> in Juvenal's Twelfth Satire and in Horace Satire 2.5.....	81
Chapter 5: Conclusion.....	97
Bibliography.....	103

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

### Synopsis

In his Twelfth Satire, Juvenal describes to a certain Corvinus the sacrifices which he is offering to the Capitoline gods in order to welcome his friend, Catullus, home from a dangerous nautical voyage. Catullus has survived a horrific storm at sea, in which he sacrificed the luxury goods which he was importing in order to save the lives of himself and of the rest of the crew. Ultimately the mast is chopped down, the storm subsides, and the maimed ship limps into the safe harbour at Ostia. After recounting their safe arrival, the narrator returns to his festivities, but refutes Corvinus' unspoken charge that his sacrifices are meant for legacy-hunting, or *captatio*. Since Catullus already has three sons, ingratiating behaviour for the purposes of *captatio* would be in vain. Therefore, the narrator's sacrifices are not self-serving, unlike those of the *captatores*, who would sacrifice elephants, slaves and even their own daughters to be the heir of some rich and childless senior. May the legacy-hunter, the *captator*, be cursed with a long life full of riches, Juvenal concludes, and may he neither love nor be loved.

### Previous Scholarship: Structure and Form

Previous scholarship on the Twelfth Satire has been quite cursory, and occurs mostly in commentaries on the Juvenalian corpus. The poem is rarely quoted in larger works on Roman Satire, only partially due to its shortness. Close textual analysis of the

Satire is found mostly in the major commentaries of Courtney (1980), Ferguson (1978), Duff (1970), and Mayor (1888). Of these, Courtney's seminal work on Juvenal has the fullest analysis of the content, while also providing an analysis of the treatment of the poetic motifs such as the *prosphonetikon* and the mock-epic poetic storm. Other minor textual notes have been made by Ronnick (1993a, 1995), Colton (1972), and Jones (1982). Beyond the commentaries, the few scholars who have studied the Twelfth Satire have generally taken a philological approach focusing on one theme of the poem to determine its overall point. Their contributions are addressed in the following section.

Many scholars identify a structural division into four parts: the narrator's joyous sacrifice (1-16), the storm narrative (17-82), the return to the narrator's oblations (83-92), and the diatribe against the legacy-hunters (93-130).<sup>1</sup> These fall into a larger bipartite structural schema of the poem (1-92; 93-130). The narrator's sacrifices (1-16, 83-92) encompass the adventure of his friend whom he is welcoming with these, thus forming a "ring-composition."<sup>2</sup> The second half of the poem is included as a qualification that the narrator's sacrifices do not have ulterior personal motives, *viz. captatio*. Only Courtney divides the poem at line 93, which is surprising, since the narrator's celebrations are explicitly reactions to Catullus' disaster and safe return. Juvenal emphasizes the causal relationship between the storm and the narrator's festivities both initially (*ob reditum ... /*

---

<sup>1</sup> Decker (1913), 80; Highet (1954), 280; Ramage (1978), 223; Ferguson (1979), 288; Courtney (1980), 516; Braund (2004), 419.

<sup>2</sup> For ring-composition, see Courtney (1980), 516.



... *amici*, 15-16) and as he returns to the initial dramatic sacrifice scene (*igitur*, 83).<sup>3</sup>

Moreover, the topic of legacy-hunting is not introduced until line 93; many scholars have interpreted this miniature satire against *captatio* as awkwardly appended to the first half, as it seems to have little to do with the narrator's sacrifices, let alone with Catullus' heroic actions in the storm. But as we will see, these two complementary halves form a cohesive attack against greed, focusing on two examples: Catullus in the first half and the legacy-hunters in the second.

The Twelfth Satire's play on poetic form and genre supports this bipartite structure. The poem is addressed to an unknown Corvinus, who acts as a dramatic audience to Juvenal's satirical observations. Although he is largely absent from the content of the poem, Corvinus' role as addressee creates a certain intimacy between author and reader, since this form allows Juvenal to express his attitudes and reactions as he would to a third party. Appearing throughout Roman satire,<sup>4</sup> this so-called "loose epistolary form" aids the transition through the repeated address to Corvinus (93, recalling 1). Here the addressee's unknown identity draws him somewhat out of the background as a possible target of the poem's satire. Juvenal thus plays on form by using the addressee, customarily a bystander, as a structural and satirical hinge.

The explicit purpose of the 'letter' to Corvinus is to detail the narrator's responses to the safe return of Catullus, who might be a mutual friend (*nostro... Catullo*, 29). As

---

<sup>3</sup> Ramage (1978), 231. The Latin text of Juvenal is from Clausen (1992).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Juv. 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16; Persius 2, 6; Horace *Sermones* 1.1. For the term "loose epistolary form" see Ramage (1978), 222, and Lindo (1974), 22-27.

such, it fits in the class of *prosphonetika*, poems of welcome for the safe arrival of a traveller.<sup>5</sup> However, Juvenal's take on the *prosphonetikon* is characteristically sarcastic, since the welcome is ironical. I argue that Juvenal undercuts any traces of sincere joy through the expression of his critical view of Catullus to his literary addressee, and thus to the reader as well.

### **Previous Scholarship: Satirical Point of the Twelfth Satire**

My reading of the poem's satirical point is determined by the identities of the major characters and their relationships with Juvenal's narrator.<sup>6</sup> The 'letter' is addressed to a certain Corvinus who is otherwise unknown. His name was very likely chosen for satirical significance, recalling Horace's likening of legacy-hunters to carrion-crows.<sup>7</sup> This reference to *captatio* strengthens the argument that Corvinus represents a legacy-hunter, since he suspects that the narrator's sacrifices are meant to secure the will of Catullus – a logical response from one who would be quick to identify a fellow *captator*.<sup>8</sup> As the addressee, Corvinus the *captator* acts as a pivot for the satirical thrust of the poem, changing its target from the greed of the merchant to the greed of the legacy-hunter.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Cairns (1972), 18-20 and *passim*; Courtney (1980), 516. Other examples of *prosphonetika* include Catullus 9, Horace *Carmina* 1.36, and Ovid *Amores* 2.11.

<sup>6</sup> For the purposes of this thesis I have largely conflated Juvenal the character in the poem and Juvenal the author of the poem. It is generally assumed in this paper, as elsewhere, that the attitudes and opinions presented are held by both the satirist and the narrator. This is a problem which deserves further inquiry, but the difficulties of delineating the thoughts of the narrator from those of the poet himself require more space than is afforded here.

<sup>7</sup> *corvum ... hiantem*, Horace *Sermones* 2.5.56; Courtney (1980), 517.

<sup>8</sup> *neu suspecta tibi sint haec*, *Coruine*, 93; Courtney (1980), 517.

Alternatively, or perhaps in addition, Corvinus' name, which is "that of a blue-blooded aristocrat of the *gens* Valeria,"<sup>9</sup> may suggest that he is a senator - one who might disparage the contemptible greed of *nouveaux-riches* such as Catullus, whose large-scale endeavours in maritime commerce preclude him from the senatorial rank.<sup>10</sup> Catullus is certainly a merchant, similar to Petronius' Trimalchio, a ridiculous freedman who became extremely rich by importing lucrative commodities from overseas.<sup>11</sup> Juvenal emphasizes his character's familiarity with the business world when, at the height of the storm, Catullus' first reaction is to bargain with the winds by paying them off with jettisoned valuables (*decidere iactu*, 33).<sup>12</sup> While Corvinus remains in the background of the literary and satirical context, the materialistic Catullus provides Juvenal with the initial subject matter for his satire against greed. But this understanding of Juvenal's critical attitude to his characters has rarely been advanced by previous scholars, largely due to the widely held misinterpretation that the relationships between the parties are generally amicable. This is not the case.

Generally scholars have viewed the Twelfth Satire as inferior due to lack of satirical force or of unity; so Courtney argues that it is "not only his shortest complete

---

<sup>9</sup> Ferguson (1979), 294.

<sup>10</sup> The *lex Claudia* of c. 217 BC prevented senators from owning ships capable of bearing more than 300 *amphorae* of cargo, approximately seven tonnes. This legislation was founded on the belief that maritime trade was a lesser means of attaining wealth, as opposed to owning land, for example.

<sup>11</sup> Petronius *Satyrice* 76, includes bacon and beans alongside more profitable goods such as wine and slaves; perhaps these base goods (not famous for their potential profit) parallel the base and stupid character of Trimalchio, just as Catullus' luxury goods display his greed.

<sup>12</sup> Ferguson (1978), *ad loc.*, notes that this is "the technical term for a bankrupt compounding with his creditors for a partial payment."

poem, but also his weakest.”<sup>13</sup> The traditional school of thought has assumed sincerity in the narrator’s claim of benevolence towards his ‘friend’ Catullus. This has caused some scholars such as Helmbold (1956) to believe that the only satire in the poem is against the legacy-hunters; Catullus’ act of sacrificing his riches contrasts with the obsession with money of the legacy-hunters, who would sacrifice their own daughters. A similar approach is advanced by Highet in his biographical analysis of Juvenal’s *Satires* (1954). He considers the depiction of this friendship as an attempt to reconcile his loyalty to his friend with a newfound Epicurean philosophical approach which condemns the complicated life of *luxuria* which Catullus leads; Juvenal is described as writing from the mellowed perspective of an old man at ease.<sup>14</sup> Ramage (1978), building on Highet’s analysis, argues that Juvenal contrasts his own pure friendship, described in the first half, with that of the legacy-hunters, whose false friendship is the ultimate target of the immediately overt satire in the second half. However, such an argument makes the first two thirds of the poem (93 of 130 lines) appear overly bloated and even pointless, especially considering the lengthy storm narrative which is largely irrelevant to the theme of true friendship. In contrast to these interpretations, Ferguson (1979) and Smith (1989) briefly argue that Juvenal uses a deeper layer of ironic satire in his treatment of the ‘heroic’ protagonist. More recently, Larmour (2005) and Littlewood (2007) have relied largely on intertextual analysis to support one of the two scholarly approaches, *viz.* that Juvenal is actually a friend of Catullus or that he is critical of him. Larmour’s discussion

---

<sup>13</sup> Courtney (1980), 518.

<sup>14</sup> Highet (1954), 122-23.

generally supports Smith and Ferguson by showing how the metaphor of the eunuch beaver aligns Catullus and his acquisitive commercial world against traditional Roman sexual and economic values. Lattimore also notes the opposition between Juvenal's world and that of Catullus. He maintains that the two are friends, but that there is a pressure on their friendship due to the incongruity between the merchant's urban commercialism and Juvenal's idyllic farm life which is evidenced by the mismatching of registers throughout the poem. Although intriguing, Lattimore's argument – specifically that Juvenal exposes himself to the weaknesses of his friend by crossing out of his own space and into Catullus' commercial one – fails to account for such a negative portrayal of Catullus. Ultimately, the narrator's attitude towards Catullus is not one of friendship but one of satirical criticism.

Ferguson and Smith also analyse Juvenal's attitude to Catullus. Ferguson's brief discussion of the Twelfth Satire was the first to argue for a re-evaluation of the poem's overall satirical point;<sup>15</sup> he examines the characters crucial to the reading of the poem, namely Corvinus, Catullus, Pacuvius Hister (as the prototypical legacy-hunter), and the narrator himself. Instead of contrasting Catullus' sacrifice with the legacy-hunter's obsession with wealth, the poem rather places both *mercator* and *captator* in the same class of people who value money over everything. Their greed is mocked by Juvenal and contrasted with his own simple lifestyle. The fact that Catullus is twice referred to as "friend" (16, 96) must not be taken at face value, for he is negatively characterized and

---

<sup>15</sup> See Ferguson (1978), 294 for his General Comments.

praised only ironically; Catullus is a “typical exponent of *luxuria*,”<sup>16</sup> engaged in importing opulent goods such as silver plates, and even effeminate valuables such as purple robes fit for “soft Maecenases.”<sup>17</sup> Juvenal states that among these jettisoned riches are baskets, a sarcastic remark suggesting that Catullus is an idiot if he thinks that this will lighten the sinking ship. As others have seen,<sup>18</sup> in likening this disaster to that of a *poetica ... / tempestas* (23-24), Juvenal suggests that Catullus has exaggerated the whole story. Juvenal mentions that the storm narrative is quite familiar (28) and no different from any other (26), underlining the point that this episode is merely a trope. Furthermore, Juvenal indicates that Catullus is certain to continue to make such voyages, advising that “next time” he remember to bring axes.<sup>19</sup> The description of Catullus as a “friend” must be ironical, due to Juvenal’s thoroughly negative characterization: the merchant is a fool whose greed leads him into an easily predictable storm, and who is too consumed by materialism to be reformed.

According to Ferguson, the narrator contrasts himself with both the legacy-hunters and Catullus: his simple life is completely unlike that of greedy people. Ferguson considers Eleven and Twelve as following the programmatic satirical approach of Ten, which critiques the vain desires for power, military glory, long life and beauty; the

---

<sup>16</sup> Ferguson (1978), 294.

<sup>17</sup> *Vestem / purpuream teneris quoque Maecenatibus aptam*, 38-39; for the full list, see lines 38-47.

<sup>18</sup> Courtney (1980), 517 and on line 23, for example.

<sup>19</sup> *Mox ... / accipe sumendas in tempestate secures*, 60-61.

Twelfth Satire builds on this list by attacking wealth as another vice, inspired by greed. Ferguson thus suggests a more cohesive reading of the Fourth Book than previously interpreted.

Smith, building on Ferguson's interpretation, focuses on the relationship, or rather the lack thereof, between the narrator and Catullus. Smith argues for "an incompatibility between [Catullus'] business world and the narrator's old-fashioned Roman values,"<sup>20</sup> by which the narrator distances himself from his supposed friend, who is characterized negatively throughout, as seen by Ferguson. Through the philological interpretation of the sections of the text which introduce the themes of love and friendship, Smith argues that each of these is either meant to be ironic or juxtaposed with ideas which undercut a compassionate and friendly attitude.<sup>21</sup> Specifically, Juvenal uses the word *amicus* "for some sardonic antithesis which belies, undercuts, or otherwise stands in contrast to the expected connotation of the word."<sup>22</sup> Most commonly it is used to describe a relationship based on selfish motives, associated especially with avaricious patrons (5.113, 134, 173; 7.74; 10.46), but also informers (1.33), flatterers (3.87), Greeks (3.101, 107), and, of course, legacy-hunters (1.146; 5.140).<sup>23</sup> In line 96, the narrator's reaction to Corvinus' unspoken accusation of *captatio* is one which "seems to downgrade Catullus' worth;"<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Smith (1989), 288.

<sup>21</sup> See especially Smith (1989), 290-1.

<sup>22</sup> Smith (1989), 289.

<sup>23</sup> Other instances include 3.57, 116, 121; 5.32, 140. In all of these examples, *amicus* comes at the end of the line, its delayed position adding weight to the irony of the word.

<sup>24</sup> Smith (1989) 290.

since he already has children, he is worthless as a target for legacy hunting (93-98). Smith suggests that Juvenal emphasizes Catullus' worthlessness far more than any feelings of warmth for his safety. Although he is obviously quite fertile - having three heirs was the ideal to sustain a proper Roman family - Catullus is described as "sterile" (97). This refers back to the height of the storm, when Catullus is likened to the beaver who bites off his own testicles to escape the pursuing hunter (34-36). However, his sterility in the eyes of the *captatores* is not due to any financial losses incurred during his disastrous shipwreck, but due to his ability to produce children. In this joke, Juvenal ventriloquizes the perspective of the legacy-hunter, voicing a different negative view of Catullus. As the representative of traditional morality, the satirist criticizes the merchant for his acquisitiveness, but ignores the societal contribution of his family. Catullus' paternity is his only morally laudable attribute, but this is voiced negatively through the *captator's* point of view rather than in praise from the narrator. After the opening lines, Juvenal only praises Catullus ironically. In the end, the poem's initial joy is not reflected in Juvenal's attitude towards his "friend." Smith sees a distance between the two characters.

Smith also contrasts the opening sacrifices with the usual scene of welcome, noting a general lack of fondness between Catullus and the narrator. There is no description of the scene of reunion between the two, as is typically envisioned in poems of welcome;<sup>25</sup> for Smith, the language "never clearly encompasses a reunion" between

---

<sup>25</sup> E.g. Ovid *Am.* 2.11, Propertius 1.8, and Cat. 9.



the supposed friends.<sup>26</sup> Here I think Smith may be proceeding in the wrong direction.

While I agree that throughout the poem the narrator makes an effort to distance himself from Catullus, I would argue that the storm narrative is a second-hand, satirical version based on Catullus' own original account. It seems clear that they have met, at least within the frame of the poem, since Juvenal is able to say that Catullus is still trembling from his adventure (*trepidantis adhuc*, 15), amazed at the fact that he is still alive (*incolumem sese mirantis*, 16). It is directly from Catullus that the narrator knows such intimate details of the storm, and the specific goods that were thrown overboard. Rather than using a dialogue format between the shaking merchant and the joyful narrator, Juvenal has his narrator recount this storm second-hand to Corvinus. The narrator can only know about this story from Catullus, and so, due to the narrator's sarcastic and critical attitude towards the merchant, Juvenal's version inflates the obvious hyperbole of the storm, suggesting that the original account of the danger was largely exaggerated.<sup>27</sup>

Furthermore, the lengthy and detailed discourse on the items cast overboard allows the narrator to mimic mockingly his friend's obsession with material goods; he even tries to negotiate in legal terminology with the winds (*decidere*, 33),<sup>28</sup> clinging to the values of his own business world which the narrator is intent on criticising. Juvenal then compares his merchant "friend" with the *captator*, providing a characterisation which is more

---

<sup>26</sup> Smith (1989), 291.

<sup>27</sup> Ferguson (1978), 294; Courtney (1980), 516.

<sup>28</sup> Ferguson (1978), *ad loc.*, views this as an excellent piece of satire.

critical than is usually acknowledged; valuing money nearly above their own lives, they exist in another world, one foreign to the narrator.

So, for all of the above reasons, it seems clear that Catullus is neither heroically portrayed, nor a true friend of the narrator. Both the storm narrative and its hero are meant to be taken ironically. However, one major problem persists regarding the appreciation of the overall point of the poem: why does Juvenal include such expressions of joy as are manifested in the initial scene of sacrifice? As we have seen, Juvenal clearly states that these sacrifices are in response to Catullus' safe arrival following the storm, and he is quick to point out that these are altruistic rather than self-serving.<sup>29</sup> Some have seen this as a genuinely altruistic offering motivated by Juvenal's new Epicurean influences; for example, Ferguson suggests that Juvenal is setting a good example for Catullus and the legacy-hunters, suggesting an alternate lifestyle for these agents of *luxuria*.<sup>30</sup> The problem here is that it is very hard to identify Juvenal's own specific philosophy; the Tenth Satire, from which such arguments derive, includes strains of Socratism, Democriteanism, Stoicism and the declamation of "the poet's own preferences and opinions."<sup>31</sup> It is more likely that the sacrifices of the narrator are also ironical, a point which will be explained in detail in the second chapter.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> *Neu suspecta tibi sint haec*, 93.

<sup>30</sup> Ferguson (1978), 294; see also Highet (1954), 123 and 136.

<sup>31</sup> Courtney (1980), 448-54, Courtney (1980), 517.

<sup>32</sup> See chapter 2, pages 44-45.

## Satirical attacks against Greed

Therefore, amidst the various postulations about the overall theme of the Twelfth Satire, the argument that it is a satire against greed is the most appealing. While Catullus is lampooned in the first half for his materialistic obsessions, in the second half Juvenal castigates the mercenary behaviour of the legacy-hunters. The greedy merchant and *captator* are connected via sacrifices (27-28, 100-1), and both fulfil typically poetic actions, the one passing through an exaggerated “poetic” storm (23-24), the other promising exaggerated sacrifices worthy of mythological comparison (118-20, 127). The narrator emphasizes their greed by mimicking their obsessive materialism, evaluating items throughout the poem in commercial terms. For example, if the narrator could afford it (*si res ampla domi*, 10), he would offer a great bull and show off its fine provenance (*laeta*, 13). These references often emphasize the loss or futility of wealth: not even the wisdom of the old helmsman is of aid (*opem*, 33); Catullus jettisons his goods imitating the beaver who escapes the hunter through the loss of his testicles (*damno*, 35); even the losses (*damna*, 53) of the useful items thrown overboard do not help. The obsession with money applies more directly to the legacy-hunters, who would sacrifice elephants if they were for sale (*uenales*, 102); but they are willing to offer their most beautiful (and therefore most expensive) slaves and even their own daughters - and it will be well worth their while (*quam / grande operae pretium*, 126-27). These mercenary and mercantile references and motifs pervade the entire poem, mocking the greed of both the legacy-

hunter and Catullus. Merchant and *captator* are “opposite sides of the same coin,”<sup>33</sup> the satire coheres around the theme of greed, with Juvenal attacking two of its agents.

The Twelfth Satire critiques greed in several ways, using the merchant and the legacy-hunter as examples of the effects of greed. An obvious attack is against the manic nature of their materialism. Both mercenary types are completely obsessed with the minutiae of material possessions. Catullus has obviously dwelled on his lost possessions at length, since the narrator can recall them in such a detailed catalogue (38-47). Juvenal mimics the greedy man’s attention to detail in both the catalogue of jettisoned goods and in the catalogue of the *captator*’s sacrifices, which includes nearly ten lines describing the unavailable elephants (102-10).

