

wichtig, wo er Ariadnes Lage beschreibt. Es heißt nämlich Vers 52/53 von ihr: *namque fluentisno prospectans liore Diae / Thesae cedentem celeri cum classe tuetur*. Die Entsprechungen zu Propert. (1/2) sind evident: *fluentisno ... liore* und *desertis ... lioribus*; *Thesae cedentem celeri cum classe* und *Thesae ... cedente carina* (wobei hier als verbindende Klammer die Alliteration hinzukommt). Wenige Verse darauf (57) lesen wir bei Catull: *desertam in sola miseram se cernat harena*. Die Ariadne Catulls erblickt sich verlassen an einsamem Gestade, an einem öden Sandstrand (1–7, 57).¹¹ Catull bezeichnet hier sowohl das Verlassensein Ariadnes wie ihre Lage in menschenleerer Landschaft (*desertam ... sola*), während Propert. beide Aspekte auf die Verse 43 und 2 verteilt: In Vers 2 wird die Landschaft, in Vers 43 Cynthia verlassen genannt.¹² Die vom Dichter verlassene Cynthia vergleicht sich hier also mit der von Theseus verlassenen Ariadne.

In Vers 43 sind aber beide Komponenten vertreten: Cynthia, als die vom Dichter verlassene (*deserta*) Geliebte, gibt durch *meum quarebar* zu erkennen, daß sie allein ist, insofern sie ihre Klage nur an sich selbst richten kann. In *meum* ist also *sola* impliziert. Schon deshalb kann *deserta* nicht einfach gleich *sola* sein.¹³

bezieht *deserta* ausdrücklich nur auf Cynthia. Aber diese weist auf Ariadne am Anfang zurück. Am Ende ihrer Klage (200) sagt dann Ariadne bei Catull: *solan Thesurus me ... reliquit*, womit sie gewissermaßen Vers 57 (*in sola ... se cernat harena*) mit Vers 133 (*liquisti in liore, Theseu*) kombiniert.

¹¹ Wohl diese Stelle aufnehmend, läßt Ovid, *fast.* 3, 479/480, Ariadne vorwurfsvoll fragen: *quid me desertis mortuam, Liber, harenis / servabas?* Catulls auf Ariadne bezogenes *desertam* wird also hier zu *harenis* gestellt und entspricht damit Propertzens *desertis lioribus*.

¹² Auch *miseram* wird von Propert. Vers 40 mit *me miseram* aufgenommen.

¹³ Hätte Propert. Cynthia nur alleingelassen oder einsam nennen wollen, hätte er *sola* gesagt. Das hat er 1, 12, 13/14. Dort mußte er feststellen, daß Cynthias Liebe zu ihm dahingeschwunden ist, und beschreibt nun seine Lage mit den Worten: *nunc pri-mum longas solus cognoscere noctes / cogor*. Er wird also gezwungen, lange Nächte allein, ohne die Geliebte, zu erleben. Ähnlich sagt er von sich, nachdem ihm die Liebe seiner Herrin (*domina*) geraubt ist: *abrepto solus amore vacem* (1, 13, 2) und flücht 2, 9, 46 *solus ero, quoniam non licet esse tuum* hinzu.

MS 112 (1999)

JOSHUA D. SOSIN / DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA

Ausonian Allusions to Juvenal's Satires

It has been acknowledged for more than a century that the satirist Juvenal was one of the favorite authors of D. Magnus Ausonius. Dozens of passages in Ausonius that appear to draw inspiration from Juvenal have been collected and tabulated.¹ But in the focus upon listing echoes, Ausonius' specific habits and objectives of literary allusion have been neglected. The present study shows that Ausonius' echoes of Juvenal follow a fixed, but fluid model: a verbal echo – almost verbatim, and never more than two or three words – is embedded in a matrix of less direct echoes that

