Corax also provides a brief glimpse into Petronius' ironic strategies because he uses the raven's associations with unmusicality to hint at the irony in Eumolpus' name. This suggestion does not negate Labate's, which persuasively explains the anxiety of Encolpius. The interpretation of Corax as 'Croaker' is, however, not closely tied to any particular moment in the text; it need not explain the pattern of designations deployed in an unreliably transmitted section. Nevertheless, careful attention to these patterns allows a better appreciation of Petronius's narrative skill.

University of Wisconsin MAX GOLDMAN
mlgoldman@wisc.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838808000438

PERSIUS' MIND AT WORK: A STUDY OF THE SIXTH SATIRE[1]

The recipient, Caesius Bassus, was a lyric poet who wrote, at least occasionally, about love and had a retreat in the Sabine country (1–5). So one assumes that he was, to some extent, a disciple of Horace, though he could not have belonged to the *servum pecus* of *E.*1.19.19. Quintilian names him in rather tepid terms as the only other (dead) practitioner of the genre worth mentioning (*I.O.* 10.1.96).[2]

In lines 2–4 Persius employs several terms connected by Horace with lyric poetry.[3] The most interesting is the verb *vivunt* (2). Horace uses *vivere* of Sappho's passionate love-poems, exploring the idea of survival (*C.*4.9.11); but Persius talks of the strings of the lyre 'coming to life' under the action of the austere plectrum (*OLD* 3a). The plectrum is austere (*tetricus*) because Bassus' diction was, apparently, archaic (*veterum primordia vocum* in v. 3). But it has been suggested that the word also recalls *Mons Tetricus* on the Sabine-Picene border.

On the Ligurian coast and its stretch of water, with which Persius feels a personal link (*mihi* in v. 6, *meum* in 7), *hibernat mare* – a vivid use of a verb usually associated with an army in winter-quarters and therefore at peace.[4] Commentators cite as a

[1] These remarks may be seen as belatedly completing the discussion of *Satires* 1–5 in Chapter 5 of *Lines of Enquiry* (Cambridge 1976, paperback reprint 2004). I am indebted to a referee for some observations which are incorporated in nn. 8, 13 and 16.

[2] If in vv. 5–6 we read with most editors *mox iuvenes agitare iocos et pollice honesto / egregius lusisse senex*, Bassus, about A.D. 62, is called a *senex*, while Persius is only twenty-eight. Even assuming a low limit for *senectus*, say forty-two, that means Bassus was some fourteen years older than Persius. Yet according to the *Vita* (Valerius Probus) Persius had Bassus as a friend *a prima adulescentia*. So when Persius became a *iuvenis* at seventeen, Bassus was already thirty-one. This gap is somewhat surprising; yet the alternative is more difficult.

If, with Jahn (Leipzig 1843, repr. Hildesheim 1967) and Morton Braund (Loeb 2004) we read *mox iuvenes agitare iocos et pollice honesto / egregios lusisse senes,* there is no longer any problem about age. But then 'making fun of eminent old men' doesn't sound like a lyric writer, or even a Roman satirist; it points, rather, to comedy. Yet Quintilian recognises Bassus only as a lyrist (10.1.96).

[3] E.g. *lyra, pectine, chordae, numeris, fidis, pollice.*

[4] The shore withdraws *multa valle* (8) – 'along many a valley'; so Harvey (Leiden, 1981) and Morton Braund, perhaps rightly. In the Penguin translation I followed Conington-Nettleship, taking *multa* as *magna*, referring to a deep bay. The question could be resolved by one who knew the ancient geography of the area.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880800044X Published online by Cambridge University Press

source Horace's *hiemat mare* (*S*. 2.2.17). They are surely right, but Persius has turned the idea upside down; for in Horace it means 'stormy'. If we want a Horatian precedent for spending the winter (*bruma*) at the seaside, we will find it in *E*.1.7.11: *ad mare descendet vates*.

In v. 9 Persius becomes more specific: he is staying at Luna – a harbour recommended to the public by Ennius in a work written after he had finished the *Annals*. But Persius is never so simple. In an early passage of the *Annals* Homer had revealed in a dream that he was turning into a peacock (fr. ix Skutsch), a bird which would transfer his soul to the body of Ennius. In *E*. 2.1.52 Horace had referred to Ennius' dream as his *somnia Pythagorea*, because Pythagoras of Samos had taught the doctrine of metempsychosis. (Pythagoras himself was supposed to be the reincarnation of the Trojan Euphorbus.) Persius provides the final complication: Ennius' *cor*[5] had recommended Luna after he had 'snored off' (*destertuit* is a coinage) his identity as Quintus Maeonides (i.e. Quintus Homer) which he had acquired through the medium of Pythagoras' peacock (the bird of Samos, symbol of immortality).[6] So whereas the classical Horace had complained that Ennius as the 'second Homer' was now beyond criticism, Persius is talking, not about stylistic elegance, but about the difference between the inspired 'Homeric' utterance of the *Annals* and the down-to-earth level of the miscellaneous *Saturae*.