The catalogues of detailed sacrifices further define the effects of this obsessive materialism, arguing that greed destroys families and emasculates men. Catullus’ lost items include Greek cups (47) and purple clothes fit for Maecenas (38-39), already synonymous with foppish luxury.<sup>34</sup> Furthermore, his imitation of the eunuch beaver (34-36) and his status as a “sterile friend” (97) supports this effeminising effect of greed. He is also neglecting his role as a father: in risking his life for profits, he is forgetting about his three sons at home, potentially making them fatherless. The legacy-hunter’s greed goes far beyond this, in that he would sacrifice his own daughter if it secured him an inheritance (118-20, 127). They would then grow up to be old, rich, and childless, and

---

<sup>33</sup> Courtney (1980), 517, notes these parallels.

<sup>34</sup> Courtney (1980), *ad loc.* Cf. Juv. 1.66.

themselves become ideal targets of *captatio*. This is part of Juvenal's charge that greed is a never-ending cycle.

Juvenal also demonstrates that greed is dangerous. Catullus' greed sends him on a sea voyage which will almost certainly be perilous; everyone else knows that these types of nautical storms happen all the time and are recounted in poetry and on tablets in shrines (24-28). Sea-farers are greedy people who separate themselves from death by a piece of wood the width of a few fingers (57-59). The praise of Catullus' sacrifice (48-51) is clearly sarcastic, since it is these goods which have put him into the disaster in the first place.

Catullus' greed forces him to act illogically; in a panic, Catullus abruptly shouts out that all of his things must be thrown overboard.<sup>35</sup> The rashness of this is brought out by the description of the jettisoned luxury items: the greedy merchant is stupid, since he thinks clothes and baskets will increase the ship's buoyancy. His illogical sacrifice has little effect, since he eventually resorts to more practical measures.

Juvenal ties this materialistic stupidity to the exponential growth of greed. Catullus does not realize that his greed has brought these dangers on himself, since the narrator has to advise that next time (*mox*, 60) he bring axes along with the other necessary items for seafaring. According to Juvenal, materialism is not something that can be satisfied, since Catullus has not learned his lesson. This view of the progressive nature of greed extends to the treatment of the legacy-hunters. Juvenal's final curse

---

<sup>35</sup> Ferguson (1978), 294, notes that Catullus speaks with rash panic.

against the *captator* is that he be extremely old, filthy rich and have no friends. Juvenal actually wishes that the legacy-hunter be successful in *captatio* several times over, and not content with his one success. With each inheritance, the *captator*'s greed increases, and he will go to further lengths and spend much of his earnings on more and more extravagant sacrifices, thus winning a new inheritance. This leaves Juvenal's final statement that greed isolates its victims.

The ultimate curse against legacy-hunters is that they not be loved. This is because they only offer sacrifices to those with available inheritances - specifically the rich, childless invalids of Rome (99, 122). The mercenary *captator* befriends only those about to die, since there can be no financial gain in actual friendship. Their obsession with money would drive them to sacrifice their loved ones for a profit. Moreover, the greed of the legacy-hunter sets him in competition with all others whom he sees as rivals to his goal (124-25), leaving them alone and without friendship or love. If they have sacrificed even their own children for the sake of greed and have no true friends of their own, the successful mercenary legacy-hunter will eventually become a prime target of his own trade, his isolation bringing the negative cycle of greed back upon himself.

While Juvenal attacks these various effects of greed, he notes a progression of the degree of greed from the merchant to the legacy-hunter. Throughout the poem the narrator's tone grows from mild irony to caustic satire. In the first half, the tragedy of Catullus' lost goods is undercut in the same bathetic manner as when the narrator first contradicts his own sincerity by wishing for a "bull fatter than Hispulla;" Catullus must

jettison a precious vase which is big enough for “thirsty Pholus [the centaur who used a huge *crater* both to fight the Lapiths and to entertain Hercules], or even the wife of Fuscus.”<sup>36</sup> In the second half, Juvenal is much less light hearted,<sup>37</sup> preferring to exaggerate grossly both his own offerings and those of the legacy-hunters to the point of mordancy.<sup>38</sup> The severity of the satire matches the increased depravity of the vice; in comparison to the mild irony with which he mocks the triteness – and therefore the stupidity – of Catullus’ greed-driven sea-voyage, the gravity of Juvenal’s criticism increases with the appalling exaggeration that *captatores* might sacrifice their own daughters for an inheritance. Although Catullus is mocked for the greed which nearly costs him his life, he himself potentially becomes prey for the ravenous legacy-hunters, who appear to easily manipulate and deceive such naïve and wealthy individuals.

### The Unity of the Twelfth Satire

One recurring criticism of the Twelfth Satire is that it lacks unity. On the most basic level, Juvenal builds the unity of the poem through the repetition of words. Some of these simply establish themes and subjects which run throughout the poem, as the repetitions of *do* and its cognates make sacrificial offerings a recurring theme (4, 90, 119, 125). Moreover, verbal links explicitly indicate parallels between the scenes. At either

---

<sup>36</sup> *Et dignum sitente Pholo uel coniuge Fuscus*, 45; see Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*

<sup>37</sup> Aside from a few amusing images such as at 95-97.

<sup>38</sup> As if suggesting that the sacrificing of slaves was not bad enough, Juvenal sardonically praises his “fellow citizen” for slaughtering his own Iphigenia, since a thousand ships cannot compare to a will, 121-22.

end of the first half, the narrator sacrifices to Jupiter both on the Capitoline (6) and in his own house (89), with both offerings in thanksgiving for the *reditus* of Catullus (15, 94). The initial sacrifices are linked to those of Catullus by the repetition of *res* (10, 49), and also to those of the legacy-hunters; Juvenal promises a few animals to the gods (*promissa deis animalia*, 2) while the *captator* promises an entire hecatomb to the gods (*promittant hecatomben*, 101; *deis*, 114). Both the narrator and the *captator* lead their sacrificial animals to the altars in the same terms (*ducimus*, 3; *ducatur*, 112; *arae*, 7; *ad aras*, 112), and both wish for more expensive victims raised in famous fields (*Clitumni pascua*, 13; *Turni pascitur agro*, 105). Beginning the second half of the poem, the narrator's private sacrifices also pick up the offerings made elsewhere. The repetitions of *cuncta* (37, 91) and *iacio* (33, 53, 62, and 90) link Catullus' sacrifices to those of the narrator. Especially noteworthy is the connection, in two complete lines, between the dangers of the sea which may cost you your life, and the happy sacrifice scene made by the narrator safe in Rome (*i nunc et uentis animam committe dolato*, 57; *ite igitur, pueri, linguis animisque fauentes*, 83). This connection shows the causal relationship between Catullus' disaster and the narrator's sacrifice, while also expressing Juvenal's ironic joy at the safety of the merchant, whose greed led him into danger in the first place, and will do so again. Naturally the two agents of greed, merchant and legacy-hunter, are also connected by similar verbal links. Beyond the repetition of *euado* (18, 35, 122) and *arbor* (32, 105), both of the mercenary figures sacrifice *pulcherrima* (38, 116), a point which emphasizes



the waste of greed. These verbal repetitions create a web of connections which unites the poem.

In addition to drawing the poem together as a whole, verbal links often provide transitions between the sections of the poem and heighten the satirical resonance. I have already mentioned the structural and satirical importance of the repetition of Corvinus' name (1, 93); both instances establish and re-establish the form of the poem as a letter, and both introduce a new scene, breaking up the flow of the line to reinforce the transition. As a background figure Corvinus establishes the literary setting but also suggests the presumption that sacrifices in Juvenal's social context are usually self-serving, since the narrator must directly and abruptly reject the accusation that his sacrifices are meant for *captatio*. These sacrifices are made for "friends", as Juvenal points out with the repetition of the pregnant word *amicus* (16, 96). In both cases *amicus* serves as a transition between the narrator's sacrifices and his accounts of the merchant and legacy-hunter. The second instance, however, is qualified by *tam sterili* (97), with which Juvenal advances this same critique of the greedy sacrifice for personal profit. This approach to friendship is carried to the end of the Satire, where Juvenal's curse wishes that the legacy-hunter *nec amet quemquam nec ametur ab ullo* (130). Thus the repetition of *amicus* plays a crucial role in establishing Catullus and the *captator* as parallel targets of the satire in the poem, uniting the Twelfth Satire in the theme of the corruption of friendship by greed.

To summarize, Catullus is the satirical target of a narrator whose attitude is certainly closer to the indignation of Juvenal's earlier Satires than to the meandering thoughts of a mellowed old man. Instead of being an example of bravery, the greedy merchant is both illogical and perhaps even arrogant. He is a "friend" only ironically. Juvenal has established a much more sarcastic narrator than has been commonly understood; his parodic hyperbole undercuts any possible sincerity in both the storm narrative and underlines the horrific extent of the *captator's* depravity. Thus the ironic lampoon of the merchant leads directly into the subsequent diatribe against legacy-hunters (93-130). The poem is neither a contrast between the nobility of Catullus and the depravity of the *captatores*, nor a "study of friendship, true or false."<sup>39</sup> Rather, it is a satire against the greedy whose satirical force builds from hyperbole to harangue, unified by verbal repetitions and a pervasive tone of sarcastic irony.

---

<sup>39</sup> Ramage (1978), 237; Highet (1954), 136.

## CHAPTER 2: LITERARY ANALYSIS

### Section 1: Lines 1-16

To comprehend the overall meaning and point of the Twelfth Satire, one must realize how the opening section of the poem introduces doubts about Juvenal's happiness and his praise of Catullus - doubts which are later confirmed. This is accomplished by subtle hints of irony and the overall tone of the passage which, as we will see, is one of false joy. Juvenal starts by creating a festive atmosphere which appears to be genuine, albeit one uncharacteristic of the satirist.<sup>1</sup> Juvenal uses the rather poetic *lux* for this "day" which is happier than his own birthday (1). As the first word of the poem, *natali* is given great weight; the Romans sacrificed to the *Genius* on their birthdays, and gave parties and received gifts.<sup>2</sup> Juvenal is clearly intent on expressing his great happiness. The satirist is not usually overjoyed, and such a strong exclamation of happiness might itself provoke initial suspicion to the reader. At this point, the poem's addressee, Corvinus, is introduced; the poem thus describes to this unknown and silent interlocutor that which has inspired Juvenal to write to Corvinus, viz. his festive sacrifices, the cause for this

---

<sup>1</sup> Ramage (1978), 223-24, notes that "nowhere else does [Juvenal] begin one of his poems in such a positive, lyrical way."

<sup>2</sup> Duff (1970) *ad loc.*; Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.* Even with his first word, Juvenal hints at the theme of sacrifice which recurs throughout the poem. The implication is that today's sacrifices are greater and more important than those offered on his own birthday; as suggested below, this might raise suspicion since Juvenal rarely displays happiness.

occasion, and his own reflections on and attitudes to the dramatic situation.<sup>3</sup> As yet, Corvinus' relationships with Catullus and with the narrator are still undefined.

The reader's suspicion of the initial joyous tone is sustained by the lack of characterization of Corvinus and by absence of an explanation for Juvenal's happiness. The reader is left with an impression that something is unresolved, and these delays build an anticipation that things may not be so simple and earnest. Instead of explaining why he is so happy, Juvenal describes, at some length, the joyous activities of this day, namely his sacrifices (2-9). This delay allows Juvenal to continue building the celebratory atmosphere by describing the *festus* (2) altar prepared for his sacrificial victims. These sacrifices are linked to the special day by the echoing of *die* (1) by *deis* (2) in the second half of the sentence, with both words at the metrical centre of their lines;<sup>4</sup> the gods are to be thanked for whatever has caused Juvenal's joy. The seeming sincerity of his joy and his sacrifices is supported by the spondaic rhythm of the first four lines.<sup>5</sup> The scene is filled with solemn poetry. The narrator gives a mini-catalogue of the sacrificial animals, referred to by synecdoche (*uellus*, 4), and offered to divinities named by periphrastic epithets (*reginae*, 3; *Tarpeio ... Ioui*, 6; *pugnanti Gorgone Maura*, 4) at an altar (*caespes*, 2, and *arae*, 7). This gravity culminates in lines 14 and 15: Juvenal uses juridical and

---

<sup>3</sup> For the implications of Corvinus' name, see chapter 1, pages 4-5.

<sup>4</sup> Ramage (1978), 224, makes this observation, identifying this as "a day for the gods."

<sup>5</sup> Only 6 of 16 available feet are dactyls.

religious language in part of a religious formula to mark the scene with formality.<sup>6</sup> But the explicit solemnity is questioned by an underlying feeling of dissonance, suggesting a disclosure still to come.

There are a few hints of satire which introduce doubts about the sincerity of Juvenal's joy by undercutting this solemnity. Unlike the two lambs to be sacrificed to Juno and Minerva, the calf for Jupiter appears to fight against the sacrifice, being described as resistant, bold, brandishing its horns, stretching his rope and attacking a tree (5-9). Although victims were to make their way to the sacrificial altar without resistance, some scholars have argued that this behaviour shows only the admired *ferocitas* of the sacrifice, rather than suggesting a bad omen.<sup>7</sup> However, I would argue that the victim's resistance does indicate an ill omen, and thus undermines the idyllic joy of the scene by casting doubt in the integrity of the narrator's optimistic tone. Perhaps more persuasive is the first appearance of humour in the poem. Juvenal bathetically undercuts the solemnity of his sacrifice with one he would prefer to offer if he could afford it: he would sacrifice a bull *pinguior Hispulla* (11), no doubt some notoriously obese target of contemporary Roman gossip. Although this joke might merely reflect the supposed joyful mood of the narrator, the bathos of this reference undercuts the initial lofty language of the first ten lines. The reader's doubts concerning the satirist's true motivations for the poem still

---

<sup>6</sup> *A grandi ... ministro*, 15, and *ob reditum*, 16. Ferguson (1979), on line 16; Courtney (1980), on line 15, refers to Pearce (1970), 311-13.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. Courtney (1980), 518.

remain, and will be confirmed by the characterization of Catullus and the reason for the occasion.

Juvenal introduces the theme of wealth with this imagined sacrifice. His wish for a larger sacrifice is governed by the conditional phrase which precedes it: if his wealth equalled his feelings (10),<sup>8</sup> he would give an expensive and elaborate sacrifice. Juvenal describes his imagined victim in great detail: the bull is slowed down by its massive bulk, so large that a tall attendant is needed to kill it, and so well-bred that its blood displays that it was reared in the finest fields of Italy (12-14). This level of detail will be revisited in imitation of the obsessive catalogues of the merchant and legacy-hunter.<sup>9</sup> The conditional sentence is of course contrary-to-fact: Juvenal is not wealthy. Although he suggests that he would offer bigger and better victims if he could, at no point does he express a desire for wealth, suggesting that he lives within his means.<sup>10</sup> This passage outlines the narrator's position concerning wealth, thus introducing the topic to the poem.

Only at the end of this section do we discover the reason for the narrator's supposedly joyous sacrifices. They are because of the return of a friend who has just survived a great disaster. The position of *amici* at the very end of the sentence delays the

---

<sup>8</sup> This implies that the narrator is not wealthy enough to give a gift with a value that reflects the degree of his happiness; this associates the poem's themes of wealth and of sacrifice as a measure of friendship.

<sup>9</sup> In fact, the merchant's catalogue also makes comic reference to another woman of contemporary gossip, the bibulous *coniuge Fusci* (45). The catalogue of the *captator's* sacrifices is of course explicitly tied into the narrator's contemporary context, referring to *locuples Gallitta et Pacius orbi* (99) in addition to the legacy-hunters.

<sup>10</sup> As we will see, Juvenal's "feelings," *affectibus*, 10, are not like those which inspire self-serving sacrifices, like those of Catullus or the *captatores*.

unanswered questions of the whole section to the last possible moment:<sup>11</sup> what kind of a friend is he? Whose friend is he? Juvenal appears to have encountered Catullus, who is described as still shaking and amazed at his own survival (15-16). Ferguson has suggested that *amici* might be translated as “your friend,” with Juvenal addressing Corvinus.<sup>12</sup> This is, of course, problematic, since there seems to be no reason that Juvenal would offer sacrifices to Corvinus’ friend, in addition to his appellation as *nostro* ... *Catullo* (29). But if Catullus is a friend of Juvenal’s, why then is he not even named until line 29? We hear nothing of him until this point, and the true reasons for the narrator’s sacrifices, and thus the poem itself, remain unexplained. Overall, this section has misled Juvenal’s readers to think that he is sincere about his sacrifice and about the joy felt for a friend’s survival of a storm at sea. He intimates that his sacrifices, the manifestations of his feelings, do not even match how happy he really is that his friend has returned.<sup>13</sup> However, as we will see in the following section, Juvenal thoroughly undercuts this attitude of happiness at Catullus’ safety and of pure friendship. The mention of his *amicus* serves as a transition into the second section of the poem, during which Juvenal tells his audience what kind of friend Catullus really is.

---

<sup>11</sup> See chapter 1, pages 8-9.

<sup>12</sup> Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*

<sup>13</sup> Is it possible that Juvenal is genuinely happy that Catullus has survived the disaster so that Juvenal would have the opportunity to tell him and others (through this poem) that greedy people deserve such disasters? This might be more appropriate given Catullus’ ultimate characterization.

## Section 2a: Lines 17-29

The delayed revelation of the reason for Juvenal's sacrifices (15-16) serves as a transition to an epic storm scene, abruptly shifting from his own exuberant festivities into the vivid details of the disaster. In a brief sentence (17-18), Juvenal swiftly thrusts the reader into the *pelagi casus* (17) which Catullus has survived. First Juvenal sets the gloomy scene with language conveying the tremendous darkness which has enveloped the sky with a single cloud, both in the image conjured up and in the word-order of the line (*densae caelum abscondere tenebrae*, 18).<sup>14</sup> The slow, spondaic rhythm of these lines (17-20) helps to build the impression of impending doom suggested by such dark skies,<sup>15</sup> being interrupted suddenly (*subitusque*, 19) by the lightning strikes which start a fire in the rigging.<sup>16</sup> The sound through lines 17 to 20 seems to mimic the scene by punctuating the repeated nasals (*n*) with harsh dentals (*d* and *t*) and stops (*c*, *q*, and *x*). Attention is brought to the terrifying image of a fire at sea by the alliteration of *inpulit ignis* (19), and sustained by the following subordinate clause which identifies the sailors' fear with the word *attonitus* (21), carefully chosen for its flippant play on literal and metaphorical senses,<sup>17</sup> as well as the fitting juxtaposition of *uelis ardentibus* (22). Here, Juvenal focuses on their reactions as much as on the actual events (*crederet*, 20, and

---

<sup>14</sup> For a full discussion of Juvenal's treatment of the motifs of the *poetica tempestas*, such as this one, see chapter 3.

<sup>15</sup> In lines 17-20, 14 of 16 possible feet are spondees.

<sup>16</sup> The first two syllables of *subitusque* form the dactylic half of the foot.

<sup>17</sup> Duff (1970), *ad loc.*; Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*



*putaret*, 21), and begins to create sympathy for Catullus and his crew. There is no hope for those in the storm, as their plight is worst than a shipwreck (*naufragium*, 22), a fate which would have seemed almost certain. The initial sympathy is strengthened by the fact that the storm narrative appears to be learned from the narrator's recent encounter with Catullus, still trembling from his disaster (*trepidantis adhuc horrendaque passi / nuper*, 15-16). Juvenal recounts not only the details of the storm, but also the complete despair of its victims, therefore relaying Catullus' perception of the storm while allowing Juvenal to express his own perceptions of Catullus' experiences and reactions. As in the opening section, Juvenal begins the description with utter solemnity: by focusing on the hopelessness of the situation rather than his own joy, he stimulates pity in his audience for the doomed sailors.

However, any pity for Catullus and his shipmates is subsequently undermined by the hyperbole that follows. While Juvenal exaggerates the severity of the storm with *omnia* (22) and *tam grauius* (23), the statement which throws the entire scene over the top is that this all happens *si quando poetica surgit / tempestas* (23-24);<sup>18</sup> the storm was so bad that it was just like those famous tempests of epic poetry, which are worse than ever happens in real life. This might have been something that Catullus had said during his original encounter with the narrator to bring out the violence of the event. Whether this is a reiteration of Catullus' account or a sceptical observation made by Juvenal himself, the comparison of this poetic storm to its own literary *topos* creates a humorous

---

<sup>18</sup> The emphatic position of *tempestas* at the end of the sentence and the beginning of the line brings out the satirical force of the phrase, drawing attention to the scene's play on the literary *topos*.

reference to its own poetic tradition, while simultaneously expressing cynical hyperbole, essentially referring to the entire storm narrative as fiction.<sup>19</sup> Indeed, the phrase (23-24) seems too hackneyed to attribute to the poet in earnest, but its inclusion in the narrative might suggest something of Juvenal's attitude towards Catullus, who might use such a mawkish phrase.<sup>20</sup> Most scholars see at least a touch of sarcasm in this reference, indicating the exaggeration of the storm narrative, and thus at least a slight touch of irony in Juvenal's perception of Catullus' character.<sup>21</sup> More importantly, this aside draws the reader away from the apparently genuine description of the disaster and its victims, and again forces the reader to question whether the scene is entirely sincere. The reference to the *poetica tempestas* functions similarly to the reference to Hispulla in the opening scene (11), questioning what initially appears to be genuine emotion on the part of the narrator.