¹ C. Hosius, *De Iuvenalis codicum recensione interpolata*, Bonn 1888, 14 n. 2 = *Apparatus criticus ad Iuvenalem*, Bonn 1888, 54 n. 2; H. A. Strong, *Ausonius' Debt to Juvenal*, CJ 25 (1911), 15; G. Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist*, Oxford 1934, 297/298 n. 8; R. E. Colton, *Ausonius and Juvenal*, CJ 69 (1973), 41–51 [the most comprehensive list, although some of the echoes he cites are not entirely persuasive]; R. P. H. Green, *Ausonius' Use of the Classical Latin Poets: Some New Examples and Observations*, CQ 27 (1977), 441–452; *The Works of Ausonius*, Oxford 1991, index s.v. Juvenal. See also R. E. Colton, *Ausonius' Ephemeris and Three Classical Poets*, 27–30; Horace in Ausonius' *Parentalia* and *Proffessores*, CB 51 (1974/75) 40–42; Catullus 1 and Martial 1.3, 3.2 in Ausonius, *Eclogues* 1, CB 52 (1976), 66/67; *Some Unusual Words Used by Martial and Ausonius*, and: *Some Echoes of Horace in Ausonius' Epistulae*, CB 54 (1977), 8–10, 27–30; Vergil and Horace in Ausonius, *Epist.* 4, CB 58 (1982), 40–42; *Some Echoes of Propertius in Ausonius*, CB 59 (1983), 62–65; *Horace's Sabine Farm and Ausonius' Estate near Bordeaux*, CB 63 (1987), 41/42; *Echoes of Persius in Ausonius*, *Latomus* 47 (1988), 875–882. For more substantial treatments of the Latin poets' ancient reception by Ausonius see N. G. Davis, *Cupid at the Ivory Gates: Ausonius' ancient reception by Ausonius* in *Antiquity* 30 (1994), 162–170; K. Smolak, *Der Dichter Theon und die Choliamben des Persius*, *WS.* 91 (1978), 175–186; M. R. Posani, *Reminiscenze di poeti latini nella Mosella di Ausonio*, *SIFC* 34 (1962), 31–69; W. Görl, *Virgilizate in Ausonius' Mosella*, *Hermes* 97 (1969), 94–114; H. D. Jocelyn, *Catullus 58 and Ausonius*, *Ep.* 71, *LCM* 4 (1979), 87–91; R. P. H. Green, *Ausonius to the Rescue?* (Vergil A. 1.455–6 *artificumque manus inter se operumque laborem miratur*), *LCM* 7 (1982), 116–118; for Ausonius' appropriation of prose works R. P. H. Green, *Marius Maximus and Ausonius' Caesares*, CQ 31 (1981), 226–236; B. Baldwin, *Ausonius and the Historia Augusta*, *Gymnasium* 88 (1981), 438; H. Szelest, *Ausonius und Suetonius*, *ZivAvAnt* 26 (1976), 433–442.

are thematic in nature.² In so doing Ausonius weaves an intricate web in which competing genres are carefully combined and opposing treatments of the same theme are delicately intertwined. Three allusions that exemplify this technique will be explored along philological, generic and thematic lines; they are Ausonius Epistulae (27) 1: Juvenal Satire 4, Ausonius De Hereditio (6); Juvenal Satire 3, and Ausonius Epithaphia (12, Astyanacti) 15; Juvenal Satire 5. It will be shown that Ausonius' allusive practice establishes a symbiotic relationship between the echoed text and the Ausonian text into which the echo is imported. Thus Ausonius exploits the thematic and generic tensions³ between his text and the echoed text in order to define more closely a setting for his own poems both on their own terms and in their relationship to their classical predecessors. While the poems in which Ausonius echoes the Satires tend to be short, their programmatic allusiveness is sustained and systemic. The allusions do not simply invoke words, verses, or passages, on the model of a rhetorical figure,⁴ but rather they establish deep structural, thematic and generic lines of connection.⁵ This allusive practice is both argumentative and integrative,⁶ it offers interpretation of the echoed text and a mode of interpreting Ausonius' text.⁷

² It has been argued that ancient commentators did not recognize „imitation as a form of ‚structural‘ or ‚thematic‘ allusion“; see R. Kaster, *Macrobius and Servius: Verecundia and the Grammarian's Function*, HSCP 84 (1980), 232/233; see also M. Wiggotsky, *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry*, Wiesbaden 1972, *Hermes Einzelschriften* 24 8–12, 140/141. On imitation and thematic allusion see D. M. Hooley, *Persius' Refractory Muse: Horatian Echoes in the Sixth Satire*, *AJP* 114 (1993), 137–154; The Knotted Thong: Structures of Mimesis in Persius, *Ann Arbor* 1997, 122–174. Ausonius' own use of literary allusion implies a well developed sense of imitation as structural and thematic allusion; see Szelest (n. 1).

³ For allusion as a means of expressing contrasting themes and narrative elements, as opposed to imitation and importation whole-cloth, see R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Vergil's Aeneid: Subversion by Intertextuality*: *Calculus* 66:39–40 and Other Examples, *G&R* 41 (1994), 187–204, esp. 191–193.

⁴ G. B. Conte, *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*, translated by C. Segal, Ithaca and London 1986, 32–39, 52–69. See also L. Edmunds, *Intertextuality Today*, *Lexis* 13 (1995), 3–22, esp. 14.

⁵ J. Farrell, *Vergil's Georgics and the Tradition of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History*, New York and Oxford 1991, 61–127. G. B. Conte, *Genres and Readers: Lucretius, Love Elegy, Pliny's Encyclopedia*, translated by G. W. Most, Baltimore 1994, 138–141.

⁶ For a clear formulation of this type of symbiosis see J. E. G. Zeisel, *Catullus, Ennius, and the Poetics of Allusion*, *JCS* 8 (1983), 251–266.

⁷ For self-conscious insertion of the poem, by the poem, into a poetic tradition see A. Barchiesi, *Future Reflexive: Two Modes of Allusion and Ovid's Heroides*, *HSCP* 95 (1993), 352.