On several occasions Horace expresses his attitude to the crowd. Once he makes a sensible distinction: *interdum vulgus rectum videt, est ubi peccat* (*E*. 2.1.63). Usually, however, he implies distaste (*S*. 1.4.72, 1.6.18, *C*. 1.35.25, 2.16.40, 3.1.1, *E*. 1.20.11). Persius (12–14) affects indifference (*securus vulgi*); he then moves on to indifference about what the *auster* may do to his cattle (*pecori*) – which is, of course, a kind of wealth, then to another kind of wealth – the fertility of his neighbour's soil (*angulus ille / vicini…pinguior*). At each point he varies his construction – first a noun in the genitive, then an indirect question, then a clause of reason. Finally in 14–17 he expands the idea still further: he will ignore the richness of everyone else – even his social inferiors. With *quid praeparet auster* (12) he may have had in mind Virgil, *G*. 1.462 – *quid cogitet…auster*, but it is worth recalling that in one tradition Horace, *Epod*. 16.61–2 reads*: nulla nocent pecori contagia, nullius austri / gregem aestuosa torret impotentia*. But in the envy of his neighbour's bit of land (*angulus ille vicini*) he certainly alludes to Horace, who ridicules the same attitude – *o si angulus ille / proximus accedat* (*S*. 2.6.8–9).

In refusing to resent his wealthy social inferiors Persius calls them *orti peioribus* (15). This recalls a another passage about resentful emulation, in which Horace will not over-work in the fear that Mutus, with the help of his wife's money, may bring in a larger harvest – a shaming prospect, for he is *peioribus ortus* (*E*. 1.6.21–2). In his efforts to vie with such people Persius will not *curvus ob id minui senio* (16) – a striking expression.; for although *senium* is an extension of 'old age' (something like 'an old man's grumpiness'), Persius pulls it back towards its root meaning with the adjective *curvus* ('bent'), which enforces *minui* ('become shrivelled'). The word *senium* occurs only once in Horace, where he advises a client to set aside *inhumanae senium Camenae* (*E*. 1.18.47) – 'the ill-humour of the unsociable Muse'; i.e. don't insist on being left alone to compose poetry. Instead join your patron in a hunting expedition; that will

[5] *Cor Enni* = 'the intelligent Ennius'; cf. *cordatus* in *Ann*. 329 with Skutsch's note.

[6] The wording of the new Loeb, p.116, n. 1 might seem to imply that the descent was peacock–Homer – peacock – Ennius.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880800044X Published online by Cambridge University Press

give you an appetite for your dinner (*cenes ut…pulmenta*). In Persius the Horatian presence is supported by the fact that the idea of dining is reversed: as a second penalty the miser has to dine *without* dainties (*cenare sine uncto* in v. 16). A third penalty is to sniff the seal on a stale wine-jar (*signum in vapida naso tetigisse lagoena* in v. 17), i.e. to keep a jar so long that when one checks it the contents are stale. In general sense this is like Horace's Avidienus, who is too mean to open his wine until it has gone sour : *nisi mutatum parcit defundere vinum* (*S*.2.2.58); but in Horace it is the olive oil that smells – *cuius odorem olei nequeas perferre* (59).

Someone may disagree – even twins vary (18–22). One is a miser who as a special birthday treat dips his dry greens in a cupful of brine; he personally drizzles (*inrorans*) the precious pepper on to the plate. Avidienus (above) on *his* birthday drips oil on to his salad (*instillat* in v. 62). This lies behind Persius' *inrorans*, which, as Harvey says, is very bold, for, however tiny the grains, pepper is a solid. The other twin munches his way through a huge inheritance. Persius himself represents a sensible mean (22–4): he will use what he has, but not to the extent of serving turbots (*rhombos*) to his freedmen; nor is he such an epicure as to distinguish the subtle flavour (*salivas*)[7] of hen thrushes (*turdarum*). In that same satire (*S*. 2.2) Horace mentions turbots four times (42, 48, 49, 95), thrushes once (74).[8]