Juvenal then begins to direct the reader back into the narrative: *genus ecce aliud discriminis audi / et miserere iterum* (24-25). However, he fails to give the reader any details to look upon or listen to, since he once again pulls back from the details of the storm, jerking the reader's attention to another cynical aside, even longer – and thus more disruptive – than the first interjection. By interrupting the narrative in this way, Juvenal

---

<sup>19</sup> Duff (1970), *ad loc.*, first suggests Juvenal's scepticism concerning Catullus' account. See also Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*, and Smith (1989), 291.

<sup>20</sup> Helmbold (1956), 19, notes that this particular phrase seems especially out of place, and attributes it to Juvenal's "interpolator", since "Juvenal at his worst does not write in this way." While this is a possibility, it is equally possible that the phrase is purposefully affected to mimic - and mock - Catullus, in order to diminish the urgency of the storm and to comment on Catullus to some degree. I think it completely possible that this is authentic, and no other scholar argues for corruption here.

<sup>21</sup> At the least, see Ramage (1978), 226; at the other extreme, see Smith (1989), 287.

distances the reader from the severity of the crisis and makes the narrator's concern for those involved seem questionable. Although the storm is terrible, Juvenal says, such events are common enough to be seen in votive tablets to Isis (25-28).<sup>22</sup> Juvenal emphasizes the banality of the scene not only by pointing out that it is *cognita multis* (26) but also by rhetorically asking *pictores quis nescit ab Iside pasci?* (28).<sup>23</sup> the scene is so commonplace that it should not come as a surprise. Furthermore, these votive tablets are dedicated by those saved from such horrific disasters, so there is a strong implication that people do survive these storms. This sarcastic remark is followed by the acknowledgement that this very thing happened to Juvenal's supposed friend, *nostro ... Catullo* (29). Since *amici* in line 16, the reader has been waiting for further characterization of the narrator's friend, making this short reference vital in determining Catullus' role in the poem. In bracketing *similis fortuna*, this identification ties Catullus immediately to Juvenal's recent undermining of the storm. The implication is that Catullus, although we know nothing about him, cannot really be the object of any genuine sympathy from Juvenal, since the narrator has just undercut his friend's crisis by noting its banal exaggeration. Again, Juvenal begins the narrative only to subvert the initial mood with an aside, which briefly adds to the characterization of Catullus, who again is promptly abandoned, but about whom the reader already has several reservations.

---

<sup>22</sup> The emphatic position of *plurima*, 28, attests to their ubiquity.

<sup>23</sup> Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*, suggests sarcasm in Juvenal's reference to Isis, given her Eastern provenance and her being worshipped by Domitian. Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*, also notes that a prominent episode of Isis' myth is her role in the journey to recover the dismembered body-parts of Osiris; this may foreshadow the references to the eunuch beaver and the dismemberment of the mast.

## Section 2b: Lines 30-36

After these interruptions, Juvenal finally returns to the storm scene, but trite exaggeration and a halting narrative suggest to the reader that this particular storm is not as sincere as others in the literary tradition. Once again, Juvenal briefly describes the elements of a storm typically found in the literary *topos*; the rough seas are emphasized (*fluctu*, 30, and *euertentibus undis*, 31), as is their effect on the ship (*iam / alternum ... latus*, 30-31).<sup>24</sup> In addition to taking on water, Juvenal dwells on their precarious position by bringing out the frailty (*arboris incertae*, 32) of the rocking vessel. Alongside these, Juvenal reiterates the hopelessness of the sailors in the crisis, being underlined in the word order by the bracketing of the sailors' last hope, *prudentia cani / rectoris*, by *nullam ... / ... opem* (32-33).<sup>25</sup> Thus Juvenal plunges back into the seemingly horrific - but already mock-epic - disaster, if only for a few lines.

Both the details of the storm and the reactions to it form two successive *cum* clauses, leading directly into Catullus' act of jettison and the simile which follows. At this time, Catullus *decidere iactu / coepit cum uentis* (33-34);<sup>26</sup> using "the technical term

---

<sup>24</sup> The spondaic rhythm and recurring 'u' sounds in lines 30-34 might emulate the howling winds which accompany such harsh seas, or might merely contribute to the severe atmosphere of the gloomy scene.

<sup>25</sup> Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*, notes epic elements in these lines, adding to the mock-epic tone of the scene. The *rector*, or helmsman, would presumably be the one to turn to in a crisis, especially given the authority implied by the word's relation to *rego*, *regere* (to guide, to command); the wisdom required of his position is supposedly increased by his old age implied by *cani* (32), given emphatic position at the end of the line.

<sup>26</sup> Although Catullus is not named, he is clearly the one 'saving the day', picking up *nostro ... Catullo* (29) as the subject of *coepit*, following the *cum* clauses of 30-33.

for a bankrupt compounding with his creditors for a partial payment,”<sup>27</sup> Juvenal suggests that Catullus’ first reaction in a crisis is to use his skill in negotiation, attempting to apply his commercial expertise to *uenti* and the raw power of nature. If the concept of the notoriously fickle winds as creditors was not absurd enough to deflate Catullus’ attempts at nobility, the juxtaposition of *decidere* and *iactu* continues the deflation of our supposed hero, as does the further classification of the jetsam. Catullus attempts to save his life by suffering the smaller loss of his luxury goods, ironically abandoning those items which he went to sea to acquire in the first place.<sup>28</sup>

In this act, Catullus emulates a beaver which bites off its testicles, which purportedly held *castoreum*, a medicinal drug, in order to escape from those hunting them for this valuable commodity.<sup>29</sup> The initial reading implies that the beaver (and thus Catullus) must make a great sacrifice to survive (*euadere*, 35). In both cases, the victims lose exotic trade commodities which they value immensely. Juvenal emphasizes the beaver’s loss, and so that of Catullus, through the position of both *eunuchum* (35) and *testiculi* (36) at the beginning of each line, underlining the pun between *castora* (34) and

---

<sup>27</sup> Juvenal means that sailors owe the winds their lives, and that Catullus is trying to pay back his debts through the barter of his luxury goods; Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*

<sup>28</sup> The irony of Catullus’ escape through the loss of his beloved luxury goods is expressed by the juxtaposition of *euadere damno* (35): to survive the predictable storm, the merchant must lose those items which initially prompted his voyage.

<sup>29</sup> See Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*; Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*; Duff (1970), *ad loc.*; Smith (1989), 292-93.

*castro*, *castrare* (to castrate).<sup>30</sup> The second-foot hiatus between *testiculi* and *adeo* (36) rhythmically mimics the metaphor's image, cutting the flow of the line and perhaps adding to the weight of this act of sacrifice.<sup>31</sup> Catullus' own role in this action is brought out by words which show the beaver's agency in this act (*se*, 34, and *ipse*, 35). The metaphor seems to praise Catullus in the near personification of the beaver in *intellegit* (36), almost turning the self-castration of the metaphor into a human decision rather than a rash act of panic. But although the metaphor may at first seem to laud Catullus' reactions, the reader's suspicions of the earnestness of the tale grow into a more satirical interpretation of the merchant's character.

The metaphor of the eunuch beaver is both problematic and facetious. There are several possible readings. Some Romans may have realized that the beaver's self-castration was just a fable;<sup>32</sup> not only did beavers not bite off their own testicles, but *castoreum*, the medicinal drug for which beavers were hunted, was actually secreted from a gland in the groins of both sexes. This inaccuracy makes the tone of *medicatum intellegit inguen* (36) rather ironical,<sup>33</sup> since the metaphor seems to imply a rationale to

---

<sup>30</sup> Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.* Tertullian, *Marc.* 1.1 makes this pun explicit. *Castor* is favoured over *fiber* here for this reason. It is perhaps significant that Juvenal, notoriously hostile to Greeks, chooses two words of Greek derivation to apply metaphorically to Catullus.

<sup>31</sup> The unique position of the hiatus, pointed out by Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*, draws attention to this metrical play on the beaver's self-castration.

<sup>32</sup> E.g. Aelian *De Natura Animalium* 6.34, but not Pliny *Naturalis Historia* 8.109; Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*; Courtney (1980), *ad loc.* The veracity of the eunuch beaver may be inconsequential, as it seems unlikely that this would matter to Juvenal, who would be eager to use such a deflating metaphor in any case.

<sup>33</sup> The irony is emphasized by alliteration.

Catullus' action, which now seems rash and illogical, following the satirical suggestions of lines 33 to 34. Indeed, as we will see, Catullus' jettisoned objects are sacrificed unsuccessfully.<sup>34</sup>

Despite the metaphor's initially favourable appearance, its satirical bite is partially drawn from several incongruities between the beaver's fabled sacrifice and those made Catullus. The beaver does lose a valuable luxury good, but it is only valuable commercially to the hunter, while much more valuable to the beaver itself for more practical purposes. Catullus' jettisoned sacrifices, on the other hand, have no value to the winds, bringing out the irrationality of *decidere iactu* (33). While the fabled beaver suffers actual physical injury, Catullus' losses are merely financial, and seem not to change him for better or for worse.<sup>35</sup> Overall, the message seems to be that in giving up these most cherished commodities, Catullus metaphorically castrates himself, becoming incomplete, lacking in his some way. Thus the metaphor ultimately reads with great contempt: Juvenal expresses the materialism of his "friend" who considers his possessions to be as valuable and important as his testicles.

### Section 2c: Lines 37-51

At this point Juvenal allows Catullus direct speech for the first and only time in the poem. Beginning with the imperative *fundite* (37), Catullus orders immediate action,

---

<sup>34</sup> See page 34.

<sup>35</sup> See page 36-37.

with slight hesitation indicated by the punctuation of the quotation by *dicebat*. The delayed position of *cuncta* has comic effect, indicating Catullus' hesitation at the prospect of losing "everything."<sup>36</sup> the word-order of this direct speech emulates the merchant's faltering. But Catullus' reaction is wholesale and, upon close investigation of the jettisoned goods, seemingly rash.<sup>37</sup> Catullus is *praecipitare uolens etiam pulcherrima* (38), including clothes and baskets which do nothing to offset the sinking ship's condition. He is acting rather than thinking - unlike the supposedly intelligent beaver.

What follows immediately is a catalogue, methodically arranged with five lines of clothing thrown overboard followed by five lines of various plates. The clothes are purple, a colour notoriously indicating ostentation, decadence and high status,<sup>38</sup> while also being *teneris quoque Maecenatibus aptam* (39), where Maecenas represents effeminate luxury.<sup>39</sup> Thus Juvenal's commendation of Catullus and his precious commodities reads as mock praise, satirizing his greed, associating him with ostentation and emasculation. Also, given the proximity to the metaphor of the eunuch beaver, this statement suggests that materialism and sexual mutilation and perversion go hand in hand, a point reinforced by the juxtaposition of *purpuream teneris* (39).<sup>40</sup> Juvenal uses

---

<sup>36</sup> Smith (1989), 293. The alliteration of *cuncta Catullus* also draws attention to the word-order.

<sup>37</sup> Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.* In hesitating, Catullus perhaps considers not the practical consequence of his action but rather their moral significance, wishing to receive praise as in lines 48-51.

<sup>38</sup> See Courtney (1980), at 1.27, and Barber (1999), 117-20.

<sup>39</sup> See Juv. 1.66; cf. Seneca *Epistulae*. 114.4; Martial 10.73.4.

<sup>40</sup> Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*; Smith (1989), 293.



sound to mimic the excessive ornamentation of the luxury goods, including the repeated *p*, *m*, and *u* sounds of lines 38-39 and the alliteration and further assonance of lines 39-42. Other clothes are *generosi graminis ipsum / infecit natura pecus* (40-41), referring to the utopian scene envisioned in Virgil's Fourth Eclogue, which identifies artificial dyes as evidence of modern corruption in opposition to a golden age.<sup>41</sup> Juvenal uses this reference ironically, pointing out that Catullus' obsessive materialism deludes him to believing that his decadent luxury goods belong to a golden age.<sup>42</sup> The clothing is described even further. Not only does the grass contribute to the colour and quality of the wool, but also the water (*egregius fons*, 41) and the air (*Baeticus ... aer*, 42). The wool is imported from exotic Baetica, famous for this natural colouring phenomenon, thus increasing the value as a trade-good.<sup>43</sup> The entire phrase seems "deliberately bombastic,"<sup>44</sup> suggesting that, in addition to disapproving of the cargo, Juvenal doubts the authenticity of the catalogue of goods, presumably learned from Catullus' original account.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Virgil *Ecl.* 4.43-45; see Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*; Courtney (1980), *ad loc.* On the Virgilian passage, see Irwin (1989).

<sup>42</sup> The verb *inficio*, *inficere* can mean "to dye", but also may imply the more sinister sense of "to stain;" it is where we get the English word "infect." It seems unlikely that such an ambiguous word would be used for a purely utopian image.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Martial 14.133, 9.61.3-4, 8.28.6, 12.98.2; Pliny *NH* 8.191.

<sup>44</sup> Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*

<sup>45</sup> Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*

The second half of the catalogue of jetsam presents a diverse collection of tableware, from Roman *lances* (43), a Greek *cratera* (44), foreign baskets (*bascaudas*, 46),<sup>46</sup> a thousand plates (*mille escaria*, 46) and engraved goblets (*multum / caelati*, 46-47). The *crater* specifically draws attention as *dignum sitiante Pholo uel coniuge Fusci* (45). Juvenal's mythological reference to the famous centaur comically builds the mock-epic tone, with the reference to some notoriously bibulous woman bathetically undercutting the severity of the whole scene further; both the centaur and Fuscus' wife suggest immorality in their barbaric lack of self-restraint.<sup>47</sup> Furthermore, the engraved goblets are given famous ownership (47), which adds both value and negative moral associations. This reference associates the current owner, Catullus, with Philip the Second, the historical owner whose identification as *callidus emptor Olynthi* (47) emphasizes the king's use of bribery and trickery along with his reputation as a heavy drinker.<sup>48</sup> If both men are attracted to such objects, perhaps their values may not be so different. In fact, whenever a luxury item is associated with a particular celebrity, Juvenal links materialism with moral transgression, and thus creates indirect characterization of Catullus through the implied criticism of his acquisitiveness.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Although Mayor (1888), *ad loc.*, and others believe these to be British, relying on Martial 14.99, the exotic value of the good lies in the obscurity of the word.

<sup>47</sup> When mentioning these goods, Larmour (2005), 150-51 surprisingly omits much discussion of the threat which excessive inebriation has to the Roman values which maintain codes of masculinity.

<sup>48</sup> Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*; Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*

<sup>49</sup> Larmour (2005), 150.

This passage begins with the initial stress that *ille nec ... dubitabat mittere* (43) these extremely valuable dishes. This appears to be a compliment, stressing the selflessness of Catullus in jettisoning that which he covets so dearly, and anticipating the praise of 48-51. However, the implicit suggestion is that Catullus did not even consider whether his sacrificed baskets would be of any help in their situation. Catullus acts quickly and without thought, irrationally attempting to bribe the winds with material goods, referring back to 33-34. He acts through panic rather than reason, and is accordingly characterized as ridiculous.

The mock compliments of Catullus continue with the first completely explicit moral satire in the poem (48-51), contrasting the merchant's actions to those customary in the satirist's contemporary context. This highly rhetorical passage appears to praise Catullus as different from those identified by the interrogative *quis ... alius* (48). Here, *nunc* refers back to the naturally dyed sheep of Virgil's golden age, *argento* to the silver dishes (*argentum*, 43), and *rebus* to the narrator's own wealth (*res ... domi*, 10), urging the reader to consider the phrase in light of the entire context of the poem. However, the position of *audet* contributes to the somewhat back-handed nature of this compliment, leading into the cryptic sentence which follows.<sup>50</sup> The irony of lines 50-51 is that Catullus is literally one of those who *propter patrimonia uiuunt* (51), at least in his own eyes, due to his attempted bartering with the winds;<sup>51</sup> the merchant thinks his survival is

---

<sup>50</sup> Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*; Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*

<sup>51</sup> Lines 50-51 are doubted by Clausen (1992) and Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*, although the latter's suggestion that *quidam* offers a "ridiculous anti-climax" is helpful in reading these lines along with 48-49. On the other hand, Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*, supports at least the possibility of their authenticity.

due to his wealth, but in fact he is consumed by greed that his life is devoted to making fortunes. Given Catullus' characterization up to this point as materialistic and illogical, the reader must conclude that Catullus is actually included in the class of *uitio caeci* (51), that vice specifically being *auaritia*.<sup>52</sup> The phrase also looks forward to the latter half of the poem: although *patrimonia* (50, 51) refers to a "fortune" in general, the repetition of the word emphasizes the importance of inheritance as a means of the transmission of wealth in the Roman world.<sup>53</sup> As well, this anticipates the last part of the poem which critiques those whose lives are literally devoted to acquiring full inheritances, since being a *captator* is their career; legacy-hunters exhibit a greed which, although considerably greater in extent, is still the same vice.

## Section 2d: Lines 52-61

After sacrificing his prized luxury goods, Catullus casts overboard *rerum utilium pars maxima* (52). There is heavy irony in this phrase. These "useful" items are presumably in addition to the luxury goods,<sup>54</sup> which are thus by implication *inutiles*: Catullus' commodities are "useless" in the practical world, and even as jetsam they serve no purpose. So Catullus jettisons the *res utiles* which are useful in every day life and

---

<sup>52</sup> Duff (1970), *ad loc.*

<sup>53</sup> For more on Juvenal's treatment of legacy-hunting, see chapter 4.

<sup>54</sup> Duff (1970), *ad loc.*, mentions the possibility that this could sarcastically refer to the luxury items listed above, but favours the interpretation that it refers to items which are actually of use ("food and stores"), as do Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*, Ramage (1978), 229, and Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*; *contra* Smith (1989), 293-94.

hopefully useful as jetsam for creating buoyancy (at least more so than baskets and clothing).<sup>55</sup> However, even the loss of the *res utiles* is in vain, as *nec / damna leuant* (52-53). There is a contemptuous tone in this last clause, in that the useful items are, in effect, completely *useless*. There is, then, a play on *utilium* which adds a further satirical layer to the scene. Juvenal is relishing the self-induced predicament of his “friend,” in which he is exhibiting his complete foolishness and ineptitude: Catullus can’t even make useful items useful. The description of Catullus’ desperate and hopeless measures casts him as the primary agent in this self-inflicted disaster, acting in a senseless panic by hurling overboard his own beloved luxury goods, as well as almost anything else, all in vain. It seems clear that Juvenal recounts this moment not without a certain *schadenfreude*.

Juvenal indicates the arrival of the climax of the storm with *aduersis urgentibus* (53), *angustum* (55) and *discriminis ultima* (55), which, in their word order, bracket the action which appears to save the lives of the sailors. In the utmost of dire straits, Catullus takes the extreme action of cutting down the mast with an axe. This sense for *ferrum*, confirmed by *securae* at 61, seems deliberate: axes were the customary instrument for the sacrifice of large victims, like the lambs and calf initially offered by Juvenal, as well as most of the victims offered by the *captatores* in the final section of the poem. In cutting down the mast, Catullus is clearly attempting some kind of propitiatory sacrifice, similar to his catalogue of jettisoned luxury items. Juvenal, in his mocking contempt, will go on to see this as a perversion.

---

<sup>55</sup> This remark thus mockingly contrasts the catalogue of jettisoned luxury goods with those more commonly, and practically, thrown overboard in literary storms. For a detailed comparison, see chapter 3.

Juvenal links the severing of the mast from the ship, the ultimate action during the apex of the storm, with the sexual mutilation already associated with Catullus. Just prior to the act, Juvenal refers to the dangers of the crisis by the repetition of *damna*, reminding the reader of the humiliating metaphor of the eunuch beaver (*damno / testiculi*, 35-36). Building on this verbal linkage, the act of cutting down the mast completes the humiliating sexual castration of the entire voyage: in order to save the ship, Catullus must completely neuter the vessel of its primary (and phallic) instrument of propulsion.<sup>56</sup> Juvenal notes this ultimate irony in escaping the *discriminis ultima* (55):<sup>57</sup> *praesidia adferimus nauem factura minorem* (56). This ironic statement builds on the paradox inherent in *rerum utilium* at 52, and inspires the heavy irony of the following lines (57-61), which sum up Juvenal's attitude to naval commerce and to those who are foolish enough to attempt it. At the very apex of the storm, Juvenal strengthens the association between one such individual - Catullus, intent on material gain through the importing of effeminate luxury commodities - on one hand, and sexual violation and violence on the other.

Juvenal gives the command *i nunc et uentis animam committe dolato / confisus ligno* (57-58); the irony here is obvious, as these winds often play a large and notoriously

---

<sup>56</sup> Several scholars have made further suggestions along these lines. Courtney (1980) and Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*, note the irony between *summitto* (54), the common term for the lowering of a mast, and the surprising presence of the axe. Smith (1989), 293-94, argues that *summitto* also suggests sexual violence, as in other uses of the word by Juvenal at 1.36, 6.207 and 6.334. *Reccidit* (54) might also further the violence of the cutting of the mast, playing on its homophone, the other *recido*, "to cut off."