Finally, brief conclusions will be offered on the light that this allusive technique may shed on Ausonian poetics.

Ausonius Epistulae (27) 1 : Juvenal Satire 4⁸

In a letter to his son Hesperius (27, 1) Ausonius echoes a passage from Satire 4:⁹

- 1 *Qualis Piceae populator turdus olivae*
clunes opimal cereas,
vel qui lucentes rapuit de vitibus uvas
 5 *pendelique nexas reibus,*
quae vespertinis fluitant nebulosa sub horis
vel mane lenta roscida,
tales hibernis ad te de saepibus ipsos
capi volentes, mistinus
 10 *bis denos: tot enim crepero sub hincis ecae*
praiceps volatus intulit:
lumi, quas vicinae suggestit praeda lacunae,
anates maritias tunximus,
remipedes, lato populantes caerulea rostro,
et crure rubras punico,
 15 *iricolor vario pinxit quas pluma colore,*
collum columbis aemulas.
defrudata meae non sunt haec fercula mensae:
vescente te fruimur magis:
vale bene, ut valeam.

(„Such a thrush, plunderer of Piceae olive, / as fattens its waxy haunches, / or one that snatches glowing grape clusters from the vine / and hangs shared in the nets, / [5] which float cloud-like in the evening hours / or stretched in the dewy morning, / such thrushes from their wintry hedges to you, themselves / wishing to be caught, I send, / twice ten in number, for so many, under the twilight of the eastern light, / [10] flew headlong into the net. / Next, I add pairs of mated ducks which a raid / on a nearby

⁸ Citations from Ausonius follow the text and numeration of Green (n. 1), whose concordance of editions may be consulted against earlier fabrications of echoes (n. 1); citations from the Satires follow the text of Clausen (OCT 2:1991).

⁹ On Satire 4 in general see R. S. Kilpatrick, *Juvenal's Patchwork Satires: 4 and 7*, *YCS* 23 (1973), 229–241, esp. 229–235; G. B. Townend, *The Literary Substrata of Juvenal's Satires*, *JRS* 63 (1973), 148–160, esp. 154–158; R. Stewart, *Domitian and Roman Religion: Juvenal Satires Two and Four*, *TAPA* 124 (1994), 309–332; W. C. Helmhold and E. N. O'Neil, *The Structure of Juvenal IV 4*, *AJP* 77 (1956), 68–73; J. G. Griffith, *Juvenal, Status and the Flavian Establishment*, *G&R* 16 (1969), 134–150; T. E. S. Flintoff, *Juvenal's Fourth Satire*, *Leeds Latin Seminar* 6 (1990), 121–137.

pond furnished, / ear-footed, with wide bill plundering the blue waters, / and reddish in their purple thighs, / [15] which a rainbow of plumage tints with different hues, / riving doves in their collar-tufts. / These courses have not deprived my table: / I gain a greater pleasure from your eating them. / Fare well, that I may fare well!"

The letter presents itself as composed to accompany a gift of game birds. The echo involves three words, *ipsos / capi volentes* (27, 1, 8). They recall Juvenal 4, 69, *ipse capi voluit*. The first couplet of the epistle calls up the same region of Italy as the bay in which the giant turbot of Satire 4 is snared (27, 1, 1/2): *Qualis Picenae populator turdis olivae / clunes opimat cereas*. The Satirist's turbot is Picene (4, 39 – 41):

40 *incidit Hadriaci spatium admirabile rhombi
ante Domum Veneris, quam Dorica sustinet Ancon,
implevitque sinus.*

(...into the net fell an Adriatic turbot of awesome size / [40] before the temple of Venus, which Doric Ancona lifts high, / and it filled the curving folds.)

Juvenal's fisherman is specifically tied to that region by name (*Picens*, 4, 65). The same geographical setting is evoked in both poems. There is a further parallel between the bird-nets that are stretched and taut¹⁰ from the morning's catch (*gnae vespertinis fuitant nebulosa sub horis / vel mane lena roscida*, 27, 1, 5/6) and the Satirist's bay, or fishing net, that is filled by the turbot's girth (*implevitque sinus*, 4, 41). *Sinus* (4, 41) may denote equally the bay of Ancona, or the folds of the fisherman's net.

The Satirist bends the course of the seasons so that the fish may travel from the Adriatic coast down to Rome, as it were, refrigerated (4, 56 – 59):

56 *iam leijero cedente pruinis
autumno, iam quartanam sperantibus aegris,
stridebat deformis hiems praedamque recentem
servabat: tamen hic properat, velut urgeat auster.*

([56] ...Already with death-bringing Autumn yielding to frost, / with the sick already hopping for a third-day fever, / unsightly winter started howling and kept the plunder fresh, / nevertheless he rushed on, as if the southerly compelled.)