At this point (27) the miser objects, not unreasonably, that he has to meet an obligation; a ship-wrecked friend is seen as clinging to the rocks of Bruttium and then as sprawled, still alive, on the beach. Horace makes no mention of Bruttium, but the allusion comes into view when we hear that the miser's friend has consigned all his goods (as if deliberately) to the Ionian Sea (28–9). Horace's one reference to the Ionian Gulf comes in *Epod*. 10.19, where the wretched Mevius is also pictured as sprawled on the beach, his boat, like the other's, shattered. Mevius' prayers have been ignored by Jupiter who has turned away (18), just as those of the miser's friend are *surda* (transferred from the unhearing gods to the unheard prayers in 28). Two interesting departures: whereas Mevius in prospect provides food for the gulls (22), in Persius it is the ribs of the stricken vessel that are at the mercy of the gulls (30) – as if they were covered with meat.[9] In Persius the giant gods from the vessel's stern (*puppe*) are lying there too (30). These gods may come from another boat in danger of foundering – that of *C*. 1.14.10, whose gods have been shattered, if not carried overboard; in any case the terrified crew put no trust in the painted stern (*puppibus*).

To meet this reasonable point, Persius now recommends his interlocutor to cut a sod off his landed capital (*frange aliquid*) and give it to the poor fellow (31–3) – again, a moderate response to the situation. You may argue, he concedes, that your heir will be angry because you have truncated his inheritance (*rem curtaveris*, continuing the image of breaking off); when you die he will skimp on the funeral feast and will put your bones into the urn without scent (33–7).[10] Because *curtare* is used just once in a similar financial context by Horace (*S*. 2.3.124), it is worth comparing the two

[7] Propertius uses *saliva* = taste (4.8.38). At several points, in fact, Propertius foreshadows Persius' daring use of language; thus in 1.7.18 *agmina septem* (a poem on the Seven against Thebes) lie *in aeterno surda…situ*, just as in Persius (28) a man's *surda vota* are sunk in the sea. There 'unhearing' is extended to 'unheard'; cf. the observations on *logopoeia* in Pound's *Homage to Sextus Propertius* in my *The Classical Tradition in Operation* (Toronto, 1994), 140–6.

[8] Where the gender is clear in Horace, it is masculine (*S*. 1.5.72, 2.5.10, *E*. 1.15.41). I am told of an (old wives'?) tale that the flesh of a female turkey is superior.

[9] Cf. Martial's complaint: *nec costa data est caudave missa mihi* (9.48.10).

[10] In *spirent cinnama surdum* (35) the adjective is further extended from 'unheard' to 'unsmelt' *via* the comprehensive idea of 'dull'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880800044X Published online by Cambridge University Press

passages. Horace indignantly asks an old miser if he really thinks he will be in need; how much would his capital be truncated (*curtabit*) every day if he bought decent oil for his salad and his hair? In Persius the emphasis lies on the greedy heir: he will resent even a sensible gesture on the part of his father, and take revenge by giving him a cheap funeral. The querulous heir continues: like Bestius,[11] he ostensibly upholds Roman tradition, blaming his father's expensive habits on Greek experts (*doctores Graios*): 'ever since their emasculated wisdom/taste (*sapere*)[12] entered the city along with pepper and dates, our farmhands have spoilt their porridge with greasy sauces' (38–40). The complaint is dismissed by Persius: *haec cinere ulterior metuas?* (41) – a phrase in which the remains of the pyre (*cinis*) take the place of the pyre as a whole, which itself takes the place of the final generality, death. One wonders if the idea of something surviving beyond the pyre may have been prompted by the beginning of Propertius' most haunting poem (in every sense): *Sunt aliquid manes: letum non omnia finit, / luridaque evictos (?) effugit umbra rogos* (4.7.1–2)

In 41ff. Persius turns to address his imaginary heir, who is expecting a hefty legacy. He warns him that he intends to splash out money,[13] bringing on a hundred pairs of gladiators to celebrate Caligula's (bogus) triumph over Germany – a comic fiction of course, since the triumph took place in the poet's childhood, and in no way represents his real position. It simply illustrates how one extreme may give rise to its opposite. Again the idea comes from Horace: the *centum paria* recalls the *centum paria* which the heirs of the miser Staberius were committed to pay for, if they failed to record their father's assets on his tombstone (Horace, *S*. 2.3.84–6).[14] There too, one extreme is countered by another. Finally, on the matter of birth and descent, Persius condemns unwarranted pride to the point of absurdity, claiming that he is prepared to go off to Bovilla and make some beggar his heir (52–6). We are left to infer that the proper attitude lies somewhere in the middle. So if a relative does expect to inherit, he'd better not be too importunate: Persius is still up and running; the man shouldn't grab the torch (our baton) before the poet has finished his lap. This is a variation of Lucretius' famous image, in which a member of one generation hands on the torch of life to his descendant (*DRN*. 2.79).