<sup>57</sup> This phrase furthers the emphasis that this is the climax of the storm narrative, with the height of the disaster as the culmination of *aliud discriminis* (24) near the beginning of the account.

untrustworthy role in such literary storms. Similarly, a carved plank is not to be relied upon, with the position of *a morte* (58) lurking closely below *animam* of the line before. The superlative *latissima* (59) brings out the point that sailors are *digitis a morte remotus / quattuor aut septem ... taedae* (58-59). There is a clear critique that sea-travel is incredibly dangerous, and that those who risk it - and specifically Catullus - are utterly stupid for doing so. While this statement seems a general address to Juvenal's readers, perhaps as a parenthetical word to the wise, the *mox* of line 60 directs the command towards Catullus. The audience learns that Catullus, following Juvenal's advice, will bring an axe as part of the necessary equipment when he embarks on a similar voyage "soon," with *mox* taking the emphatic position at the beginning of this pithy couplet.<sup>58</sup> Delayed until the very end of the phrase, *securae* (61) are to be included amongst the *res utiles*; Juvenal means that axes will be of use because these storms are commonplace at sea, and are to be expected. More importantly, Catullus, having actually gone through this terrible disaster, has not learned his lesson. He is, rather, a complete fool governed by a greed which not only brings disaster upon himself but prevents him from realising that sea-faring is a perilous enterprise. Juvenal assumes that Catullus will attempt naval commerce again "soon," and will inevitably encounter another storm as terrible, and yet just as predictable, where the requisite axes will be of use. In such a reading, it seems impossible to view the relationship between Juvenal and Catullus as one of friendship. Juvenal contemptuously depicts Catullus as completely blinded by greed, his materialism

---

<sup>58</sup> Ferguson (1979), 294; *contra* Ramage (1978), 229, who unconvincingly suggests that this is "directed at a person *like* Catullus rather than at him directly." Since Catullus is only known to us as a merchant involved in naval commerce, he is inevitably the target of this criticism.

inspiring his own idiocy and inciting the dangers to his own life, even without the material payoff of a successful voyage. The characterization of Catullus is surely critical.

### Section 2e: Lines 62-70

Juvenal makes a sudden shift from the climax of the storm to its calm aftermath. Many scholars have noted the slowing of narrative pace in this section, where Juvenal commits six full lines to convey the abrupt serenity of the scene.<sup>59</sup> The extensive account of this part of the voyage is surely in mocking emulation of the relieved and fatuously effusive Catullus.<sup>60</sup> The clichés of the passage certainly convey hyperbolic mockery; as the terror of the storm resembles a *poetica ... / tempestas* (23-24), the calm of the storm is equally exaggerated with mock-epic description. The narrative purposefully omits any diminuendo of the ferocity of the wind and waves; Juvenal offers only the merest suggestion that the removal of the ship's mast achieves the desired result, in the brief reference to the act as *praesidia* (56). By this omission, Juvenal undercuts Catullus' heroic role, choosing rather to emphasize the fickleness of the sea as the primary cause of the safety of the crew.

Indeed, there is a stark contrast between the two faces of the sea: one is vicious and terrifying, the other peaceful, safe, and even kind. Juvenal emphasizes the temporal contrast by repeating *postquam* three times in the space of three lines (62-64), adding

---

<sup>59</sup> Ramage (1978), 229-30; Smith (1989), 294; Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*

<sup>60</sup> Ramage (1978), 230.



clause after brief clause to contribute to the scene's exaggeration.<sup>61</sup> Two of the instances of *postquam* come at the beginning and end of line 62, clearly distinguishing the abrupt change of scene in the storm narrative, and reminding the reader of all the dangers the greedy Catullus foolishly encountered earlier. This same sea, juxtaposed at the very beginning of the storm narrative with *casus* (17), now lies flat (62), prostrating itself before the greater powers which now intervene. For one, *fatum* (63) is now *ualentius* (63), with the comparative emphasising the fickleness of the *euro / et pelago* (63-64) which have pacified their turbulent violence. Another great cosmic force, the Parcae, favourably spin *meliora benigna / pensa manu* (64-65). The description of these *hilaes et staminis albi / lanificae* (65-66) not only suggests happiness and good luck for Catullus and his shipmates,<sup>62</sup> but also contrasts with the luxuriously dyed wool jettisoned during the storm. This perhaps suggests that Catullus ought to value the life-threads spun by the Parcae over his beloved opulent clothing. The presence of both fate and the Parcae clearly does nothing to illuminate Juvenal's own philosophical beliefs; rather, the accumulation of all these clichéd supernatural powers contributes to the mock-epic hyperbole of the miraculous calm following the storm.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Ramage (1978), 230 n. 21, aptly notes how the sound and meter of lines 62-63, with "soft consonants (*m, n, l, r*) and open vowels (*o, a, u*)," reflect the calm and contrast the violent sounds in line 61, such as "harsh consonants... and clipped vowels (especially *e*)." The diction throughout the passage results in "an impression of smoothness, serenity, and relief."

<sup>62</sup> Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*

<sup>63</sup> Smith (1989), 294.

Following the sudden benevolence of sea, fate, and the Parcae, the wind also has a change of heart, offering *modica nec multum fortior aura* (66), with the heavy stress on the gentle moderation of the wind occupying most of the line. Being *miserabilis* (67), the ship seems unlikely to survive any fiercer weather. After the mutilation of her mainsail, the ship sails *inopi ... arte* (67), relying on the power of the jib (*uelo prora suo*, 69).<sup>64</sup> Juvenal seems to imply some surprised contempt in his parenthetical mention that this extra sail happened to survive the storm (*quod superauerat unum*, 68). Even more satirical is the sailors' use of *uestibus extentis* (68) as makeshift sails; clothes, apparently useless as jettison, actually do serve some practical purpose onboard following the inevitable storm, and are thus similar to the essential axes of 61. By now the storm winds have finally relented (*austriis*, 69, not the gentler *aura* at 66). The return of the sun, hidden by *nube una* (19) at the very beginning of the storm narrative, causes the sailors to realize that they may indeed live after all.<sup>65</sup>

## Section 2f: Lines 70-82

The description of the ship's arrival at Ostia contributes to the argument that the bloated and clichéd descriptions of relief were originally those of Catullus. Juvenal creates a parallel between the sailors and the Trojan survivors in the *Aeneid*, echoing the

---

<sup>64</sup> It is likely that *inopi... arte* (67) creates a further link between the economic damages suffered by Catullus and the physical damage incurred by the ship, since *inops* can mean both “deficient” and “poor.” The speed implied in *cucurrit* (67) is ironical.

<sup>65</sup> Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*; Ramage (1978), 230.

comparison likely made by Catullus himself. Ramage argues that like Aeneas, Catullus and his happy crew finally arrive in Italy, having been helped by fate (64-66) after surviving many dangerous adventures.<sup>66</sup> While Ramage merely sees this as an honest description of the sailors' relief and good fortune, the parallel between Catullus and Aeneas, the leaders of their respective ships, is loaded with irony. While Aeneas is the founder of the Roman race, honour-bound to his divinely ordained duty, Catullus is a lowly merchant whose greed has caused the metaphorical castration of himself and of his ship. There is no compatibility between these two 'heroes,' and the discord created in the parallel furthers the characterization of Catullus as greedy and base, and completely undeserving of praise. Moreover, the inappropriateness of this comparison suggests its origins in Catullus. There is much more satirical impact in the fact that in likening himself to the great hero Aeneas, Catullus appears to the reader as extremely vain. Catullus is surely nothing like Aeneas, although he seems to be making this suggestion. In addition, he comes across as incredibly stupid, blinded by greed: Catullus inappropriately likens his own difficulties to those of the fate-driven Aeneas (*fato profugus*, *Aen.* 1.2), unable to see that it is his greed which has led to the disaster.

The jarring of registers contributes to both the mock-epic tone and to the reader's impression of Catullus as a ridiculous fool.<sup>67</sup> Mount Alba appears on the horizon, a sight as happy to Catullus and his comrades as it was to Iulus (*gratus Iulo*, 70); the happiness

---

<sup>66</sup> Ramage (1978), 230-31.

<sup>67</sup> Littlewood (2007), 405-6.

of the mythical Trojans (*laetis* and *mirabile*, 73) extends to the relief of the sailors. However, there is a general mock-epic subversion of the initial dignity by the image of the white sow, known especially from *Aeneid* 8.81-85, and linked etymologically with Mount Alba. However, the emphatic position of the lowly words *scrofa* and *sumen* at either end of line 73 provides bathos which undercuts the lofty, epic tone in the references to Ascanius, Lavinia, and the Trojans (70-74).<sup>68</sup> The scene is deflated by the comic juxtaposition of *clara mamillis* (74), as teats are not usually so highly distinguished, and by the phrase *numquam uisis* (74), lowering the epic myth to the level of a sailor's exaggerated yarn.<sup>69</sup> Whether such diction is supposed to be read as satirical commentary on Juvenal's part or as Catullus' inept and ludicrously inappropriate original narrative, the satire is directed much more against the greedy and idiotic merchant than against the *Aeneid* or the epic genre itself. Furthermore, it seems almost blasphemous for a contemporary materialistic consumer to compare himself with Aeneas, Iulus and Rome's proto-history, further tainting the reader's appreciation of Catullus' character.

The entry into Ostia contains a similar tone of cynicism in Juvenal's version of Catullus' original account. The debilitated ship limps into the harbour *tandem* (75), playing on the reader's reaction to the slow pace of the section.<sup>70</sup> The harbour is

---

<sup>68</sup> Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*, observes the reference to Virgil's *mirabile monstrum* (*Aen.* 8.81), as well as the substitution of *sumen* for *sus* (8.83).

<sup>69</sup> Smith (1989), 294-95, notes the double-meaning of *numquam uisis* as both "unseen" and "figments of the imagination;" this seems to anticipate the *garrula ... pericula* (82) told by the sailors. See also Littlewood (2007), 406.

<sup>70</sup> This section has also been criticized by many for its irrelevance and long-windedness; see page 36.

described in extensive detail, continuing the matching of the narrative pace with that of the boat. Two great piers (*moles*, 75) come out from the mainland towards the breakwater and the lighthouse (*Tyrrhenamque pharon*, 76).<sup>71</sup> These appear to Catullus to be *bracchia* (76) which embrace the weary sailors and their injured ship.<sup>72</sup> The comfort implied in this rather strange image likely draws its origins from Catullus' narrative, reflecting the natural, exaggerated reaction of survivors coming into safe port.<sup>73</sup> The following aside (78-79) continues this hyperbole of relief, while also reminding us of Catullus' preference of manufactured luxury items to the simple life in harmony with nature. Indeed, it is no surprise that Catullus' ultimate periphrasis for safety is that even a *Baiana... cumbae* (80), a small pleasure craft from the centre of luxury, Hellenism, and effeminacy in Italy, can safely traverse the "lagoon" (*stagna*, 81).<sup>74</sup>

The end of the storm narrative recalls, briefly, the losses of the journey. While the mutilated ship has been reduced to being *trunca* (79), the sailors shave their heads (*uertice raso*, 81) according to vows made at the height of the storm.<sup>75</sup> The sacrifice of hair completes the various levels of sacrifices made by all those involved in the

---

<sup>71</sup> Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*, includes a helpful diagram; the appellation of the lighthouse, in reference to that of Alexandria, underlined with the repetition of *r* (76), adds renown and dignity to the setting.

<sup>72</sup> The emphasis placed on the active movement of the twin piers in *porrectaque* (76), *occurrunt* (77) and *relincunt* (77) heightens the welcoming nature of the harbour.

<sup>73</sup> Ramage (1978), 230 this passage strengthens the earlier suggestion that much of this section derives from Catullus' original account of the storm.

<sup>74</sup> Littlewood (2007), 406, emphasizes the reference to Satire Eleven, in which Baiae is the luxurious man's ultimate destination.

<sup>75</sup> Duff (1980), *ad loc.*; Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*; Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*

commercial sea-voyage, and thus serves to round out Juvenal's message about the dangers and cost of greed. The main stress, however, seems to be in what follows: the sailors who have just piously sacrificed their hair immediately head to the tavern to tell long-winded tales of their adventures (*garrula securi narrare pericula nautae*, 82). The loss of their hair now seems much less of an act of piety than a costume identifying of those who have such *garrula pericula* to tell, an indicator of sailors turned narrators.<sup>76</sup> This is not just a parody of the *topos* of the poetic storm, but also a mockery of those who craft them. And so in this section Juvenal reinforces the reader's understanding of Catullus as greedy, arrogant and stupid by mimicking the merchant's account of his safe arrival, with its longwinded hyperbole and its inappropriate comparisons to heroic mythologies.

### Section 3: Lines 83-92

Having rounded off the storm narrative with this cynical jibe at the entire *topos* of the *poetica tempestas*, Juvenal returns to the opening sacrifice scene. The reader is alerted to this change in setting by the imperative phrase *ite ... pueri* (83), introducing the slaves accompanying the narrator (*iam sequar*, 86) during his sacrificial procession.<sup>77</sup> *Igitur* (83) eases the transition by reinforcing the causal relationship within the framework of the

---

<sup>76</sup> Baldness attracted attention by making one corporally distinguishable. There were also associations with slavery; cf. Petron. *Sat.* 103.

<sup>77</sup> The address to these previously unmentioned *pueri* seems quite abrupt, but perhaps this points to the ubiquity of slaves on such occasions.

poem between Catullus' adventure and the narrator's joyous sacrifices which are being recounted to Corvinus. The return to the initial scene is crucial to resolving Juvenal's ambiguous attitude towards Catullus.

Having performed the crucial public sacrifices (*sacro, quod praestat, rite peracto*, 86), Juvenal brings his religious celebrations home in another catalogue of private rituals. Following the preparations for the public sacrifice - the decoration of shrines and altars, and the placing of sacred grains on the sacrificial knife - Juvenal returns home (*inde domum repetam*, 87), where he placates private deities, burns incense, and decorates his house with flowers, branches and lanterns (87-92). The main point here is that these sacrifices are being offered both publicly and now privately.<sup>78</sup> In doing so, Juvenal is supposedly showing - or showing off - to Corvinus his true friendship with Catullus. However, as Juvenal himself acknowledges (93), the display of friendship fails to convince.<sup>79</sup>

Despite the apparent sincerity of the narrator's offerings,<sup>80</sup> Juvenal has distanced himself from Catullus by the preceding characterization of his "friend." The array of religious paraphernalia - garlands on shrines, grain on sacred knives, turf altars, wax figurines, household gods, incense and flowers, doorways decorated with branches and festive lamps - form yet another catalogue of sacrifices. This long list builds detail upon

---

<sup>78</sup> Ramage (1978), 231; note the emphasis in *nostrum* and *paternis* applied to the divinities (89).

<sup>79</sup> See below, pages 46-48; Smith (1989), 295.

<sup>80</sup> Ramage (1978), 231, stresses that "there is no hint of satire in either religious scene."

detail until their accumulation reads more like a parody of religious actions, especially when contrasted with Catullus; it is highly unlikely that Juvenal would go to such great lengths for someone whom he holds in such low esteem and whom he has ridiculed in the first half of the poem. The section begins with *ite* (83), reminding the reader of *i nunc* (57) and of Juvenal's attitude to the sea-faring merchant. The impression of Juvenal's ironic generosity is perhaps aided by minute details outlining the *graciles ... coronas* placed on the figurines coated with *fragili ... cera* (87-88), or in the delicately described *mollis ... focos glebamque uirentem* (85), since the idyllic serenity of the scene clashes with Juvenal's animosity towards Catullus. There is also plenty of hyperbole in *omnis uiolae ... colores* (90), and *cuncta nitent* (91), and the scene is so natural that the door itself grows branches (*longos erexit ianua ramos*, 91). Within the details of this list, there seems an ironic exaggeration of the idyllic atmosphere which many scholars associate with this scene.<sup>81</sup> It is unlikely that the satirist would ever make such happy offerings in earnest, and impossible that they would be associated with a character so possessed by greed as Catullus.

What is even more problematic is that the scene contains little emotion regarding Catullus, save the traces of joy implied in *nitentia* (88) and *cuncta nitent* (91),<sup>82</sup> and almost no connection with his disaster, save that initial *igitur* (83). For example, it seems

---

<sup>81</sup> Ramage (1978), 231; Littlewood (2007), 406-7.

<sup>82</sup> The predominantly dactylic meter in lines 87-88 adds a speedy enthusiasm to the glimmering offerings; Ramage (1978), 231.



unclear why Juvenal says *nostrum placabo Iovem Laribusque paternis* (89).<sup>83</sup> What do his own private deities have to do with Catullus or their friendship? These offerings at private shrines do more to anticipate the private sacrifices made by legacy-hunters (113-14) than to prove the narrator's unlikely friendship with the greedy Catullus.<sup>84</sup> These pious actions of a dutiful friend come off as histrionic, since they do not appear to be motivated by any relief or joy at Catullus' safe return. Due to the narrator's contempt for Catullus, Juvenal's sacrifices cannot be taken seriously.

But beyond serving as hyperbolic parodies of a devoted friend's actions, the public and private offerings allow Juvenal to contrast his own world with that of Catullus. First of all, he orders his slaves to be *linguis animisque fauentes* (83), unlike Catullus' garrulous accomplices in the line before, not to mention the effusive merchant himself. Also, just as the artificial harbour warmly extended its arms to welcome Catullus in an embrace, the narrator's gate is also personified, as it *longos erexit ... ramos* (91) to welcome him home. Instead of a man-made harbour safe for skiffs from luxurious Baiae, the transition into Juvenal's private world is marked by his door which becomes a natural living creature.<sup>85</sup> Thus in addition to the dissonance between the narrator's actions and his attitude towards Catullus, Juvenal's private offerings distance him from his greedy merchant friend. As his friendship with Catullus is quite unconvincing, it is not surprising

---

<sup>83</sup> The appellation of these gods as *paternis* implies that these are Juvenal's own private household gods, rather than the *Lares permarini*, protectors of sea-travellers.

<sup>84</sup> Of course, these offerings also sustain the theme of sacrifice which recurs throughout the poem.

<sup>85</sup> Littlewood (2007), 406-7.

that Juvenal must immediately refute the implied charges that he is engaged in *captatio*, leaving the conclusion that his private sacrifices are included to intensify the irony of Juvenal's joy at Catullus' survival.

#### Section 4a: Lines 93-98

Juvenal now confirms the lack of credibility of his sacrifices; since he is clearly not Catullus' friend, the likeliest motivation behind his actions is that he is attempting *captatio*.<sup>86</sup> Once again, Juvenal stresses the connection between Catullus' return and his sacrifices (*pro cuius reditu tot pono altaria*, 94), but refutes the charge of legacy-hunting since Catullus *paruos / tres habet heredes* (94-95). Word order builds the tension of this unspoken charge; the sentence begins with *neu suspecta* (93), piquing the reader's suspicions that the offerings are not in earnest, and concludes with the explanation, delayed by enjambment and placed at the very end of the sentence, that Catullus *tres habet heredes* (95); this is why the sacrifices cannot be aimed at *captatio*.

The unveiling of Catullus' heirs is the pivotal moment of transition into the satirical diatribe against legacy-hunters, simultaneously reminding the reader of the relationships between the satirist, his addressee, and the merchant. The juxtaposition of *Coruine*, *Catullus* in 93 forces the reader to ponder why Corvinus would care about Juvenal's friend. The transition is motivated by the contrast between Juvenal's sacrifices and the ostentatious ones offered by the legacy-hunters. And so while the narrator's *tot ... altaria* and Catullus' *paruos / ... heredes* (94-95) are placed side-by-side, reminding the

---

<sup>86</sup> While this might not be an obvious conclusion, it certainly would be a legacy-hunter's first reaction.

reader of the *parua... simulacra* with their *graciles ... coronas* (87-88), these would appear to Corvinus to be cause for suspicion - hence Juvenal's anticipation of the charge of *captatio*. This connects the poem's addressee with *captatio*, and contributes to the argument that Corvinus is likely a legacy-hunter, since his first reaction, as suggested by Juvenal, is to suspect ulterior motives and identify competitors.<sup>87</sup> This relates Juvenal's two main characters, linking the two halves of the poem by comparing two representatives of greed.

While the revelation of Catullus' heirs eliminates the possibility of legacy-hunting, Juvenal does not confirm his true friendship with Catullus by rejecting the possibility of his hostility towards his supposed 'friend.' Given the mock praise of Catullus earlier in the poem (48-51), we might expect more of a connection between the offerings and their beneficiary, or an explanation of how these are actions of a dutiful friend. But instead, Catullus is completely debased, being referred to as an *amico / tam sterili* (96-97). This is figurative sterility from the perspective of the *captator*. While legacy-hunters normally target those who are physically *sterilis*, Catullus is a sterile target for *captatio*, paradoxically due to his fertility.<sup>88</sup> Juvenal emphasizes the negative with the hyperbolic *uerum haec nimia est inpena* (97), and *nulla umquam* (98), which are ironically juxtaposed with *pro patre*; a father of three children would otherwise be praised for his contributions to the state, and enjoy the privileges of the *ius trium*

---

<sup>87</sup> The sound in line 93 may suggest an accusatory tone, as Juvenal uses *s*, *t*, and *c* sounds in a spondaic rhythm to draw out the new direction of his satirical attack towards the likes of Corvinus.

<sup>88</sup> Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*; Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*

*liberorum*.<sup>89</sup> The suggestion of sterility recalls the humiliating connection between Catullus and castration, initiated by the metaphor of the eunuch beaver (34-36) and the dismemberment of the ship's mast (53-56). Such degradation of Catullus continues; he is unworthy of a sick, dying chicken (95-96), and would not even be honoured with a quail (97-98).<sup>90</sup> The "negative, back-handed pledge of loyalty to his friend" confirms Juvenal's cynical attitude towards Catullus and his greed, as alluded to throughout the poem.<sup>91</sup> Juvenal may refute the possibility that he is intending *captatio*, but this is not the same thing as confirming that these sacrifices are motivated by pure friendship.