The awesome size of the imperial turbot commands the respect even of the seasons, whose timely shift enables the fisherman to bring his gift to the emperor. Ausonius too emphasizes the "wintry hedges" from which his gift comes (27, 1, 7): *hibernis ... saepibus*. And yet while similar regions and seasons are invoked in both poems, the pastoral beauty of Ausonius'

¹⁰ The nets are distended with snared birds, not heavy with dew: Green 1991 (n. 1), ad loc.

scenery stands in sharp contrast to the bleak aspect of the Satirist's. The giant turbot is compared to fish that make their way down to Pontus after lurking beneath the winter's ice (4, 44): *tardos et longo frigore pingues*. Ausonius' catch, however, fattens its delicate, waxy haunches and is bedecked with a rainbow of bright colors (27, 1, 2: 13–15). An ill-formed, death-bringing, howling, fever-ridden winter wind accompanies the Picene's booty, *praedam* (4, 56 – 59), whereas Ausonius' is captured from scenic wintry hedges (27, 1, 7). The bitter coldness of the Satirist's gift is exchanged for the pastoral charm of Ausonius'. In generic terms Ausonius offers a pastoral alternative to a satiric outlook.

In addition to the common settings we also find a striking parallel in the underlying theme of the 'bait' in both poems. Having snared the giant turbot, the mock heroic Picene fisherman, the *cumbae linique magister* (4, 45), has no choice but to hand it over to the emperor, lest he himself be snared by bands of informers (4, 46 – 48): *quis enim proponere talem / auere audeat, cum plena et litora mullo / delatore forent?* Fearful that the seaweed-inspectors might promptly seize the turbot on the grounds that it had escaped from the imperial fish-preserves, *vivaria*, (4, 48–51), the Picene promptly delivers the fish to a preserve stocked with different beasts, the hall where Domitian's cabinet is to meet. The grotesque¹¹ pack of cabinet-members are herded and hustled (*properabat*, 4, 76; 94) into Domitian's hall, like beasts into a closed pen. They are described in terms of the slaughterer that they have eluded, or the predators to whom they eventually will succumb.¹² When the emperor has had his fill of the charade a council he ushers out the cabinet-members (4, 145/146): *quos Albanam dux magnus in arcem / traxerat attonitos et festinare coactos*. Domitian's hall is portrayed as a *vivarium* of another sort, and the cabinet-members the stock in it. And yet there is an irony in Domitian's portrayal as lord of the fish-pond for the satire closes with the snaring and killing of Domitian himself (4, 153/154), the fruition of the double-edged metaphor of the *vivarium* that is first established when the Picene invites Domitian to glut his belly on feed, *sagina* (4, 67), like a beast that is fattened for slaughter.¹³

The theme of the bait is equally fundamental in Ausonius' letter to his son. The thrushes that he has caught are likened to the Picene thrush, the

¹¹ For a recent discussion of the Bakhtinian aspect of the Domitian and his parade of ghastly informers and court hangers-on see M. M. Winkler, *Alogia and Emphasis in Juvenal's Fourth Satire*, *Ramus* 24 (1995), 59 – 81, esp. 74–76.

¹² Pegasus (4, 92/93), the younger Acilius (4, 95/96, note also his description as a hunter himself at 4, 99–101), Pompeius (4, 110), Fuscus (4, 111/112), Calulus (4, 113).

¹³ See Winkler (n. 11), 68/69.

Picene populator turdus olivæ (27, 1, 1), who in snatching (*rapuit*, 27, 1, 2) a hanging grape hangs snared in the nets (*rexus retibus*, 27, 1, 4). So too a raid on a pond (*praeda*, 27, 1, 11) has provided Ausonius with the ducks that he gives. The subject of the raid is ambiguous: Ausonius raids the pond and catches the ducks; the ducks raid the pond in order to catch fish but are caught in a raid themselves, just as Domitian lords it over his preserve as the chief predator, but one day becomes the prey. Like the thrushes, the ducks are described as plunderers as well (*populantes*, 27, 1, 13); like the thrushes the plundering ducks are plundered themselves.

Ausonius' epistle and Satire 4 share not only a common setting, and the theme of the 'bait', but common reasons for the gift as well.¹⁴ Crispinus' purchase, the Satirist says, might be understandable if the fish were intended as a means of buying his way into a rich man's will or a rich woman's favors (4, 18–21), but the Satirist is indignant that the fish is purchased for Crispinus' own consumption: *emii sibi* (4, 22). Crispinus is as greedy as Domitian. Ausonius is not. Both Ausonius' epistle and Satire 4 center around the gift of game. The sophisticated Ausonius gives away the fowl which he has snared. So too the rough but wily Picene fisherman donates his catch to the imperial mess (4, 65–69):

65
tum Picens, accipe' dixit
,privatis maiora focus, genitalis agatur
iste dies, propera stomachum laxare sagina
et tua servatum consume in saecula thombum.
ipse capi voluit, quid aperitius?

([65].) Then the Picene said, "Take it: / It's too big for private hearths. Why don't you have / yourself a party? Hurry up and glut your belly on feed / and devour the turbot that has been saved for your reign: / It wanted to be caught. / What could be more obvious?"