The image of a hand-over leads Persius to a painting of Mercury offering a purse of silver to a lucky mortal. Any such gift should be accepted with gratitude (cf. Horace, *S*. 2.6.5) without calculating the receipts, adding the interest, and working out the remainder. As Conington-Nettleship point out, such mental arithmetic recalls Horace's satirical description of a boys' class in *A.P*. 325ff. At the end Persius passes

[11] In Horace, *E*. 1.15.37 Bestius appears as a one-time spendthrift, now a vociferous critic of extravagance. He says nothing there, however, against the Greeks. The detail is therefore an original expansion on the part of Persius, or (less likely) it is based on some information about Bestius from Horace's time.

[12] Some years ago, by a most regrettable oversight, I failed to take account of Housman's note in *Classical Papers* vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1972), 861–2, which pointed out that in Horace, *S*. 2.8.14–15 (*fuscus Hydaspes / Caecuba vina ferens, Alcon Chium maris expers*) *maris expers* (eunuch) refers to *Alcon* and is a parallel to *fuscus*. There cannot be a punning reference to the absence of sea-water; for, in a pun, two different senses can be applied to the same person or thing; but in Horace's passage two different senses would have to be applied to two different entities (a person and a thing). I offer nervous apologies to that great and scornful shade.

[13] This reverses Horace (*C*. 2.14.25–8) where the heir will recklessly spend the money which his father is too mean to enjoy.

[14] The amount of the dead father's assets, carved on his tombstone, would reveal the extent of his sons' profligacy. Jahn's commentary (p. 223) quotes one of numerous inscriptions recording grants from wealthy citizens for such shows.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880800044X Published online by Cambridge University Press

from the greedy heir to the pursuit of money in general – a pursuit which can be endless. By way of illustration he employs the logical argument of the *sorites* or pile. Horace had used it in his attack on conservative poetic taste (*E*. 2.1.34–49): How old does a poem have to be before it acquires value? A hundred years? What if it's only ninety-nine? If that's allowed, why not ninety-eight? And so by 'the dwindling pile' he neatly effects the collapse of the hostile critic. Persius, however, (75–80) asks the business man how much he wants to make; will it be enough if he doubles his capital? No? Well suppose he increases it by three-fold…four-fold…ten-fold?[15] If he manages to pin-point where to stop, he has succeeded in putting a limit to Chrysippus' infinitely growing pile.[16] So Persius transfers the context from poetry to money; and unlike Horace's dwindling pile, his is a growing one. Finally, as a loyal Stoic, he attributes the argument to its originator, Chrysippus.

The concluding reference to Stoicism is no surprise. And yet it has always been recognised that in the body of the poem 'the poet retreats from the uncompromising Stoic austerity of the earlier satires and speaks to a friend through a more relaxed persona'.[17] If this is so (and I believe it is), it would not have involved a total rejection of the Stoic tradition. One thinks of the more flexible and inclusive attitude of Panaetius as reflected in Cicero. I mention only Cicero, *De Fin*. 4.79 (his eclecticism), *De Off*. 1.93 (on *temperantia et modestia*), 1.129 (the avoidance of extremes), 2.55 (the observance of the mean in gifts; money should not be squandered on gladiatorial shows; cf. Persius 6.48–9), 2.56 (Aristotle's authority is invoked), 2.59 (*mediocritatis regula optima est*). So perhaps as a friendly gesture Persius is accommodating his own philosophy to that of his friend, upholding a moderate and sensible hedonism (e.g. *utar* in 22, and the *via media* in 23–4), and suspending the more rigorous opinions which he voices elsewhere.

It might just be, of course, that the features mentioned above were not merely diplomatic adjustments, and that Persius was actually moving towards an easier and more tolerant outlook. We will never know for sure. But at any rate, the friendship with Bassus held; for he is said to have edited Persius' work after the poet's death. He himself survived until A.D.79, when he perished in the eruption of Vesuvius.

Department of English, University of Liverpool NIALL RUDD
niall.rudd@virgin.net
doi:10.1017/S000983880800044X

[15] *Sinus* is often the fold of a toga used for a pocket (*OLD* 4). With *redit in rugam* (79) Persius may well be glancing at that sense.

[16] Tibullus 1.1 also ends with an *acervus* (77).

[17] M. Morford, *Persius* (Boston, 1982), 65. D.M. Hooley, however, believes that 'Epicurean moderation has never been seriously advocated by Persius' (*The Knotted Thong* [Michigan, 1997], 172). Morton Braund (n. 2), 114 agrees.

AMYCUS' CAVE IN VALERIUS FLACCUS

Scholarship so far has not done justice to a descriptive and intertextual *tour de force* by the generally under-rated Valerius Flaccus. At 4.177–86 he depicts the cave where the gigantic Amycus has killed many men and where he himself will shortly be killed

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880800044X Published online by Cambridge University Press