#### Section 4b: Lines 98-114

After this brief introduction to the theme of *captatio*, Juvenal gives a detailed analysis of legacy-hunters, explaining their perceptions and their tactics. The rejection of even the most pathetic of offerings for a father suggests that all sacrifices, other than those of the narrator, are selfishly motivated by the pursuit of an inheritance. While pointing broadly to the then apparent degeneration of the age,<sup>92</sup> Juvenal portrays how completely obsessed the *captatores* are in dedication to a career of greed, since they never make sacrifices for reasons other than the pursuit of an inheritance.

---

<sup>89</sup> Duff (1970), *ad loc.*; Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*

<sup>90</sup> There is some dark humour here, as Juvenal says that the sick bird is *claudentem oculos* (96), closing his eyes in death but also in anticipation of the sacrificial blow which it cannot bear to see.

<sup>91</sup> Smith (1989), 295.

<sup>92</sup> Smith (1989), 295-96.

Having clearly identified what is not a viable target of *captatio* - viz. a parent - Juvenal satirically outlines the method of the legacy-hunter through the identification of their most profitable targets. Gallitta and Pacius, both *locuples* and *orbi* (99),<sup>93</sup> become immediate prey at the slightest hint of a fever (*sentire calorem / si coepit*, 98-99), completing the three qualifications for an available, worthy, and imminent inheritance: being childless, rich, and about to die.<sup>94</sup> These, then, are the beneficiaries of the maliciously intended offerings.

Juvenal recounts the actions of the *captator*, once he has fixed on his prey. Legacy-hunters cover an entire portico with petitions (*legitime fixis uestitur tota libellis / porticus*, 100-1),<sup>95</sup> containing *uota* for the return of the health of those with such potential inheritances.<sup>96</sup> The hyperbole of the portico clothed with petitions is matched by the exaggerations of the ostentatious vows which follow. These promise a catalogue of increasingly extravagant sacrifices, the complete opposite of the *aegram / ... gallinam* (95-96) rejected above as being too much for a father. Beginning with the least excessive,

---

<sup>93</sup> The position of *locuples* and *orbi*, surrounding the names of the targets of *captatio*, emphasizes the *captator*'s concern with the viable status of their inheritances, rather than with their own identity. *Sentire calorem* (99) shows how legacy-hunters react as quickly as possible at the first sign of illness, even with the smallest chance that this might develop into something terminal.

<sup>94</sup> Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*; Champlin (1991), 90-91, identifies this final prerequisite as *senex*, but the point is that the future testator is about to die. Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*, notes how Juvenal mimics the *captator* charming his female prey in his use of the affectionate diminutive form of Galla. This role-playing continues the intermingling of poetic voices throughout the poem, just as Catullus was mimicked earlier.

<sup>95</sup> The portico is in a temple; see Courtney (1980), *ad loc.* and Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*, who specifies the temple of Aesculapius on the Isola Tiberina.

<sup>96</sup> Duff (1970), *ad loc.*; Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*; Courtney (1980), *ad loc.* The *libelli* promise sacrifices for the health of the invalid; *promittant* (101, cf. 2) and *uouebit* (115).

the list starts with the sacrifice of 100 animals (*hecatomben*, 101). Although Juvenal implies a certain scorn in this,<sup>97</sup> the satire is mainly in the inappropriate enormity of the sacrifice; while such enormous - and enormously expensive - sacrifices were not unknown to the Romans,<sup>98</sup> offering a hecatomb for the health of one individual would be completely excessive, especially when compared to the modest sacrifices made by Juvenal (1-9, 83-92). By placing the hecatombs as a second choice behind the greater and even more awful sacrifices of elephants, slaves and their own daughters, Juvenal displays the immoderate actions caused by the *captator*'s greed. The legacy-hunter follows the logic that the more ostentatious and excessive the sacrifice, the easier it will be to curry favour with the target and secure the inheritance.

The hecatombs are actually a substitute for the preferred elephants, which are discussed in a passage which has been criticized by scholars as being irrelevant and longwinded.<sup>99</sup> However, these scholars have failed to note how this passage not only develops the negative characterization of the *captatores* as consumed by greed - even more than the merchant - but also satirizes them by contrasting the corrupt present with the noble past. The passage is also instrumental in understanding the narrator's sacrifices alongside Juvenal's negative attitude to his satirical targets.

---

<sup>97</sup> The word *hecatomben*, with its Greek ending, implies Hellenistic effeminacy due to Juvenal's prejudices against the Greeks; Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.* Hecatombs appear in Homer (although these are not necessarily of 100 oxen; *Iliad* 1.315, 6.115, 23.146; *Odyssey* 1.25, 3.59); the reference to this kind of sacrifice thus continues the poem's mock-epic tone.

<sup>98</sup> Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*, identifies a few occurrences which are all made by wealthy people or groups following major political events or martial victories.

<sup>99</sup> Courtney (1980), 517, among other critics.

By including this passage in the list of sacrifices promised in the vows of the legacy-hunters, Juvenal continues his satirical analysis of the *captator*'s greedy intentions in the description of the elephants. As an instinctive consumer, the legacy-hunter views the elephants as commodities, referring to them by metonymy as *ebur* (112), their valued luxury good,<sup>100</sup> and the juxtaposition of *nec uenales elephanti* (102).<sup>101</sup> The commercial value of elephants is increased by a stress on their exotic provenance (103-4), as well as their historical fame (107-10).<sup>102</sup> In this regard, the commercial evaluation of elephants compares with that of the luxury goods sacrificed by Catullus in the storm. Just as Catullus, the merchant consumed by greed, undercut the sincerity of the epic *topos* of the poetic storm with his commercial sacrifices, so the *captator* displays his greed by stressing their commercial value.<sup>103</sup> Like Catullus, the legacy-hunters are eager to point out the great value of their offerings, to make themselves appear more favourable in the eyes of their audience.<sup>104</sup> Both merchant and legacy-hunter sacrifice for self-serving reasons. The satirical point of this passage, then, lies partially in connecting the two representatives of materialism through the greed-inspired commodification of sacrifice.

---

<sup>100</sup> It is perhaps important to note that collecting the ivory tusks requires the death of the elephant; the sacrifice of one would thus have a secondary benefit, especially for mercenary characters. This also mirrors the legacy-hunter's financial gain at the death of the testator.

<sup>101</sup> Later, the rhetorical construction and repetition of *nulla igitur mora... mora nulla* (111) with the subjunctives stress how quickly the *captatores* would slaughter elephants, if they could.

<sup>102</sup> The emphatically positioned *belua* (104) has connotations of monstrosity, implying their size alongside their foreign origins (*furua gente petita*, 104).

<sup>103</sup> Littlewood (2007), 408.

<sup>104</sup> The legacy-hunter's audience is of course his prey, while Catullus' audience is Juvenal.

A further layer of satire within Juvenal's brief survey of elephantine history relates to the theme of corruption over the course of time, contrasting the grotesque present with the heroic past. Even if they are foreign, the elephants have noble ancestors (*horum maiores*, 109) which fought in famous wars, both for and against the Romans (107-9); but now they serve only Caesar by grazing in fields which have epic associations (*arboribus Rutilis et Turni pascitur agro*, 105), and no longer have a military role.<sup>105</sup> Juvenal thus contrasts Caesar and the legacy-hunters of the present with Hannibal, Pyrrhus, and the great Roman leaders of the past (*nostris ducibus*, 108). Against the noble past, those in the present are clearly snooty, luxurious, and lazy.

This section develops the poem's satirical attack on modern sacrifices. Throughout the poem, religious offerings are manipulated for personal reasons – some more immoral than others. The *captator's* absent elephants are discussed in the same terms as sacrifices throughout the poem,<sup>106</sup> which accounts for the confusion over which sacrifices are or are not honestly intended. The absence of these elephants also recalls the imaginary sacrifice which the narrator wishes he could afford. Indeed, while Juvenal rebukes the legacy-hunter for using self-serving offerings, Juvenal must refute the same charge, implicitly made by Corvinus (93-94); the assumption seems to be that all

---

<sup>105</sup> *Caesaris armentum nulli servire paratum / priuato*, 106-7; see Courtney (1980), *ad loc.* The tone in *Caesaris* is rather critical, given Juvenal's generally negative attitude to the imperial house; following the theme of the corruption of time, the emperor is likely a depraved modern version of *nostris ducibus* (108).

<sup>106</sup> The lexical links to the various sacrifice scenes include *ducatur* (112, cf. 3), *aras* (112, cf. 7), *deis* (114, cf. 2), and *cadat* (113, cf. 98); *digna* (114, cf. 45) also falls into this list, having appeared in Catullus' catalogue of sacrificial jettison.



sacrifices are selfishly motivated. However, while the narrator's desired sacrifice may have certain questionable motives,<sup>107</sup> those made by *captatores* are a complete perversion of anything resembling a traditional religious offering for another's health, due to their exorbitance, their commercialization, and also to their ironic intention; although the legacy-hunters claim to be sacrificing for the health of their target, gaining their inheritance is, of course, predicated on the target's death. A *captator* would slaughter an elephant without delay (*nulla igitur mora... mora nulla*, 111), as the *uictima sola / tantis digna deis et captatoribus horum* (113-14). The hyperbole of this passage is met with the sardonic attack on the gods, who benefit greatly from such extravagant sacrifices on their altars; the *Lares Gallitae* might favour "their" legacy-hunters, due to the offerings made to them. These sacrifices, as both the reader and the gods know, desire not the health of the beneficiary as their goal, as the *libelli* claim, but rather the securing of the will of the *orbis* and *locuples aeger*. As in the majority of his corpus, Juvenal criticizes the corruption of the present, this time in connection with the perversions of modern sacrifice.

#### Section 4c: Lines 115-130

The end of the poem extends Juvenal's satirical diatribe against legacy-hunters further into his discussion of how greed corrupts traditional Roman religion and morality through the perversion of sacrificial offerings. While adding to the catalogue of

---

<sup>107</sup> See pages 21-22.

sacrifices, Juvenal explains that the tactics of the *captator* rely as much on the display of the gesture's expense as they do on the offerings themselves. As with the *libelli* which promise hecatombs (100-1), Pacuvius, the exemplary legacy-hunter, will promise human sacrifices (115-12). There seems to be an initial stress in *uouebit* (115), in emphatic position, and in the juxtaposed *mactare*, as both words generally refer to religious offerings. Indeed, the description of the human sacrifice reminds us of sacrifices earlier in the poem; the slaves are part of a flock (*de grege*, 116), as the lambs offered to Juno and Minerva might have been, and they are adorned with *uittas* (118) on their foreheads,<sup>108</sup> perhaps recalling even *parua coronas / accipiunt fragili simulacra nitentia cera* in 87-88. Human sacrifice here represents an abomination of traditional ritual for the sake of material gain: the *captator* will slaughter the *magna et pulcherrima quaeque / corpora* (116-17) of slaves in order to secure a legacy, perverting religion to make money.<sup>109</sup> The similarities between human and animal sacrifices are intended to be horrifying, as is the description of the victims now in the prime of youth and beauty. If the ritual slaughter of slaves was not enough to characterize him as a complete monster, Pacuvius would even sacrifice his own daughter for an inheritance! Pacuvius will lead to the altar (*altaribus*, 119, echoing *altaria*, 93) his own household Iphigenia (*illi / Iphigenia domi*, 118-19)

---

<sup>108</sup> These are placed on the heads of victims; Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*; *frontibus*, 117, links these victims also to Juvenal's young calf who *frontemque coruscat*, 6, on its way to the altar.

<sup>109</sup> Courtney's note (1980), *ad loc.*, explains both the likeliest reading and the underlying principle "that size is essential for beauty." These slaves are more valuable as commodities, and thus serve as more elaborate sacrifices.

whose nubile age (*nubilis*, 118) increases her value as a sacrificial victim.<sup>110</sup> Thus the religious diction of the passage must be read as either sarcasm on Juvenal's part or, more likely, the language used by the *captator* to emphasize the presentation of his sacrifice in order to catch the eye of his target; he is, after all, one competitor among a great many,<sup>111</sup> and, presumably, the more solemn and holy his sacrifice appears, the more likely it is to attract favour.<sup>112</sup> Pacuvius' sacrifice of his own daughter is made even more awful since he *non sperat tragicae furtiua piacula ceruae* (120); such a substitution might have a negative effect on his securing the inheritance, since a deer would obviously curry less favour.

Such a grossly disproportionate sacrifice would result in successful *captatio*. In such a victory, Pacuvius *superbus / incedet uictis riualibus* (125-26), and his haughty gloating emphasizes his complete detachment from any level of moral decency. Juvenal cynically notes how worthwhile the sacrifice of his daughter would be, matching Pacuvius' obsession with money (*quam / grande ... pretium*, 126-27) with the callous *iugulata* (127); the *captator* would show no hint of regret. If the *aeger* lets his guard down (*si concedas*, 115), he will be entrapped and duped (*inclusus carcere nassae*, 123) into believing that the offering are actually *meritum sane mirandum* (124), which

---

<sup>110</sup> The sacrifice of the legacy-hunter's own daughter is even more depraved than the practice of offering your child in marriage to the lonely rich person, one possible sexual service provided by *captatores*; see Champlin (1991), 90.

<sup>111</sup> Viz. those who cover the portico with similar petitions, 100-1; cf. *uictis riualibus*, 126.

<sup>112</sup> While the *captator*'s vow is directed to the gods, its intended audience is surely the target of *captatio*. But given the link between the gods and "their" *captatores* in 113-14, it seems likely that the gods are involved in the successful legacy-hunt.

suggests that testators are not at all intelligent.<sup>113</sup> The *captator*'s vow and its perverted offering will accomplish both their open and hidden goals; the rich invalid might return to health (*Libitinam euaserit*, 122) and rewrite her will claiming Pacuvius as the sole heir (123-25). Juvenal clearly links the sacrifice and the result (124-25): following *post meritum ... mirandum*, the juxtaposition of *omnia soli* encapsulates the legacy-hunter's ideal result, while *dabit* suggests a reciprocal gesture in the repetition from 119, where Pacuvius would sacrifice his daughter. This is a complete perversion of the religious formula of reciprocity, *do ut des*, in both the appalling human sacrifice and in the corruption of the traditional Roman system of patrilineal inheritance.<sup>114</sup>

The mention of *illi / Iphigenia domi* (118-19) begins the final section's continuation of the poem's degradation of epic characters and themes alongside the implied criticism of Pacuvius.<sup>115</sup> The sacrifice of Iphigenia by Agamemnon was seen as an impious crime against proper religion,<sup>116</sup> but at least this was considered as necessary for the Trojan war and a part of the heroic mythology preserved in tragedy and epic. But if Pacuvius' daughter is Iphigenia, then the legacy-hunter is Agamemnon, whose role in this particular myth is unequivocally immoral; and so when Juvenal compares

---

<sup>113</sup> Juvenal places the blame for *captatio* on the legacy-hunter, rather than on the testator, the one who actually writes the will, which must be honoured.

<sup>114</sup> See chapter 4. Ronnick (1993b), 10, suggests that the poem as a whole satirizes the formula *do ut des*, although she does not explore this in much detail.

<sup>115</sup> Both references to Iphigenia (119, 127) are made in dactylic lines, suggesting the speed at which the *captator* thinks and acts.

<sup>116</sup> Cf. Lucretius 1.84-100; Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*

Agamemnon and Pacuvius (*nec comparo testamento / mille rates*, 121-22), the legacy-hunter's materialistic motivations make him appear even more appalling than his mythological counterpart. The sarcastic praise for *meum ciuem* (121) also contrasts Pacuvius with the Greek Agamemnon; this is not just ironic but laments the fact that a successful Roman citizen has such base motivation. So Juvenal disparages modern Roman society for its immorality, which, in this example, is motivated not by duty or even war, but by pure financial gain.

Although the poem's conclusion has been seen by several scholars as sarcastic praise, the predictions for Pacuvius are clearly meant to be curses. Thus the ending of the poem brings the Fourth Book of Satires to a close by reminding the reader of the distance between Juvenal's desired world and the corruption of the actual one. Long life (128), usually seen as a blessing,<sup>117</sup> is for Juvenal in Satire 10 an object of misguided prayer, marked by physical and mental decay (188-288); Juvenal even uses Nestor as an example of this (10.246-55),<sup>118</sup> and so his reappearance here deliberately reminds the reader of the satirist's understanding of old age. The next curse, that of wealth, picks up Satire 10's misguided wish for heaps of riches (24-25) with *montibus aurum* (129), as well as the example of Nero, who was certainly known for his depredations and proverbial for his

---

<sup>117</sup> Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*

<sup>118</sup> It is perhaps worth noting that the trouble with Nestor's long life in Satire 10 is in outliving his son; and old man who outlives his children would be a *senex orbus*, whose lack of an intestate heir would make him a likely category for *captatio*.

unrestrained greed, as in Satire 10.15.<sup>119</sup> At last, Juvenal's ultimate curse, that Pacuvius be denied friendship and love, identifies what is commonly lacking in most prayers and desires, and thus what is largely lacking in contemporary Rome. So the poem ends with an unambiguously harsh rebuke of the negative effects of greed which are perpetuated by people like Catullus and Pacuvius – and perhaps even Corvinus – throughout contemporary society.

---

<sup>119</sup> Courtney (1980), *ad loc.* *Montibus aurum*, 129, may also target Nero's love of gold, most commonly recognized as being manifested in the *Domus Aurea*. Interestingly, Nero *rapuit* in Satire 10.308 as well, but there as an example of sexual depravity, thus serving as an ideal display of how wealth corrupts societal morality in various avenues.

### CHAPTER 3: JUVENAL'S *POETICA TEMPESTAS*

#### Structure and Motif in the *Poetica Tempestas*

In claiming that Catullus' situation is *tam grauius, si quando poetica surgit / tempestas* (23-24), Juvenal refers directly to the literary *topos* of the storm narrative. Storms are common in Roman epic poetry, especially after Virgil's adaptation of his Homeric model (*Odyssey* 5.291-464) in the first book of the *Aeneid* (1.81-156).<sup>1</sup> Contributors to the tradition include Apollonius of Rhodes (2.1102-22), Ovid (*Metamorphoses* 11.474-572), Lucan (5.502-677, 9.319-47), Valerius Flaccus (1.574-659), Statius (*Thebiad* 5.335-421), and Silius (17.236-91). While literary storms exist in other genres,<sup>2</sup> Juvenal's storm is set directly against those of epic, contributing to a unifying mock-epic tone in Satire Twelve. With his own poetic storm, Juvenal confronts the long-standing tradition of standard epic conventions so familiar to readers.<sup>3</sup>

The inclusion of a storm in a Latin epic seems to have been almost compulsory, and this is not surprising. Not only did it allow the poet to present a conflict between human and cosmic forces, but it was also a chance for the poet to compete with his predecessors – as well as, he must have assumed, his successors – by displaying his

---

<sup>1</sup> Otis (1963), 229-31, has explained how Virgil has taken Homer's storm and given it a new thrust and meaning; Morford (1967), 20-26, includes a thorough discussion of Virgil's influences, concentrating on those outside of Homer.

<sup>2</sup> Horace *Carm.* 1.3; Ovid *Tristia* 1.2; Seneca *Agamemnon* 462ff.. Seneca (the Elder) *Controversiae* 7.1.4, 10; Petron. *Sat.* 114.

<sup>3</sup> These are the same formulaic repetitions which Juvenal first laments at 1.1-14.

poetic prowess through allusion, innovation and improvement. As a *topos*, the *poetica tempestas* contained a natural narrative arc, comprising the rise, height, calming, and aftermath of the storm. Each section had certain conventions.<sup>4</sup> Storms in epic poetry are always massive and terrifying, and their elements are generally described at length and in great detail. Thus describing the same phenomenon with novelty to make it more intimidating or devastating - rather than generically predictable - was the poet's task in competition with his predecessors.

### Section 1: The Rise of the Storm

The first sign of a storm is, naturally, a worsening of the weather. In order to bring out the unpredictability of the sea, an eternal concern of all maritime travellers, epic storms almost always arrive suddenly.<sup>5</sup> The sea's fickleness is often matched to that of the gods, whose actions have immediate effect. It is a natural human reaction to imagine that such a sudden change in weather - and fate - is the result of a god's actions, since the awful turn of events seems to defy what seems natural and can only be explained by supernatural causes.<sup>6</sup> Aeolus, the god of the winds, is an obvious representative of the

---

<sup>4</sup> The sections are not always clearly defined, but the close attention to previous epic storm versions and the logical - and perhaps essential - progression of the storm, allow for little differentiation in plot. It must be acknowledged, however, that the classification of a particular passage, such as a speech, may not fit clearly in one section. Furthermore, it was not uncommon for authors to reposition certain elements of the storm to provide new twists to their version of the *topos*.

<sup>5</sup> Virgil, *subito*, 88; Ovid, *praeceps*, 481; Valerius Flaccus, *subitus*, 620; Silius, *extemplo*, 240.

<sup>6</sup> Huxley (1952), 119.



storm, although he is often commanded by his superiors for the sake of the plot.<sup>7</sup>

Neptune, god of the sea, is the other logically recurring manifestation of divine control of the storm.<sup>8</sup>

As for the weather itself, the winds are personified as lesser deities. Each direction is individually represented,<sup>9</sup> although three times they rush together out of the same cave in Aeolus' palace.<sup>10</sup> The representation of the plurality of winds is furthered in the recurring depiction of the winds attacking the sea or even battling against each other.<sup>11</sup> Statius' account exaggerates that the winds blow in all directions so that the sea itself is actually still (368-69). Most of the time, however, the seas grow rough, anticipating the massive waves to come. Along with the winds, the coming of the storm is indicated by a darkness shadowing the entire sky; this can also happen very suddenly, with dark clouds turning day into night.<sup>12</sup> In addition to being threatening itself, the

---

<sup>7</sup> Aeolus acts on behalf of Juno (in Virgil), and Neptune (in Silius), but is himself the main force behind the storm against the Argonauts in Valerius Flaccus. Although the enraged Poseidon can easily shipwreck his enemy Odysseus, Juno must offer a nymph to Aeolus to divert her rival, Aeneas.