The conceit of willing capture (*ipse capi voluit*) is the crowning touch to the fisherman's flattery, the rhetorical bait, and this is the memorable phrase that Ausonius echoes: *ipsos capi volentes*. The Satirist responds with a sneer, *quid aperitius?*

¹⁴ The two poems share a similar structure as well. The first third of Ausonius' poem is devoted to the description of the bird-hunter's ultimate catch (*Qualis ... tales*: 1–7), while its remainder treats the real catch and the gift to Hesperius. Juvenal's satire is structured similarly. The first 36 lines (roughly 1/4) of Satire 4 treat Crispinus' purchase of an exorbitantly priced mullet, while the rest of the satire sets Domitian's watery monstrem in parallel to Crispinus'; see Kilpatrick (n. 9), 229–235; Townend (n. 9), 154–158, as against Griffith (n. 9), 134–150.

Ausonius' reply is different and so is his conception of the gift. The abrupt Picene fisherman attaches all significance to the recipient, offering the transparent excuse that the fish was too grand for a commoner's kitchen. Ausonius, on the other hand, conceives of the gift more as an altruistic exchange between father and son (17/18): *defrudata meae non sunt haec fercula mensae; / vescentie te fruimur magis*. The father says that he gains more pleasure from the thought of his son eating the birds than he would if he ate them himself.¹⁵ If the couplet had come from the mouth of the Picene fisherman it would have qualified as *aperitius*. Here, certainly not. Ausonius' gift is offered with as much sincere good will as the Picene's is with flattery and expectation of return.¹⁶ Ausonius' statement, *ipsos capi volentes* is not open to the same objection, *quid aperitius?* The willing capture is mentioned more in light jest than in bald flattery, and it occurs in the body of the poem. The mild joke of willing capture is a part of the gift itself, not a crowning gesture of adulation. Like the nature of the mild joke, the structural balance of the two poems is reversed. For the Satirist the briefly told donation of the turbot is the necessary prelude to a lengthy parade of adulatory court uglies and informers. Ausonius, however, devotes most of the epistle to an elaborate description of the birds, emphasizing the gift, not the recipient. As with the contrast between the harsh, biting setting of Satire four and the pastoral charm of Ausonius 27, 1, the Picene's satiric dedication (4, 65–69) is as abrupt and rude as Ausonius' (27, 1) is touching.

Ausonius' echo of Satire 4 may be analyzed from three perspectives: structure, genre and theme. Structurally, Ausonius employs a three-word echo, taken almost verbatim, from Juvenal's poem. The words alone would be sufficient proof of the echo, but the thematic parallels between the two poems make it doubly secure. The geographical and climatic settings are parallel. The occasions for the gifts are common to both. The theme of the 'bait' and capture, and of predator-become-prey underlie both poems. Furthermore, in generic terms the Ausonian presentation poem is equivalent to the Picene fisherman's speech. The theme of bait and capture is internal to the Ausonian presentation, but it looks back to the capture scene in the first half of Satire 4 and forward to the flattery and blandishment of the second half of the satire. We could even suggest that the conceit of willing capture and the plundering of a gift strikes a self-referential chord: the Satirist's verse gives the impression of having been willingly captured by the

¹⁵ The evidence that this sentiment is a "common theme in such letters," is not overwhelming; Green 1991 (n. 1), ad loc.

¹⁶ E. Courtney, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London 1980, 212 note to l. 56.

predator-poet Ausonius. The pastoral pose struck by Ausonius, furthermore, along with the elegant beauty of the epistle's setting, is enhanced by the brilliant contrast to the satiric stance and grotesque setting of Satire 4. Finally, the thematic emphasis on gifts of flattery as opposed to gifts of genuine good intention is the same – although weighted inversely. Ausonius' assurance that the gift poses no serious personal loss (27, 1, 17) shows that he has rejected not only the Picene's blandishment but also the greed of Crispinus and Domitian. Ausonius helps to define his genuine gift by recalling first greedy self-indulgence and then an adulatory gift from the pages of Juvenal, or in slightly different terms, he helps to establish the parameters and tone of pastoral gift-giving by contrasting them with the gifts given in satire. The moral climate is as different in the two poems as the generic and thematic climate.¹⁷ The program of allusion is driven by a verbal echo – almost word for word – that is embedded in a matrix of less direct, thematic echoes.