<sup>8</sup> Poseidon/Neptune begins storms in Homer and Silius, but also calms storms. Jupiter sends the storm in Statius' version.

<sup>9</sup> They are Boreas or Aquilo (North), Eurus (East or South-East), Notus or Auster (South), Africus (South-West), Zephyrus (West), Corus (North-West). Morford (1967), 40-41, includes a thorough discussion of the tradition of the literary winds preceding Lucan.

<sup>10</sup> Virgil 82-83; Valerius Flaccus 610-11; Silius 241-41. Huxley (1952), 119, points out that the representation of many winds accurately describes the gales of the Mediterranean, which often blow from several directions at the same time.

<sup>11</sup> Despite the lack of divine agency behind his account, Lucan describes the climax of the storm as a battle between the winds, a powerful metaphor for the internal strife in Italy (5.597-620; see Barratt (1979), at 569).

<sup>12</sup> Homer 294; Virgil 88-89; Lucan 5.564-65; Valerius Flaccus 617; Statius 365-66; Silius 241.

darkness allows for lightning to spread fire throughout the sky, followed by the terrifying din of thunder.<sup>13</sup> The lightning strikes are often very close together, and spread fire across the sky, and heavy rain often falls; this results in a contrast between the water of rain and the fire of lightning.<sup>14</sup>

The ship's crew reacts in one of two ways: some exhibit complete despair,<sup>15</sup> awestruck or simply petrified with terror, while others take measures to prevent further damage to the ship. These include lowering the sail (Ovid, 11.482-83, 487) to prevent it from blowing away, shipping the oars so that they will not snap (Ovid, 486-87), and bailing water from the hold (Statius, 5.382-83). However, the storm's fury increases quickly and the sailors' bravery inevitably fails.

## Section 2: The Height of the Storm

As the weather worsens and the sea grows rougher, the crew's safety is increasingly threatened by the damage incurred by the ship, now being tossed violently by increasingly large waves. In addition to the snapping of the oars and the mast, and the loss of rigging and tackle and sails, leaks can break through the hull, so that the hold is filled with water from below and above.<sup>16</sup> If the ship is travelling with others in a fleet,

---

<sup>13</sup> Homer 296; Virgil 90-91; Lucan 5.520-21; Statius 394-95; Silius 251-54. Valerius Flaccus builds the supernatural element of his storm by having the thunder and the lightning arrive together, *pariter*, 616.

<sup>14</sup> Ovid 516-20; Lucan 5.629; Statius 632-34; Silius 241-41.

<sup>15</sup> Ovid 537-43; Valerius Flaccus 621-37; Statius 358-60, 396-97.

<sup>16</sup> Homer 315-18; Virgil 104-5, 122-23; Ovid 514-15; Lucan 5.595-96; Valerius Flaccus 637-38; Statius 373-75.

some vessels crash, either on jagged rocks or into each other.<sup>17</sup> Flotsam and jetsam are scattered throughout the waters, along with those who have fallen overboard.<sup>18</sup> The air is filled with loud noises: shouts and cries from men are drowned out by the screeching of cables, the howling of winds, and the crashing of waves and thunder.<sup>19</sup>

Monologue or dialogue is often used by the poet to express the characters' despair or defiance against these overwhelming odds. Odysseus (*Od.* 5.299) and Aeneas (*Aen.* 1.94-101) both wish they had died at Troy, as Silius' Hannibal expresses how fortunate his brother was to have died in battle in Italy (17.260-67). On the other hand, Lucan's Caesar, against the protestations of his helmsman, commands the vessel into the thick of the storm, hubristically putting himself above every supernatural power (5.577-96). But due to the extent of the storm, even the most experienced sailors are flummoxed, unable to do anything to alter what they can only assume is a supernatural force. Caesar's seasoned helmsman, Amyclas, is unable to determine which wind is dominant (5.560-76). Even Ovid's helmsman, who initially shouts out orders, is confounded by the storm, all his hard-earned knowledge useless in such a horrific tempest (486-87).

Waves figure prominently at the height of the storm, and are often the greatest force to assault the ship. Odysseus was thrice assailed by a crushing wave (296, 313, 365-67), while Virgil's waves are likened to mountains (104-5). Ovid introduced the

---

<sup>17</sup> Virgil 108-12; Silius 274-77.

<sup>18</sup> Virgil 106; Ovid 559-60; Silius 278-82.

<sup>19</sup> Virgil 87; Ovid 484-85, 495-96; Lucan 5.596; Valerius Flaccus 640; Silius 249-50, 255-59.

proverbial “tenth wave,” one bigger than the rest which breaks over the hull of the ship.<sup>20</sup> Great whirlpools are created by the contesting winds, which continue to wreak havoc.<sup>21</sup> The sea may consume its victims along with ships, depriving them of a proper burial, something lamented in the monologues mentioned above.

### Section 3: the Calming of the Storm

Just at the point where death for the hero seems inevitable, the storm miraculously recedes, dying off even more quickly than it came. Traditionally this is explained through divine intervention, as another deity discovers what has been happening and comes to the protection of his favoured heroes, much to the chagrin of the rival divinity.<sup>22</sup> The god may even make a speech, explaining his or her actions to other deities, to the victim of the storm, or even to the ship itself.<sup>23</sup>

The winds and waves ebb, and daylight returns; Ovid and Valerius Flaccus include rainbows (590-91 and 655-56). The calming of the storm seems almost immediate. For Lucan, the storm narrative actually ends right at the pinnacle of the

---

<sup>20</sup> Ovid 530; Lucan 5.672-76 and Silius 14.121-24 also include this phenomenon, although in Lucan instead of destroying Caesar, the tenth wave actually saves him, bringing his boat to shore, as an example of how the real world inverts norms of mythological epics, since villains who would be punished in myth are miraculously saved. See Morford (1967), 37-44, and Barratt (1979), *ad loc.*

<sup>21</sup> Virgil 115-17; Ovid 548-49; Silius 268-70.

<sup>22</sup> Neptune plays this role in Virgil, Valerius Flaccus, and Silius, with Venus involved in the latter. In the *Odyssey*, Athena restrains all the winds except Boreas, to save Odysseus from Poseidon. Despite Jupiter’s role in creating the storm in Statius, the truce between the forces fighting in the storm is matched by a calming of the weather (416-21).

<sup>23</sup> Virgil 131-41; Silius 283-89; Valerius Flaccus 640-50.

action, as the tenth wave brings Caesar safely to shore in a display of his hubris and the injustice of the world (5.672-77). Ceyx's fate in Ovid's account is much bleaker. After his crew and ship are consumed by the storm, Ceyx stays afloat for a time, repeating the name of his beloved Alcyone, but is eventually consumed by the dark waters (544-69). The narrative then breaks from the storm, which presumably continues until a rainbow spread by Iris marks its calm (590-91). The sailors who do survive act naturally when they reach land by rejoicing, kissing the earth, and flopping down to recover in exhaustion.

### **Juvenal's Storm: Tradition and Innovation**

To fit into the literary tradition, Juvenal's poetic storm must break down into the above sections. Within each section, Juvenal includes many indicators to the reader that this storm is to be compared to and contrasted with those of epic poetry. In order to parody the *topos*, Juvenal must first establish that his account fits into the tradition.

Juvenal certainly draws on the tradition of the epic storm in describing the rise of his tempest. In the worsening of the weather, Juvenal includes the darkening of the sky with vivid hyperbole (*densae caelum abscondere tenebrae / nube una* 18-19), as well as lightning (*fulminis ictus*, 17) and metaphorical thunder (*attonitus*, 21). These arrive suddenly (*subitusque*, 19), typically emphasizing the capriciousness of the sea. As in other accounts, the crew is terrified and full of despair (20-22), initially overwhelmed by the storm rather than trying to take measures to save the ship and each other.

The increase of the storm's force is marked by several familiar motifs. The hold ships a great deal of water (30) as a result of the heaving waves which rock the boat from side to side (31). In addition to being threatened by the water, the wind bends the brittle mast (*arboris incertae*, 32), one of the parts of the ship accustomed to breaking during the storm. As for the crew, they continue to be dumbfounded; even the old helmsman, offering his experience and wisdom, fails to protect them from the storm (32-33).<sup>24</sup> At this point, Catullus' entrance into the narrative is the first attempt by anyone on board to prevent shipwreck. As the presumptive hero of the story, his speech consists only of an order similar to those shouted by Ovid's captain (11.482-83), rather than the pitiful soliloquies of Odysseus or Aeneas. Since the sails have caught fire,<sup>25</sup> they cannot be tied down, and so, after the jettison fails to relieve any danger, Catullus cuts down the mast (52-56). Lucan mentions among the tactics of self-preservation that the captain himself cuts down the mast to prevent the ship from capsizing (9.327-29).<sup>26</sup>

Following the climax of the storm, the weather calms immediately (*sed postquam iacuit planum mare*, 62), with the winds and waves having died down (*ualentius euro / et pelago*, 63-64) and the rise of a favourable breeze (*modica nec multum fortior aura / uentus adest*, 66-67). The crew's safety is attributed to fate (63, 65-66), Juvenal's choice

---

<sup>24</sup> The juxtaposition of *nullam prudentia* reinforces the futility of the helmsman's advice.

<sup>25</sup> Lightning carries fire, as at Ovid 11.520-23, Statius 5.394-95, and Silius 17.253-54. Sails are often affected in epic storms.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Lucan 9.331-34. When a mast breaks, it invariably goes over the side and becomes a dead-weight anchor, endangering the ship. Any standing rigging still connecting it to the ship must also be cut away.

of divine intervention according to standard motifs. As elsewhere in the tradition, the clouds recede and *spes uitae cum sole redit* (70). Reminiscences of earlier storm narratives in the maimed ship's safe arrival include the joyous sight of land, and the sailors' celebration upon their return to harbour.<sup>27</sup> Altogether, Juvenal's narrative mirrors its predecessors in that it describes a major storm at considerable length and in vivid detail.

There are several elements of Juvenal's account which contribute to the tradition of the *poetica tempestas* through variation and innovation of details. For example, Juvenal actually omits any period of calm prior to the worsening of the weather, implying the abruptness of the storm's arrival by thrusting the reader directly into it, just as the sailors themselves were surprised. And although sails are often lost or damaged in epic storms, nowhere else do they actually catch fire.<sup>28</sup> Their long return to port is a further development, with winds so gentle they almost die away (*deficientibus austris*, 69) and seas so calm that even a tiny pleasure craft could sail without concern (80). And although ships caught in epic storms do occasionally survive, never do they return to a man-made harbour. Juvenal seems to point this out following his expansive description of the port at Ostia by saying that *non sic igitur mirabere portus / quos natura dedit* (78-79). The many *Aeneid* references in this section force the reader to contrast Juvenal's artificial harbour

---

<sup>27</sup> Most commentators have noted how this passage (62-82, but especially 70-74) specifically targets the *Aeneid* with its mock-epic tone, but here Juvenal largely avoids drawing on Virgil's storm scenes for satirical purposes.

<sup>28</sup> This may be a further reason why the sailors are so horrified at the sight, beyond the terrifying prospect of being surrounded by water while also on fire.

with Virgil's haven, which contains similar, although natural, protective features (1.157-61). Juvenal has his greedy friend return to Ostia, the great port of Rome, so as to set the poem in a modern commercial context, and to satirize his contemporary society's preference for cultured luxury over natural beauty.

Another innovation is Catullus' resort to jettison; instead of attempting to increase the ship's draft and stability by bailing out the water from the hold, Catullus tries to achieve this by casting cargo overboard, something unique in epic storms, but not unknown to the Romans.<sup>29</sup> While this has satirical reasons,<sup>30</sup> it seems to be a sound and realistic tactic. Indeed, Catullus' active role throughout the narrative diverts from those of other heroes. The hero is most often at the mercy of the gods, impotent and full of despair, while the seamanship is left to the *rectores*.<sup>31</sup> It is Catullus himself who cuts down the mast, which seems to actually save them (*ac se / explicat angustum*, 54-55).<sup>32</sup> In fact, this is the moment when the storm immediately dies down, without further description of any other force at work, divine or otherwise. Catullus' act stops the ship from capsizing, and it is so dramatic that the winds and waves seem to calm immediately, almost as a result. This is surely Catullus' own bravado coming through ironically in Juvenal's narrative; he sees himself as an epic hero, specifically Aeneas, as is suggested

---

<sup>29</sup> Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*; Courtney (1980), *ad loc.* and at 52.

<sup>30</sup> See below and chapter 2, pages 30-34.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Ovid 11.482-83; Lucan's Caesar hubristically boasts his superiority to divinities in contrast to the miserable groveling of Odysseus and Aeneas, but his helmsman, Amyclas, is the one charged with the management of the ship.

<sup>32</sup> See chapter 2, pages 35-36 for the scene's satirical implications.



by the references to the *Aeneid* in the crew's return to Ostia. Although his efforts attempt heroism, the satirical characterization of Catullus undercuts his posturing as the hero of the storm narrative.

### Parody in Juvenal's Poetic Storm

Although Juvenal consciously draws on the literary tradition of the *poetica tempestas* in his account, his poem is not an epic, but a satire. So it is not surprising that he undercuts the constructed reality of scene throughout the episode in order to create a parody of the poetic storm. As we will see, Juvenal accomplishes this through subversions, deflations, and distractions which spoil the gravity of the narrative.

Having established the storm's ferocity with the same tools used by epic poets, Juvenal creates parody by subverting the same violence he has just established. As was seen above, he begins the storm narrative by describing the weather as menacing, albeit formulaic.<sup>33</sup> The claim that this squall is as bad as *si quando poetica surgit / tempestas* (23-24) acknowledges the constant repetition of this *topos* in the literary tradition, subverting the reality of the initial descriptions. And since this happens early on, the storm narrative lacks credibility from its beginning. Juvenal also notes that these scenes are well-known in his contemporary context through the votive tablets of survivors (26-28). This not only mocks the repetitiveness of the scene but also points out that despite how terrifying these storms seem, people do actually survive them.<sup>34</sup> Indeed, Catullus and

---

<sup>33</sup> There are other hints of satire in this description, such as the flippant play on *attonitus* (21).

<sup>34</sup> Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*

the crew do, in fact, survive. At their arrival, the sailors shave their heads in supplication and tell exaggerated tales (*garrula ... pericula*, 82) of their ordeals; here Juvenal undermines the entire storm narrative by acknowledging that such accounts are often embellished by their storytellers.<sup>35</sup>

At the height of the storm, Catullus' supposedly brave actions are subverted by his characterization. Having turned to the storm's effect on the ship (30-32), Catullus acts when even the old helmsman is useless (32-33). But although the sacrifice of his luxury goods is supposedly honourable in a moral sense, it is rather impractical. If Catullus thinks that throwing clothing (38-42) and baskets (46) overboard will help, then he is an idiot.<sup>36</sup> Furthermore, there is a conscious effort to link the luxury items with effeminacy (*Maecenatibus*, 39), corruption (*callidus emptor Olynthi*, 47), and the barbaric (*Pholo*, 45).<sup>37</sup> Also subversive is the metaphor of the eunuch beaver, a grotesque and unflattering comparison, not to mention an amusing one. When the act of jettison has no effect (52-53), the statement that the beaver *medicatum intellegit inguen* (36) seems ironic, since Catullus has sacrificed his luxury goods in vain. And so when the catalogue of luxury items concludes with moralizing praise for Catullus' sacrifice, the reader's perception of the 'hero' of the storm is one which subverts any previous sympathies. On a broader level, Catullus is a trader on a voyage for profit, rather than an epic hero on a grand

---

<sup>35</sup> In this, Juvenal also satirizes Catullus, his own source for the storm; see chapter 2, pages 42-43.

<sup>36</sup> Ferguson (1979), 294.

<sup>37</sup> *Parthenio*, 44, is also applicable, if Friedländer (1969), *ad loc.*, is correct in his supposition that it refers to Domitian's chamberlain.

expedition of discovery, *nostos*, or military glory. The suggestion that Catullus even compared himself to Aeneas demonstrates not only the merchant's ignoble materialism and stupidity, but also his arrogance.

Since epic storms tend to be as terrifyingly vast and detailed as possible, Juvenal is able to create parody by deflating epic phraseology. So, for example, in the catalogue of luxury goods there is an *urnae cratera capacem / et dignum sitiante Pholo uel coniuge Fusci* (44-45), with the initial reference to the centaur of mythological fame bathetically undercut by the mention of some bibulous target of contemporary gossip.<sup>38</sup> This type of joke creates humour, something quite at odds with the solemnity and severity of epic storms. Juvenal also alters the language of his predecessors for this purpose: instead of Virgil's *mirabile monstrum* (8.81), Juvenal calls the white sow a *mirabile sumen* (73), undercutting the lofty language used in the periphrasis for Mount Alba with a base word.<sup>39</sup> Juvenal also deflates the description of the storm by turning from details to generalities. Following the initial descriptions of the one dark cloud covering the entire sky and the horrific sight of sails on fire, Juvenal continues to describe the weather to the reader. But while an epic poet might increase the dramatic threat of the storm by adding detail after terrifying detail, Juvenal deflates the scene by speaking vaguely and in generalities (*omnia*, 22; *genus...aliud discriminis*, 24; *cetera*, 25; *damna*, 53; *adiuersis*

---

<sup>38</sup> Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*; Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*

<sup>39</sup> Duff (1970), *ad loc.*; Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*; Courtney (1980), *ad loc.* Courtney also points out the bathos in *scrofa*, 73. The emphatic position of these words at either end of the line increases the satirical force of the deflation. Ferguson also argues that *numquam uisis* (74) deflates the scene: the udders remain unseen because of the piglets, and Courtney suggests that "Juvenal exaggerates Virgil's 30 piglets into 30 teats."

*urguentibus*, 53; *angustum*, 55). This forces the readers to construct the storm themselves by drawing upon their familiarity with the *topos*, rather than conjuring up a clear and terrible image of the tempest. These generalities are thus deflations of and distractions from the storm narrative.

At several points during the storm scene, Juvenal creates parody by distracting the reader from the dire situation of Catullus and the crew. Usually epic poets build suspense by shifting back and forth between the effects of the worsening weather on the ship, and the reactions of the crew to these. This type of narration also constructs pathos, and the reader feels sympathy for the sailors, whose despair is most often voiced by the hero of the epic. The scene moves the audience to be awed at the vivid descriptions of winds and waves, to pity those facing such horrors, and to be drawn into the narrative, wondering how its beloved hero will escape. Needless to say, the illusion of reality is never broken, and the action is interrupted only by similes which explain how horrific the scene is.

But unlike his predecessors, Juvenal wants the reader to acknowledge that this is a literary construction and not reality. Throughout the episode, severity and sympathy are undercut by asides which move the reader's attention from the scene to the narrator's reaction to it. This happens first in lines 22-24. Although it may mistakenly be interpreted for severity (e.g. *tam grauius*, 23), this comparison distracts the reader from the plot of the episode by acknowledging the literary *topos* itself. Juvenal continues with imperatives (*ecce*, 24, and *miserere*, 25) directing the reader back into the storm, but the reader is immediately pulled away from the scene with an almost apologetic narrative aside (25-

29). This longer break from the action shows how Juvenal writes a halting narrative which distances the reader from the plight of Catullus.

The catalogue of jettisoned luxury wares also distracts the attention of the reader (37-47). Instead of sails on fire or leaks in the hull, the reader gets an incredibly detailed list of jetsam which does little, if anything, to aid the sailors' desperate situation (*nec / damna leuant*, 52-53). As another break from the storm, the catalogue distances the reader from the severity of the storm; moreover, it also negatively characterizes the 'hero' of the episode. Capped with a moralizing statement (48-51), the catalogue is meant to be read as characterization for Catullus, whose materialism is evident in the detailed evaluation of his lost prized possessions.

Immediately following the climax of the storm, the narrator includes his final aside of the episode (55-61). Juvenal ignores the typical denouement of the poetic storm, omitting the customary divine interference which suddenly calms the seas and saves the ship. Instead, he includes an aside which mocks seafarers as fools, since such squalls are to be expected. The narrator thus removes the reader from the poetic context and ridicules the 'hero' of the poem, successfully exposing the pretence of Catullus' bravery.

In conclusion, Juvenal parodies the epic storm with subversion, deflation and distraction. With these tools the satirist undercuts his own poetic tempest, mocks his own hero, breaks any suspension of disbelief, and creates a humour which is absent from storms of epic. Juvenal's poetic storm is like any other, in that it is realistic yet

exaggerated, novel yet derivative; therefore by undercutting his own storm, Juvenal mocks the entire tradition of the *poetica tempestas*.