Ausonius De Herediolo (6) : Juvenal Satire 3

The same method of echoing Juvenal can be seen on a greater scale elsewhere. It was noticed long ago that Ausonius' De Herediolo (6) 25 echoes Satire 3, 226:

- 5 *Salve, herediolum, maiorum regna meorum,
quod proavus, quod avus, quod pater excoluit
quod mihi iam senior properata morte reliquit –
heu nolueram tam cito posse fruit!*
- 5 *iusta quidem series patri succedere, verum
esse simul dominos gratorum ordo pitis.
nunc labor et curae mea sunt; sola ante voluptas
paribus in nostris, cetera patris erant.*
- 10 *parvum herediolum, fateor, sed nulla fuit res
parva unquam aequanimis, adde etiam unanimis.
ex animo rem stare aequum pulo, non animum ex re
cuncta cupit Croesus, Diogenes nihilum;
spargit Aristippus medius in Syribus aurum,
aurea non satis est Lydia tota Midasae.
15 *cui nullus finis cupiendi, est nullus habendi;
ille opibus modus est, quem status animo,
verum ager iste meus quantus sit, nosce, etiam ut me
noveris et moris te quoque, si polis es.
20 *quamquam difficile est se noscere: ywáthi œauróv
quam propere legimus iam cito neglegimus.***

- 30 *agri bis centum colo iugera, vinea centum
iugeribus colitur prataeque dimidio;
silva supra duplum quam prata el vinea el arvum.
25 *culior agri nobis nec superest nec abest.
fons propter puteusque brevis, tam purus el amnis;
naviger hic refluxus me vehit ac revehit.
conduunt fructus geminum mihi semper in annum;
cui non longa penus, huic quoque prompla James.
haec mihi nec procul urbe sita est, nec prorvus ad urbem
30 *ne patiar turbas utque bonis potiar;
el quotiens mutare locum fastidia cogunt,
transeo el alternis rure vel urbe fruor.***

(4)Harit, small inheritance, domain of my ancestors, / which my great-grandfather, my grandfather, my father cultivated, / which my elder has now left me, by an untimely death: / Alas: I had not wished to be able to enjoy you so soon! / [5] Indeed it is a proper sequence to succeed one's father, but / for the pious a more pleasing order to be masters together. / Now the toil and anxieties are mine: before only the enjoyment / was my share, all else was my father's lot. / A small inheritance, I grant, but no possession / [10] ever was small for the fair minded, add even those of a single spirit. / That wealth comes from the soul I think is fair, not the soul from wealth. / Croesus wants everything, Diogenes nothing: / Aristippus sprinkles the Syres through with gold: / but all of golden Lydia is not enough for Midas. / [15] He who has no limit of desiring has none of acquiring. / Wealth has that limit which you, in your soul, yourself also, if you can. / It is so difficult to know oneself. ywáthi œauróv: / [20] with what haste we read it so quickly we unread it. / Twice a hundred iugera of land I till, the vine on a hundred / iugera is cultivated, and half as much pasture land; / my woodland is more than double that under pasture, vine and plough. / As to cultivators, I have neither too many nor none. / [25] A spring is hard by and a shallow well, and a stream as pure; / its ship-worthy current carries me down and carries me back. / My fruits are stored up always for two whole years. / He who has no lasting store, has imminent hunger. / This place of mine lies not far from the city, nor up against the city. / [30] so I need not endure its throngs and may enjoy its goods. / And whenever distasteful urges me to change my place, / I cross over and enjoy city or country in turn.")

The echo in line 25 (*puteusque brevis*) of Satire 3, 226 is unmistakable:

- 225 *si potes avelli circensibus, optima Sorae
aut Fabratariae domus aut Frusinoe paratur
quanti nunc tenebras unum conducis in annum.
hortulus hic puteusque brevis nec recte movendus
in tenuis plantas facili diffunditur haustu.*

¹⁷ Ausonius' playful punning on *anim-* and *aequ-* is impossible to render in English.

vive *hidentis amans et culti vilicus horti*
unde epulum possis centum dare Pythagoreis.
 230 *est aliquid, quocumque loco, quocumque recessu.*
unius sese dominum fecisse lacertae.

(.If you can be dragged away from the games an excellent / house at Sora or Fabateria or Frusino is purchased / [225] for as much as you now pay in one year's rent for a dingy dive. / Here a little garden and a shallow well – needing no rope – / waters the tender shoots with an easily-had draught. / Live as a lover of the hoe and as overseer of a well-kept garden, / from which you could furnish a banquet for a hundred Pythagoreans. / [230] It is something, in whatever spot, in whatever backwater, / to have made yourself the lord of a single lizard.”)

Green notes that the “small well” brings to mind the farm of Juvenal’s poor emigrant from Rome.¹⁸ The echo is struck by means of a memorable phrase, as before, but this time it falls (with greater emphasis) in the same metrical position. Furthermore, as in the earlier example the echo is embedded in a more complex nexus of thematic echoes.

Ausonius manages, in a way that, it seems, modern commentators have not,¹⁹ to encapsulate in just a few lines the thematic crux of Satire 3.²⁰ The program of the satire is not a catalogue of the horrors of life in Rome, but rather a lament that the horrors of city life are felt especially keenly by the poor. In the second word of the poem, *hereditolum*, Ausonius cuts to the thematic core of the satire. It is not that Umbricius has a small legacy; he has none. He retreats to the country because he is not wealthy enough to tolerate the city.²¹ Satire 3 treats reality by splitting the world between *rus*

and *urbs*, and further interprets it through a parallel dichotomy: *pauperitas* versus *divitiae*. Ausonius offers a third option to Juvenal’s two. Umbricius would like to stay but cannot. The Satirist, whose voice is heard only in the proem (3, 1–20), protests about the dread city with its incessant poets reciting in the month of August (3, 9), beggar immigrants (3, 12–16) and tasteless marble copings (3, 18–20), but he stays nevertheless.

Ausonius’ program is not satire. He need not be so taken with extremes. He can acknowledge the benefits of each life (6, 29–32). The ease with which Ausonius envisions the comfortable transition from life in the city to life in the country and back again is closer to the position of the Satirist than of Umbricius. The latter speaks as if he is never coming back to Rome. The Satirist, on the other hand, would never leave. He mentions that he would enjoy a visit to Baiae (3, 4/5). Baiae is no humble farming town. It is a fashionable resort spot, and is sure to have all the lavish amenities of the big city. Seneca (Ep. 51, 3) says that at Canopus riotous living indulges itself to a very great extent but that at Baiae *magis solvitur*.²² But again this is not the picture that Ausonius paints. Ausonius’ reading of Satire 3 grounds his poetic world somewhere between Umbricius’ and the Satirist’s. He alerts the reader to this in the first line: Ausonius can claim an inheritance, but (deprecatingly) a small one (*hereditolum*). He can enjoy the city and country in turn, but neither with the luxury that the Satirist enjoys, or at least envisages, nor the relative deprivation that seems to await Umbricius. In both passages the well (*puteus brevis*) sits amidst worlds defined by city and country, wealth and poverty.

Ausonius’ integration of the Satires with his own poetry does not stop here. He isolates another theme of the satire that modern commentators have not exploited: self-definition, a driving force behind Umbricius’ 300-line tirade. Umbricius notes the city’s failures emphatically in the first-person.²³ His speech (cast in terms of “them against us”) is introduced by a 20-line prelude. This balances structurally that of the Satirist (3, 1–20), and it allows Umbricius to establish the setting on his own terms.²⁴ Umbricius laments that he must leave the city because he is unable to make a decent living.

¹⁸ Green 1991 (n. 1), 284 ad loc.; indeed, but the point of the shallow well is not that the well is mean, but that the water table is high enough that one need not dig deep to reach the earth’s benefits.

¹⁹ Courtney (n. 16), 151–155; J. Ferguson, Juvenal: The Satires, New York 1979, 156–158; E. C. Wilke, Juvenal 3, an Eclogue for the Urban Poor, Hermes 90 (1962), 244–246, perhaps misses the ironic tone of the satire: Umbricius is not completely impoverished, but cast rather as a somewhat strapped member of a crumbling middle class.

²⁰ For an excellent reading of the third satire in the light of the prologue see J. Sarkissian, Appreciating Umbricius: The Prologue (1–20) of Juvenal’s Third Satire, CMLMed 42 (1991), 247–258; see also S. C. Fredericks, The Function of the Prologue in the Organization of Juvenal’s Third Satire, Phoenix 27 (1973), 62–67; Wilke, (n. 19), 244–246.

²¹ Umbricius’ speech is usually held up as a parade of the evils of the city. Its economic themes are often passed over: 21–57 = Umbricius leaves the city because he is bankrupt and cannot earn a living; 58–125 = Rich Greeks oust Umbricius from Rome, a living, and his patron’s doorway; 126–189 = Rome is a generally wretched place for a pauper; 190–231 = Fire and collapse are serious dangers for the poor; 232–267 = The city is noisy and dangerous for the poor; 315–322 = The night is perilous

for the poor. Compare Courtney (n. 16), 151–155; J. Adamietz, Untersuchungen zu Juvenal, Wiesbaden 1972, Hermes Einzelschriften 26, 11, 38–76; Fredericks (n. 20), 62.

²² See also Juvenal 11, 46–49.

²³ For instance 3, 41–44 (*faciam, nescio, nequeo, ignoro, volo, possum, insperxi*), 3, 58–61 (*nostris, rigiam, properabo, possum*).

²⁴ Umbricius’ setting is colored differently from the Satirist’s: marble copings and loose-tipped poets will not be attacked, but problems of greater social and economic substance.

He then poses the challenging deliberative question which the rest of the poem will attempt to answer (3, 41): *Quid Romae factam?* The fact that he is leaving indicates that he has already found the answer to be, „Nothing.“ This strikes the first note of the satire’s theme of self-definition. In the end Umbricius and the audience are interrupted by the waning day and the anxious muleteer (3, 315–318); the result is that Umbricius leaves Rome without explicitly reaching this decision – in the narrative. The reader is privy to Umbricius’ argument for leaving, but not to his conclusion. The source of his disaffection with Rome, according to Umbricius, is the corruption of the city, not himself. Umbricius might claim to know himself by knowing what he is not: compatible with the city. But Ausonius claims to know himself by knowing what he is: one who manages to enjoy city and country in moderation. His opening of the second half of the poem with the Delphic maxim, γῶθι σεαυτὸν (6, 19), underscores this claim.