## CHAPTER 4: *CAPTATIO* IN JUVENAL'S TWELFTH SATIRE

### AND IN HORACE SATIRE 2.5

Legacy-hunting often appears among the vices decried by Roman satirists, as it does in the works of other literary defenders of traditional morality.<sup>1</sup> Regardless of the degree of its prevalence in daily life,<sup>2</sup> legacy-hunting was targeted by moralizers as an example of the negative effects of greed on society. As it brought about the testamentary bestowal of property to an outsider rather than to a true friend, *captatio* symbolized the degradation of ties of kinship and friendship through the corruption of the Roman traditions of inheritance and succession. Obviously the perversion of these traditions was immoral, and invited and encouraged various vices in both the hunter and the hunted. However, the vast majority of references are made merely in passing, using *captatio* as yet another example of corruption and greed. Here is yet another weapon in the satirist's arsenal of moral reproach, with little elaboration on the implications or significance of this problem.<sup>3</sup> So, in order to determine what satirists specified as morally reprehensible,

---

<sup>1</sup> Horace *Epistulae* 1.1.77-79, *Serm.* 2.5; Juv. 1.37-39, 3.128-30, 4.15-21, 5.96-98, 6.39-40, 548 10.202, 12.93-120; Ovid *Ars Amatoria* 2.271f., 329-32; Petron. *Sat.* 116f., 124f., 140f.; Martial 2.32, 2.40, 4.56, 6.63, 9.100, 11.44 12.40, 12.90; Seneca *Ad Marciam* 19.2, *De Constantia Sapientis* 9.2.

<sup>2</sup> Scholarly opinion on this is divided; while Tracy (1980), 399, claims that "Captation was a common phenomenon in ancient Roman times from the days of the Republic," Champlin (1991), 87-102, argues that it happened very rarely, noting the near absence of historical cases, due largely to the fact that *captatio* is a "moral crime" rather than a legal one, and thus is easy to accuse yet near impossible to prove.

<sup>3</sup> Muecke (1993), 177, identifies the *captator* as the descendent of a line of social villains of literature, including the "Flatterers" described by Aristotle and Theophrastus and the "Parasite" stock character from Comedy, who exploited friendships for personal gain.

this chapter will compare and contrast the only two sustained attacks on legacy-hunters in Roman verse satire: Horace's Satire 2.5, and lines 93-120 of Juvenal's Twelfth Satire.

In Satire 2.5, Horace imagines a continuation of the dialogue between Ulysses and Tiresias in book 11 of the *Odyssey*; having just told him that his house has been overrun by suitors, Tiresias gives Ulysses a lecture on how to be a successful *captator*. The legacy-hunter's primary weapon, as suggested by Tiresias, is the ingratiating flattery of the target, no matter how base, in hopes of being included his or her will as heir or coheir. But perhaps his most practical advice for legacy-hunters, and thus the most satirically sinister, is to adjust to the target with obliging advances, and to do so in the disguise of a friend; there is a degree of discretion needed in a moral crime so public and so offensive. If the *captator* operates under the radar while simultaneously manipulating his target, he will not only be successful, but also he will not arouse any suspicions of *captatio*, his activities being camouflaged as *amicitia*.<sup>4</sup> This disguise is all the more important due to the possibility of the *captator*'s failure, as clever targets may take the bait and run, taking advantage of all the flattery and gifts which their legacy-hunters give them, only to leave them nothing in their will. Here Horace argues that *captatio* corrupts all parties involved, and recognizes that the ultimate power lies in the hands of the testator.<sup>5</sup> With the

---

<sup>4</sup> Muecke (1993), 178; see Champlin (1991), 97, 101-2, for this concept in the societal context.

<sup>5</sup> Hopkins (1983), 247, notes the ability of the dead to use their wills as "weapons of social approval and rebuke." Champlin (1991), 92-93, extends this threat further by recognizing that the greedy testator has the power to destroy the family line by rejecting his relatives and alienating the familial wealth. Given that both Hopkins and Champlin vehemently assert that the composition of a will would never have been taken lightly in ancient Rome, the active snubbing of one's kin primarily for self-serving reasons rather than for social humiliation is a caustic escalation of *captatio*'s immorality.



realisation that *captatio* requires two parties, the emphasis on covert deception suggests something completely realistic in the exploitation of the ambiguities between friend and impostor, and the difficulties in their social recognition as such in writing a will. As several scholars have argued, the method of presentation concentrates the satiric bite of the poem:<sup>6</sup> at no point in the poem does Horace intervene as satirist to condemn the wicked teachings of Tiresias, so unambiguously abhorrent. Through this literary ploy, Horace manipulates his reader into reacting with *indignatio* to the nonchalance with which Tiresias suggests the exploitation of the tenuous and sacrosanct process of inheritance.

In his treatment of *captatio*, Juvenal draws frequently upon that of Horace, acknowledging his predecessor by creating several similarities between the two poems. There are, of course, frequent references through the repetition of words connected to the topic of inheritance and legacy-hunting, such as *heres* (Hor. 2.5.49, 54, 86, 101, 107; Juv. 12.95), and, of course, the theme of friendship and its misrepresentation, especially the ironic use of *amicus* (33, 43; 96). Horace and Juvenal both identify the characteristics which legacy-hunters seek in their prey: they are wealthy (12, 14, 28, 82; 99, 127, 129), childless (28, 31, 45-50; 95, 98, 99), and old or sick (12, 71, 82, 84, 107; 122, 98-99). Juvenal continues the use of the hunting/fishing metaphor following the acquisition of the target of the *captator*, a term which appears first in Horace (57). In addition to employing Horace's term (114), Juvenal likens the ingratiating sacrifices of the legacy-hunter to

---

<sup>6</sup> Rudd (1966), 239-242; Roberts (1984), 431-33; Muecke (1993), 179; Hooley (2007), 77.

*carcere nassae* (123), just as in Horace a *captator* is a fisherman who angles *cetaria* of *thynni* (44) with his hook (*insidiatorem ... hamo*, 25). In this instance, Juvenal's brief allusion at 123 abbreviates Horace's metaphor, forming a link with his predecessor which urges a complementary reading. Elsewhere, Juvenal eagerly extends such references in order to develop points which Horace made only briefly. For example, Juvenal expands Horace's brief use of sacrificial animals as bait - to continue the fishing metaphor - but exaggerates the scale greatly; instead of the small *turdus* (10) offered to the old man in Horace's poem, Juvenal's *captatores* might offer hecatombs, elephants, and even humans as obsequious sacrifices.<sup>7</sup> These sacrifices act as bait for the prey, and are attacked by Horace, but especially by Juvenal, as perversions of true religious sacrifices. As discussed above,<sup>8</sup> the name of Juvenal's addressee, Corvinus, likely alludes to Horace's comparison of a legacy-hunter to a *corvum... hiantem* (56). Both Horace and Juvenal conclude the poem by showing the *captator*'s ultimate success (99-102; 122-26), with their prey rewriting their *tabulas* (52; 122) in favour of the legacy-hunter. Both poems recognize *captatio* as substantial threat to the traditional social order, and implicitly urge their readers against such depravity. Thus Juvenal and Horace share the same moral instruction: the identification of legacy-hunting tactics aids in distinguishing friends from impostors, and vice versa, thus allowing the reader to discern and reject the contemporary vices which corrupt testation.

---

<sup>7</sup> The rejection of the lowly *coturnix*, 12.97, and the *aegram / et claudentem oculos gallinam*, 12.95-96, may allude to Horace's *turdus*, although thrushes were common and thus inexpensive; evidently commercial value was not as much of a concern for the Augustan legacy-hunter.

<sup>8</sup> See chapter 1, pages 3-4.

Juvenal also develops Horace's use of discordance between past and present, between contemporary vice and epic virtue. Horace builds this theme throughout his poem by setting it as in the Homeric context of *Odyssey*, book 11.<sup>9</sup> The satire lies not just in presenting Tiresias and Odysseus, venerable and heroic in the *Odyssey*, as entertaining such base ideals, but also in the fact that *captatio* was a specifically Roman problem, rooted in strong cultural values of inheritance which connected the testamentary dispersion of capital to family and friends with the eventually inevitable absence of a familial heir. Thus the epic setting of the poem jars with the contemporary context on several occasions, and implies a corruption of ancient traditions by modern greed. Moreover, there is a discord between the epic and priestly identity of Tiresias and his morally criminal suggestions, and especially Odysseus, who accepts them. Juvenal's epic references also imply a contrast with his contemporary world, as in his description of the snooty elephants (102-10), which, having at once fought in epic battles, will now serve only Caesar.<sup>10</sup>

Much more poignant, however, is the presence in each poem of a famous epic family member as an accomplice to the *captator*. Tiresias suggests that Ulysses actually pimp out his wife to help secure a legacy (75-76). Although Ulysses, the cunning trickster, may have the makings of a *captator* - he is *doloso* (3) just as others are *dolosa* (70) or *astutus* (23) – Horace, by making the dialogue a continuation of a scene in the

---

<sup>9</sup> Rudd (1966), 229; Roberts (1984), 426; Coffey (1989), 86-87; Muecke (1993), 178.

<sup>10</sup> See chapter 2, page 50-51. Silius 9.239, apparently incorrectly, suggested that the Carthaginians mounted *turres* on their war elephants; Courtney (1980), *ad loc.*

Odyssey itself, refers specifically to the Homeric Odysseus, who is certainly a virtuous hero, despite any later perspectives on his character.<sup>11</sup> Ulysses does have objections to Tiresias' suggestions, but these are not concerned with morality. The hero's reaction to the suggestion that he pander his wife is not to rebuke Tiresias for his depravity, but to doubt that it would work; Ulysses is really no better than Tiresias, but the incongruity between this and his identity as the hero of the Odyssey suggests that this contemporary vice can corrupt anyone, and is thus a sobering and horrifying concept. This idea is now tested on the virtuous wife of Odysseus. As if the initial suggestion itself were not shocking enough, Penelope, proverbial for her chastity, willingly becomes part of the hunt, *ut canis a corio numquam absterrebitur unco* (83). It is certainly more satirical to corrupt the chaste Penelope than to lampoon her husband, especially when she is likened to the *captator* who clutched on to the oiled cadaver of the old woman from Thebes, as a bitch gnawing ferociously at a greasy hide.<sup>12</sup>

Juvenal draws from another mythological example related through the Trojan War: his legacy-hunter is likened to Agamemnon sacrificing Iphigenia on the eve of the Trojan expedition. Despite this mythological event being one of the crimes against religion, Agamemnon compares quite favourably with the modern *captator*, who *non sperat tragicae furtiva piacula ceruae* (120). The legacy-hunter's daughter, his *Iphigenia domi* (119), is *nubilis* (118), and so she could be married off to the testator as one of the

---

<sup>11</sup> Stanford (1963), 266 n. 12, in his chapter on Roman attitudes to Ulysses, doubts any criticism of the hero by Horace in this satire.

<sup>12</sup> Roberts (1984), 429-31.

many possible sexual services offered for *captatio*.<sup>13</sup> Instead of playing the part of a bride, like Penelope in Horace's poem, the *captator*'s daughter is maliciously sacrificed. Although the diction may be less severe in the absence of such grotesque imagery as used by Horace, Juvenal outdoes his predecessor by attacking *captatio* as an even more outrageous evil. Juvenal's choice of a mythological parallel casts his *captator* as a much more awful character, one without remorse and even, as we will see, without the need for disguise.

While Juvenal uses similarities to link his poem to Horace's, it is the divergences between them which unsurprisingly determine each poem's overall message. Perhaps the most noticeable difference between the two satires against legacy-hunting is the decreased role of the testator in Juvenal's account. Juvenal recognized that Horace had already shown how *captatio* corrupts both hunter and prey in his exploration of the role of deception in their relationship. Instead, Juvenal downplays the role of the testator while inflating that of the *captator*. Specifically, the legacy-hunter's tactics are made much more horrific to show that society has become even more corrupt in Juvenal's day, as evidenced by contemporary approaches to testation and, consequently, to *captatio*. Both satirists dwell on the antithesis between *amicus* and *captator*. Horace draws his satire from the ambiguities between the two, and the testator's ability to discern them. By contrast, Juvenal satirizes the complete lack of discretion and morality surrounding *captatio* in his contemporary society.

---

<sup>13</sup> Champlin (1991), 90.

Horace's satire exposes the main culprit of *captatio* by identifying the testator's awareness of legacy-hunting; in the end, it was the testator who determined in his will the success or failure of the *captator*. In the central episode of Satire 2.5, Nasica outwits the *captator* Coranus by excluding him from his will (61-69). As a didactic anecdote, this warns the *captator* to beware of the intelligent and vigilant testator, in order to avoid failure. Satirically, it demonstrates the ability of the testator to deceive the *captator*, rather than the other way round. Horace shows not only that testators, while living, became targets of *captatio* due to their ability to bequeath property to those outside their own families, but also that they realized their own power over those who competed for their bequests.<sup>14</sup> This suggestion identifies the possibility of a testator selfishly rejecting the strong sense of duty involved in writing a will. It was the duty of the testator to create his will as a final judgement of his friends and a mirror of his social life, in recognition of ties of *amicitia*, viz. those made across family lines through the exchange of gifts;<sup>15</sup> the *hereditas* or *legatum* transferred in a will was thus an expression of deferred reciprocity according to the customs of *amicitia*. The abuse of such a system, viz. falsely befriending someone rich, old and childless for mercenary purposes, was *captatio*. However, Horace also explains the testator's ability to deceive in the game of legacy-hunting. Nasica, the testator, may be seen as a defender of morality, a hero in the "epic of our time,"<sup>16</sup> for

---

<sup>14</sup> Hopkins (1983), 241, notes the sharp comedic bite in the exposure of "the whimsical arbitrariness allowed to testators."

<sup>15</sup> Rudd (1966), 226; Hopkins (1983), 243-47.

<sup>16</sup> Roberts (1984), 427.

identifying Coranus as a *captator* and excluding him from the will; however, his position is quite ambiguous, since he resorts to deception, having married off his daughter who will now be excluded from the will along with her husband (*invenietque / nil sibi legatum praetor plorare suisque*, 68-69). Nasica is completely aware of his own powerful role in the *captatio* relationship, as well as his ability to destroy his own family line.

Furthermore Nasica's willingness to act on this self-awareness represents a critical breach of the core values of inheritance succession.

The self-awareness of the testator's own power, according to Rudd,<sup>17</sup> led to a class of bachelors who became wealthy socialites, benefiting from their childlessness, and courted increasingly with age. Without an intestate heir, an *orbus* and *locuples senex* would recognize his friends in his will and take as heir someone outside his family according to his perception of his own social network; this adjudication of one's peers was the testator's greatest responsibility, since it was his duty to evaluate his own friendships and to dictate how his death would help shape the new community. As the social status of bachelors increased due to this unique social power, the roles in *captatio* became more complex.

The rise of the social status of bachelors resulted in the relative devaluation of fathers as valuable friends, according to the Roman satirists and their apparent zero-sum appreciation of social worth. As bachelors were more and more courted due to the possibility of cross-kin inheritance, fathers became less and less valuable as friends, since

---

<sup>17</sup> Rudd (1966), 225-26.

their heir was almost invariably determined.<sup>18</sup> No longer beneficiaries of gifts or attention, fathers are used by Horace's crafty testators only as ventures which build camouflage. Since the *captator* generally fears detection, i.e. *ne manifestum / caelibis obsequium nudet te* (46-47), he should court the rich father of a sick son, to avoid appearing as though he only pursues bachelors. Such a "gamble" (*alea*, 50) will likely pay off both financially - in the death of the boy (45-50) - and in the surreptitious manner in which it creates camouflage. Tiresias advises the *captator* to befriend a father by disguising himself as an *amicus*, thus exploiting the subjective ambiguity between *amicitia* and *captatio*. For Juvenal, however, a father simply has no use in legacy-hunting. In momentarily assuming the perspective of the *captator*, Juvenal rejects the Catullus as a quarry for *captatio* due to his status as a father (93-95). And so, while Horace points out that courting a father can have a role in the deception of legacy-hunting, Juvenal finds this suggestion laughable, humorously pointing out that *coturnix / nulla umquam pro patre cadet* (97-98).

Since Juvenal stresses that his poem has a contemporary setting (i.e. *haec lux*, 1), the satirist is likely commenting on the development of *captatio* from the time of Horace.<sup>19</sup> *Captatio* in Juvenal's day is much worse than in Horace's; now legacy-hunting

---

<sup>18</sup> It would be extremely unlikely that a father would not name his son as heir, as this would be an even greater affront to the patriarchal values behind the Roman patrilineal practice of inheritance than Nasica's slighting of his daughter.

<sup>19</sup> The atemporal setting of *Serm.*2.5 reinforces the 'reality' of the Augustan subject matter; Roberts (1984), 427-427; Muecke (1993), 177.



no longer requires a disguise, and thus fathers are no longer valued as instruments of deception; as friends they are socially inconsequential.

Juvenal rejects fathers from *captatio* due to the impossibility of a valuable return, suggesting that extra-familial sacrifices are now self-serving, and are likely attempts at legacy-hunting. By his time, Juvenal does not have to suggest *captatio* as a novelty as Tiresias does to Ulysses; for the second-century satirist, legacy-hunting is the norm. It is Juvenal who must argue against the supposition that his own sacrifices are mercenary, a suggestion prompted by his negative portrayal of Catullus in the first half of the poem. It should be obvious to Corvinus, Juvenal says, that he is not a *captator*, because his target and his tactics clearly do not resemble those of a legacy-hunter. For Juvenal, there is no ambiguity between *amicitia* and *captatio*, because in his vicious society, legacy-hunters operate shamelessly and testators are happy to receive their obsequious gifts.

If *captatio* is the norm in the context of Juvenal's poem, it is not surprising that Juvenal's legacy-hunters have no need for the secrecy and deception of those in Horace's poem. Tiresias' advice of the need for a disguise to prevent exposure suggests that such precautions are necessary in Horace's world. Tiresias warns against the possibility of being identified as a *captator* and publicly humiliated by the will of a cunning testator such as Nasica or the old woman from Thebes;<sup>20</sup> so for Horace, a successful *captatio*

---

<sup>20</sup> While the latter's *captator* was humiliated by his inclusion in the will and the stipulations of his inheritance, Coranus is disgraced by his absence from the will; as a son-in-law, he would have certainly expected to be bequeathed at least *legata* of some sort. The omission of any close friend or relative from a will was a very public rebuke due to the keen public interest in inheritance; Champlin (1989), 206-209; Hopkins (1983), 246-47.

requires both a deceptive legacy-hunter and a complacent testator.<sup>21</sup> But for Juvenal, *captatores* appear to be completely open about their actions.<sup>22</sup> Juvenal finds Corvinus' charge of legacy-hunting ludicrous not only because Catullus is a father, but also because contemporary *captatores* offer unbelievably lavish sacrifices; against Juvenal's admittedly humble calf and sheep, the legacy-hunters offer a crescendo of increasingly exorbitant sacrifices from hecatombs to humans. Despite the exaggerations, Juvenal's point is clearly that the deception and moderation of the *captator*'s disguise is no longer required, because the testators no longer care whether they correctly, and thus morally, recognize their family and friends in their will. They no longer seem to consider the writing of a will to be an important tool of social recognition, but rather seem to sell their inheritance to the highest bidder: in the case of Satire Twelve, the rival *captatores* (*uictis riualibus*, 126) compete to offer the most valuable sacrifice. Due to the lack of morality in the context of Juvenal's poem, the more vicious the sacrifice, the greater its value; thus it is not surprising that Pacuvius Hister might sacrifice his own daughter in order to secure an inheritance. Not only does Juvenal's version of legacy-hunting destroy the family-line of the testator, it also harms the family of the *captator*! In this way, Juvenal actually extends Horace's critique that *captatio* corrupts both parties. But instead of a potentially intelligent testator who can be duped into inheriting an outsider, Juvenal's testator loses any personal identity, becoming only the *aeger* (122) who either is too

---

<sup>21</sup> Roberts (1984), 427.

<sup>22</sup> The legacy-hunters may also be in too much of a hurry and too miserly to bother with courting fathers; see 97-98, 99, 111.

unintelligent to identify the blatant attempts at *captatio*, or simply goes along with a practice which, in the context of the poem, is accepted as the norm.

The main difference between Horace's poem and Juvenal's - that is, the former's emphasis on the *captator*'s deception of his prey and the public at large versus the latter's depiction of *captatio* as a socially accepted norm - is further demonstrated in their respective portrayals of the tactics and approaches of their contemporary legacy-hunters. Horace emphasizes the role of deception in *captatio* by highlighting all the various methods that are at the disposal of the hunter. The best legacy-hunter is one who adapts to the customs of his prey, lures him into the trap by exploiting his weaknesses. Building on his suggestion that Ulysses offer Penelope *ultro* to the testator if he is a *scortator* (75-76), Tiresias advises him to make a careful approach (*cautus adito; / neu desis opera neve immoderatus abundes*, 88-89). If the quarry is *garrulus*, be silent and listen (90-91, 95). If he loves praise, fill him with it like a bladder (96-98). If it might rain, tell him to cover his head (93-94). The best legacy-hunter is attentive and proactive, malleable and moderate in order to keep up the disguise of a friend.

These are the tactics directed at the testator. Horace's *captator* also has tactics which aim at bystanders and neighbours. And so, after the prey has been successfully hunted, Tiresias suggests that the legacy-hunter cry a little and lament his friend's passing (101-4) and erect his tombstone *sine sordibus* (105) so that *funus / egregie factum laudet vicinia* (105-6). Here Horace satirizes the *captator*'s ability to manipulate the public fascination with wills through disguise in order to set up future targets. Horace points out

that observers are interested in *ut patiens, ut amicis aptus, ut acer* (43) the *captator* might be, while he expands his quarry through reputation as a friend. Naturally this is possible only through the illusion of *amicitia* which lies in a moderate approach.

In Juvenal, however, the *captator* is completely extravagant in his courting of the testator. This is mostly shown by the descriptions of his elaborate sacrifices – both actual and potential - which are excessive, expensive and execrable.<sup>23</sup> Flattery and thoughtful gestures are considered only barely, if at all, as this is a business purely of conspicuous consumption.<sup>24</sup> Rather than having his legacy-hunters manipulate their prey through the perversion of such social practices, Juvenal outdoes Horace by emphasizing their transgression against religion. There is presented to us only one method of baiting the prey, and that is through sacrifice, the more extravagant the better. In fact, Juvenal describes the series of escalating offers as a sort of auction, with the *captatores* as competitors for a prize (*ille superbus / incedet uictis riuilibus*, 125-26). Juvenal contrasts Pacuvius Hister, the bragging victor, with Horace's *captator*, who must practically enslave himself to the testator and maintain the illusion even in success. In fact, in the long passage devoted to the various tactics of *captatio* (88-99), Horace refers twice to this as a form of slavery, in his reference to the legacy-hunter acting as the *Davus ... comicus* (91) and summing up the hunt as *servitium* (99). Since, as we have seen, the testator of Juvenal's day is either too dumb or too greedy to care about morality, it makes sense that

---

<sup>23</sup> See chapter 2, pages 30-34.

<sup>24</sup> Ferguson (1979), *ad loc.*, notes flattery in the *captator*'s use of the diminutive form *Gallitta* (99), perhaps useful in charming a woman, but presumably not the man, Pacius.

the *captator*'s main concern appears to be outdoing his opponents, and doing so as publicly as possible. The pledges of offerings are posted openly in the portico of a public temple for anyone to see (100-1), including the testator, rival *captatores*, and other outsiders, perhaps even potential testators who might want an idea of what the market is like, so to speak. The point is that *captatio* is not something that must be done covertly, and is apparently accepted by the public, since the legacy-hunter no longer fears exposure. This also explains why many have assumed that Corvinus might be a legacy-hunter, not because *captatio* was such a matter of public interest, but because *captatores* seem to be the only ones who care, since they have to be aware of their competitors.

Therefore the theme of deception in *captatio* emphasized by Horace, as shown in the legacy-hunter's concern with his own appearance, is replaced by Juvenal with the general awareness of *captatio* as a public sport. Juvenal exaggerates the extravagance of the courting of the testator in order to show the worsening situation in an even more corrupt society, one in which such moral villains operate blatantly, rather than in disguise. Juvenal's poem thus shows a degeneration of morality since the time of Horace. While the satirical force of Horace's poem lies in the exposure of his society's inability to differentiate between *captator* and *amicus*, the satirical thrust of Satire Twelve aims not so much at decrying the *captator*'s horrific sacrifices, but at blaming society for allowing them.

It is interesting that Horace's Satire 2.5 has often been called the most Juvenalian of his works.<sup>25</sup> But although Horace's satire is perhaps more biting than usual, Juvenal's is typically more bleak, nasty and hard-hitting. In the latter's work, *captatores* are even more greedy and immoral than the cunning tricksters of Horace's poem. Juvenal amplifies the depravity of legacy-hunters as an example of his more corrupt contemporary society which completely accepts such social villains.

---

<sup>25</sup> Roberts (1984), 426 n. 2, includes a brief list of references which suggest this argument, but he argues that Horace generates *indignatio* from the reader rather than from the satirist.

## CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

In this thesis I have tried to explain the many ways in which the Twelfth Satire does not merit the negative reputation given to it by many previous scholars, and how an understanding of the relationships between Juvenal and his characters unveils levels of satire largely ignored until now. Many have seen the poem as digressive, but I trust that I have shown how these sections are purposeful and contribute to the satire of their section. This reading hinges on the understanding of the poem's complexity in its management of fluctuating narrative voices. It is difficult to distinguish Juvenal from his narrator, to discriminate between his satirical voice and those emulating the perspectives of Catullus or of the *captator*. Juvenal's narrative flow is crucial in comprehending his attitude to the characters of the poem.<sup>1</sup>

The Twelfth Satire is very ambitious in that it deals with a large array of issues in such brief compass. In addition to the moral teachings of the satire (see below), Satire Twelve comments on poetry through the purposefully challenging manipulation of forms and motifs, notably the *prosphonetikon* and the *poetica tempestas topos* of epic. In structure, the poem presents a clear and logical line of thought, which links arguments on the many themes through the criticism of greed. In terms of satirical bite, it is a testament to the flexibility of Juvenal's writing that he is able to include many light moments with the use of jokes and puns alongside some very serious satirical criticism and moral lessons.

---

<sup>1</sup> This question is perhaps most directly addressed by Littlewood (2007), 413-14.

Contrary to the perception of some scholars, there is no lack of unity. Ultimately, the poem is about greed and its various corrosive effects on society and its members. Greed is the overarching theme that encompasses the other themes on which scholars have focused their arguments. Satire Twelve shows how friendship, for example, is corrupted by greed. The most obvious display of this is the *captator*'s abuse of Roman customs of *amicitia*, undercutting the entire patrilineal system of inheritance and the morals and values which it embodied.

Another theme is sacrifice, and the effects of greed on its many forms. Again, the legacy-hunters are the prime example, making grotesque and excessive offerings to manipulate their prey for material gain. Catullus also abuses sacrifice. Like the legacy-hunters, he acts only for self-serving reasons, offering luxury-goods - which reflect his own moral decay – to the winds. Catullus also makes a grand display of his lavish offerings. But in the comparison between merchant and *captator*, we are reminded of the degrees of greed: while the former sacrifices something useless which he holds supremely dear (his luxury goods) for his life, the latter would sacrifice that which he should hold dear (his daughter) for riches. Despite this difference, both parties show how greed has a corrosive effect on society through the exploitation and degradation of sacrifice.

Greed also causes sexual abnormality and deformity. The many images of sexual mutilation throughout the poem, mostly in the poetic storm, suggest that greed emasculates its victims. Catullus, as the main example, is ridiculed, but his loss of masculinity is not so much a ridiculous joke as it is a disturbing social comment that



equates *avaritia* and *luxuria* with the abandonment of the core patriarchal values of Roman society.<sup>2</sup> Those who are consumed by this effeminizing materialism also have a distorted view of sexuality, given the *captator*'s inversion of sterility and fertility. These aberrations from sexual norms and values carry through to the power of family in inheritance, since both merchant and legacy-hunter prefer money over their own children. Thus Satire Twelve explains that greed's corrupting influence pervades all social bonds: through friendship, kinship, the ties of religion, and the common values of the state.

Since many scholars have, in my view, mistaken the poem's central theme, few have convincingly discussed how the Twelfth Satire fits with the other poems in Book Four. Anderson (1982) and Ferguson (1979) both identify the theme of the poem as greed and persuasively see this throughout the entire Book. Ferguson sees Eleven and Twelve as "appendages" of the "long and brilliant" Tenth Satire.<sup>3</sup> The later Satires of the book, he argues, constitute two contemporary examples of the main subject of Satire Ten, case studies in which Juvenal criticizes ambition, and particularly *luxuria*.<sup>4</sup> Anderson similarly sees Book Four as a contest between *ratio* and *avaritia*. For him, Eleven and Twelve are demonstrations of this theme, played out fully in Satire Ten.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Larmour (2005), 168-69.

<sup>3</sup> Ferguson (1979), 287-88, 294.

<sup>4</sup> In specifying luxury, Ferguson's argument seems more limited than mine, since *luxuria* surely arises from *avaritia*. It is the desire for riches which results in the deviations from social propriety, although wealth itself is certainly a vice.

<sup>5</sup> Anderson (1982), 287-89.

Since Satire Ten stands out as the superior poem of the book in size, scope and quality, it is not surprising that these scholars have treated it differently from the following poems. In Ten, Juvenal discusses the various targets of misguided prayers which are inspired by ambition: wealth (12-27), political power (56-113), eloquence (114-132), military glory (133-87), long life (188-288), and beauty (289-345). To prove that the vice of ambition is universal, the poet mentions some of the most famous figures of mythology and history, both ancient and modern: Priam, Alexander, Hannibal, Catiline, Cicero, and Sejanus, to name only a few. In Satires Eleven and Twelve, however, Juvenal engages casually with unknown individuals who, at least within the frame of the poem, are his contemporary acquaintances. Courtney has pointed out how the form links the moral lesson to a specific setting; instead of dealing in broad strokes with historical examples, the satire of these later poems in the book applies these teachings to a single, contemporary occasion, and to one particular individual.<sup>6</sup> In Eleven, Persicus initially appears as a friend, but lines 185-92 suggest that he is corrupted by the luxury which Juvenal, as usual, distances himself from. In Twelve, although Corvinus is the addressee, Catullus is the main example;<sup>7</sup> as with Persicus, the illusion of friendship is washed away by thinly veiled criticism. Satire Ten, in contrast, critiques vice masquerading as virtue on a large-scale. Rather than being set in one specific example, Juvenal emphasizes the universality of such vice.

---

<sup>6</sup> Courtney (1980), 491.

<sup>7</sup> Corvinus, like Persicus, is equally suspicious on account of his name, although his absence from the poem makes him quite a minor figure. As presumptive aristocrats, they may serve as representatives of Juvenal's audience, illustrations of how vice corrupts the Roman citizen. See also Courtney (1980), 17, 491.

How then do Satires Eleven and Twelve follow Ten? These later poems pick up the first of the book. With Satire Twelve, Juvenal presents a full treatment of what is adumbrated at 10.12-27, where the desire for wealth is the first and foremost of false prayers. Juvenal revisits *avaritia*, one of the worst vices, and allots an entire poem to the subject. Having discussed how ambition has ruined the most famous of men of all ages, Juvenal turns to the effects of greed on his own time. Satires Eleven and Twelve bring this threat against the traditional Roman way of life into the present-day world wherein the satirist himself is attempting to fight such moral decay. By engaging with morally suspect individuals, Juvenal also sustains throughout Book Four the theme of human stupidity and irrationality, with Catullus in particular as the main example. Thus while the later poems of the book may not stand out as the best of Juvenal's later satires, they remind the reader of the satirist's role as a moralizer in his own contemporary society, as well as for humanity in general.

As for Satire Twelve's place in Juvenal's oeuvre, it certainly shows progression from his earlier works. By placing two much shorter poems which deal with specific, isolated occasions and individuals alongside a massive and comprehensive discussion of the moral merits of universal human desires, Juvenal displays his ability to condense his didactic satire on a broad range of themes and apply it to the modern world of his own audience, familiar with garrulous merchants and ingratiatory deceivers. Juvenal also develops the theme of *captatio*, mentioned often throughout his oeuvre but never dealt with at such length or with such striking hyperbole. The poem's poetic storm is a fitting addition to the literary *topos* in both its innovative contributions and its mocking parody

of the trite hyperbole common in both literature and modern life. What is especially impressive is Juvenal's ability to tie this in with the satirical arc of the poem, using a mock-epic tone as yet another unifying force.

Coming towards the end of the tradition of Roman Satire, the poem demonstrates Juvenal's shift from harsh, cutting language to a deeper, more meaningful type of satire which warns the reader against moral decay by outlining the effects of materialism. The poem's satire is certainly valid, since it tackles a set of problems which were of paramount concern to his society. Satire Twelve is a critique of greed, intricately developed through the complex management of form and genre, themes and motifs, satirical targets, and narrative voices. Juvenal's Twelfth Satire is a testament to his development as a satirist. While it seems less brutal in language than the author's early works, this complex poem is extremely vitriolic, often in its satirical thrust, but always in its moral significance. Juvenal's trenchant use of hyperbole regarding social comportment, e.g. the *captator*'s sacrifice of his own daughter, provides a scathing portrayal of the greedy and the extent of their acquisitiveness. Since the poem casts Catullus' seemingly harmless materialism as the early stages of the same greed, Juvenal means that any manifestation of greed leads down a horrific path. Such a universally applicable message is certainly worth giving. The poem is not expressed through one sustained tone of furious indignation, as are Juvenal's earlier poems, but as a whole it provides biting and powerfully conveyed satire which speaks to the innate fallibility of each reader.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, W. S. *Essays on Roman Satire*. Princeton, 1982.
- Barber, E. J. W. "Colour in Early Cloth and Clothing." *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 9 (1999): 117-120.
- Barr, W. "Juvenal's Other Elephants." *Latomus* 32 (1973): 856-58.
- Barratt, P. M. *Annaei Lucani, Belli Civilis, Liber V: a Commentary*. Amsterdam, 1979.
- Braund, S. M. *Beyond Anger: a Study of Juvenal's Third Book of Satires*. Cambridge, 1988.
- Braund, S. M. "A Passion Unconsoled?: Grief and Anger in Juvenal Satire 13." In *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, ed. S. M. Braund and C. Gill, 68-88. Cambridge, 1997.
- Braund, S. M. *Juvenal and Persius*. Cambridge, MA, 2004.
- Cairns, F. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh, 1972.
- Champlin, E. "Creditor Vulgo Testamenta Hominum Speculum Esse Morum: Why the Romans Made Wills." *Classical Philology* 84 (1989): 198-215.
- Champlin, E. *Final Judgments: Duty and Emotion in Roman Wills, 200 B.C. - A.D. 250*. Berkeley, 1991.
- Clausen, W. V. A. *Persi et D. Iuni Iuvenalis Saturae*. Oxford, 1992.
- Coffey, M. *Roman Satire*. London, 1976.
- Colton, R. E. "Echoes of Martial in Juvenal's Twelfth Satire." *Latomus* 31 (1972): 164-73.
- Courtney, E. *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*. London, 1980.
- Decker, J. de. *Juvenalis Declamans*. Ghent, 1913.
- Duff, J. D. *Fourteen Satires of Juvenal*. Cambridge, 1970.
- Felton, K., and K. H. Lee. "The Theme of Juvenal's Eleventh Satire." *Latomus* 31 (1972): 1041-46.

- Ferguson, J. *Juvenal: the Satires*. Bristol, 1979.
- Fredericks, S. C. "Irony of Overstatement in the Satires of Juvenal." *Illinois Classical Studies* 4 (1979): 178-91.
- Fredericks, S. C. "Rhetoric and Morality in Juvenal's 8<sup>th</sup> Satire." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 52 (1971): 111-32.
- Freudenburg, K. *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge, 2001.
- Friedländer, L. *Friedländer's Essays on Juvenal*. Amsterdam, 1969.
- Frøelund, J. B. "Crime, Vice and Retribution in Juvenal's Satires." *Classica et Medievalia* 33 (1981-82): 155-68.
- Gosling, A. "Juvenal's African Animals." *Akroterion* 35 (1990): 73-79.
- Green, P. *Juvenal: the Sixteen Satires*. New York, 1998.
- Griffin, A. H. F. "The Ceyx Legend in Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, Book XI." *Classical Quarterly* 31 (1981): 147-54.
- Helmbold, W. C. "Juvenal's Twelfth Satire." *Classical Philology* 51 (1956): 123-24.
- Henderson, J. *Figuring Out Roman Nobility: Juvenal's Eighth Satire*. Exeter, 1997.
- Hight, G. *Juvenal the Satirist*. Oxford, 1954.
- Higuchi, K. "Captatio as Depicted by Martial." *Journal of Classical Studies* 1 (1953): 27-35.
- Hill, D. E. *Ovid, Metamorphoses IX-XII*. Warminster, 1999.
- Hodgart, M. *Satire*. London, 1969.
- Hooley, D. M. *Roman Satire*. Malden, MA, 2007.
- Hopkins, K. *Death and Renewal*. Cambridge, 1983.
- Huxley, H. H. "Storm and Shipwreck in Roman Literature." *Greece and Rome* 21 (1952): 117-24.

- Iddeng, J. W. "Juvenal, Satire and the Persona Theory: Some Critical Remarks." *Symbolae Osloenses* 75 (2000): 107-29.
- Irwin, M. E. "Colourful Sheep in the Golden Age." *Classical Views* 33 (1989): 23-37.
- Jenkyns, R. *Three Classical Poets*. London, 1982.
- Jones, F. "Performance in Juvenal." *Latomus* 60 (2001): 124-34.
- Jones, F. "Juvenal Satire 13." *Erano* 91 (1993): 81-92.
- Jones, F. "The Persona and the Addressee in Juvenal, Satire 11." *Ramus* 19 (1990): 160-68.
- Jones, F. "Towards an Interpretation of Juvenal, Satire 11." *Acta Classica* 26 (1983): 104-7.
- Jones, F. "A Visual Pun at Juvenal 12.81." *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 7 (1982): 140.
- Keane, C. C. "Theatre, Spectacle, and the Satirist in Juvenal." *Phoenix* 57 (2003): 257-75.
- Kershaw, A. "Juvenal 10.150 and Ennius." *Mnemosyne* 46 (1993): 532-33.
- Kleywegt, A. J. *Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica, Book I: a Commentary*. Boston, 2005.
- Lafleur, R. A. "Amicus and Amicitia in Juvenal." *Classical Bulletin* 51 (1975): 54-58.
- Lafleur, R. A. "Catullus and Catulla in Juvenal." *Revue de Philologie* 48 (1974): 17-27.
- Larmour, D. H. J. "Lightening the Load: Castration, Money, and Masculinity in Juvenal's Satire 12." *Syllecta Classica* 16 (2005): 139-72.
- Laughton, E. "Juvenal's Other Elephants." *Classical Review* 6 (1956): 201.
- Lawall, G. "Exempla and Theme in Juvenal's Tenth Satire." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 89 (1958): 25-31.
- Littlewood, C. "Poetry and Friendship in Juvenal's Twelfth Satire." *American Journal of Philology* 128 (2007): 389-418.

- Mansbach, A. R. *Captatio: Myth and reality*. Diss. Princeton University, 1982.
- Martyn, J. R. C. *Juvenal: a Farrago: a Collection of Articles on the Satires of Juvenal and on Roman Satire*. Amsterdam, 1996.
- Mayor, J. E. B. *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*. London, 1888.
- Miller, P. A. "The Bodily Grotesque in Roman Satire: Images of Sterility." *Arethusa* 31 (1998): 257-83.
- Morford, M. P. O. *The Poet Lucan*. Oxford, 1967.
- Muecke, F. *Horace Satires II*. Warminster, 1993.
- Otis, B. *Virgil: a Study in Civilized Poetry*. Oxford, 1963.
- Pearce, T. E. V. "Lao: Two Testimonia in Later Greek Poetry." *Classical Quarterly* 20 (1970), 311-13.
- Plaza, M. *The Function of Humour in Roman Verse Satire: Laughing and Lying*. Oxford, 2006.
- Powell, J. G. F. "Stylistic Registers in Juvenal." In *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, ed. J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer, 311-34. Oxford, 1999.
- Ramage, E. S., D. L. Sigsbee, and S. C. Fredericks. *Roman Satirists and their Satire*. Park Ridge, NJ, 1974.
- Ramage, E. S. "Juvenal Satire 12; On Friendship True and False." *Illinois Classical Studies* 3 (1978): 221-37.
- Reekmans, T. "Juvenal's Views on Social Change." *Ancient Society* 2 (1971): 117-61.
- Richlin, A. E. *Sexual Terms and Themes in Roman Satire and Related Genres*. Diss. Yale University, 1978.
- Roberts, M. "Horace Satires 2.5: Restrained Indignation." *American Journal of Philology* 105 (1984): 426-33.
- Romano, A. C. *Irony in Juvenal*. Hildesheim, 1979.



- Ronnick, M. V. "Juvenal, Sat. 12.32: Catullus' Shipwreck." *Museum Helveticum* 50 (1993a): 223-24.
- Ronnick, M. V. "Form and Meaning of Juvenal's Twelfth Satire." *Maia* 45 (1993b): 7-10.
- Ronnick, M. V. "Juvenal, Satire 12.81: ubi est 'ibi'?" *Scholia* 4 (1995): 105-107.
- Rudd, N. *The Satires of Horace*. Cambridge, 1966.
- Rudd, N. *Themes in Roman Satire*. Norman, OK, 1986.
- Shelton, J. E. "The Storm Scene in Valerius Flaccus." *Classical Journal* 70.2 (1975): 14-22.
- Smith, W. S. "Greed and Sacrifice in Juvenal's Twelfth Satire." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 119 (1989): 287-98.
- Stanford, W. B. *The Ulysses Theme*. Oxford, 1963.
- Sullivan, J. P., ed. *Critical Essays on Roman Literature II: Satire*. London, 1963.
- Sullivan, J. P., and J. Mazzaro. "Two Approaches to Juvenal: Satire 1 and Satire 12." *Arion* 1 (1962): 65-73.
- Tellegen J. W. "Captatio and Crimen." *Revue Internationale des Droits de l'Antique* 26 (1979): 387-97.
- Tennant, P. M. "Tongue in Cheek for 243 lines?: the Question of Juvenal's Sincerity in his Seventh Satire." *Scholia* 5 (1996): 72-88.
- Triantaphyllopoulos, J. "Juvenal's Other Elephants Once Again." *Mnemosyne* 11 (1958): 159.
- Tracy, V. A. "Aut Captantur aut Captant." *Latomus* 39 (1980): 399-402.
- Walters, J. "Making a Spectacle: Deviant Men, Invective, and Pleasure." *Arethusa* 31 (1998): 355-67.
- Walters, J. "Juvenal, Satire 2: Putting Male Sexual Deviants on Show." In *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its self-representation*, ed. L. Foxhall and J. Salmon, 148-154. London, 1998.

Weisinger, K. "Irony and Moderation in Juvenal XI." *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 5 (1972): 227-40.

Winkler, M. M. "The Function of Epic in Juvenal's Satires." *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* V, ed. C. Deroux, 414-43. Brussels, 1989.

Witke, C. *Latin Satire: the Structure of Persuasion*. Leiden, 1970.