Here Ausonius draws together the themes of *rus* versus *urbs*, and *pauperias* versus *divitiae*. He then combines them with the theme of self-definition, γῶθι σεαυτὸν. Modern commentators have not so associated the three themes of the satire. The citation of the Delphic maxim, γῶθι σεαυτὸν, furthermore, invokes Satire 11, 27–30:

... *e caelo descendit γῶθι σεαυτὸν*
figendum ei memori tractandum pectore, sive
coningium quaerens vel sacri in parte senatus
 30 *esse velis:*

(From heaven descended, γῶθι σεαυτὸν / to be planted and remembered always in a mindful breast, whether / you are looking for marriage or you want to be / [30] a part of the sacred senate.)

Ausonius makes the connection between the Satirist’s espousal of a lifestyle that is moderate, humble and suited to one’s resources, in Satire 11²⁵ and the simple, rustic haven to which Umbricius flees in Satire 3. Ausonius weaves together the separate threads of Satires 3 and 11²⁶ and at one remove gives as advice to Umbricius the counsel which the Satirist offers at 11, 33: *te consule, dic tibi qui sis*. It is an especially noteworthy touch that Ausonius pairs the quasi-philosophical Delphic maxim with other philosophers and sages: Croesus, and so Solon, Diogenes the Cynic, and Aristippos. Juvenal also humorously stocks his humble farm with philosophical fodder, sufficient

²⁵ K. Weisinger, Irony and Moderation in Juvenal 11. CSCA 5 (1972), 227–240; on structure: Adamietz (n. 21), 123–158; cf. A. S. Devitt, The Structure of Juvenal’s Eleventh Satire, G&R 15 (1968), 172–179.

²⁶ Partially noted by Adamietz (n. 21), 1–6.

produce to feed a hundred Pythagoreans (4, 229).²⁷ Ausonius’ parallel treatment of moderation diligently incorporates this detail. The humble Pythagorean dinner, furthermore, sparks associations with Satire 11, which treats the theme of moderation in the context of a *cena*. In Satire 11 the Satirist scorns the frauds and swindlers who urge on *Pudor* as she flees from the city (11, 55). *Pudor* is as out-of-place in the extravagant city as Umbricius. The Satirist’s invitation to a dinner at which none of the outrageous luxuries of contemporary Rome will be available looks like an invitation to travel back in time to the days when Rome was not so corrupted, an invitation to the Rome that Umbricius longs for. Ausonius has found a way to invite Umbricius back to Rome. In this way the themes of *rus* versus *urbs*, and *pauperias* versus *divitiae* unfold in Satire 11 much as they do in Satire 3. And so the echoes unfold similarly in Ausonius’ poem. The difference is that in the third satire the Satirist does not advocate the same moderation that he does in the eleventh. The Satirist does not make for the reader the overt connection between the third and eleventh satires; nor have modern commentators. Ausonius does.

As in the former example Ausonius’ thematic allusion covers generic ground as well. His division of the world into *rus* and *urbs* can be seen in terms of genre. We might say that *pauperias* (not *egestas*), as the characteristic of Ausonius’ rural lifestyle and Umbricius’ future, sits squarely in the world of the pastoral. The abundant water of the shallow well encapsulates this generic position. On the other hand, the throngs, Ausonius’ *turbas* (6, 30), and perils of the city are features of the world of satire. *Rus* : *urbs* :: pastoral : satire. On another level, then, in Ausonius’ poetic world one must strike a dynamic balance not only between the setting and themes of city and country, but between competing genres as well. Ausonius’ pastoral version of the hunt, capture and presentation stands in stark contrast to the Satirist’s grotesque mock-epic portrait of a different hunt, capture and presentation. Again, the moral tones of the two poems mirror the generic tensions. While Umbricius resents his forced retirement to a humble lifestyle, Ausonius embraces such a life. Just as the ideal lifestyle, for Ausonius, seems to consist of a healthy mix of country and city, so too the ideal poetic comment on that life is a blend of satire’s bitter and pastoral’s sweet.

Once again with a two-word, explicitly lexical echo – this time with two paired together, *pietisque brevis* and γῶθι σεαυτὸν, Ausonius triggers a more thematic and interpretive pattern of echoing. As in the first example he

²⁷ And perhaps an allusion to Lucretius 2, 543 in 3, 227, *facili* ... *hausit*, as noted by G. B. A. Fletcher, Further Juvenaliana, Latomus 51 (1992), 395–396 (395).

relies on this intertextual matrix to help fortify the themes of his own poem. But in this case he stitches not just one satire of Juvenal to one of his own poems, but two satires to each other, and both of them to his own creation.

Ausonius Epitaphia (12, Astyanacti) 15: Juvenal Satire 5

In the third example we can see the same technique on a scale that is smaller at first glance, but which unfolds to reveal a dense and complex layering of allusion. Ausonius takes the image of the young son of the greatest Trojan hero and holds it up as the quintessence of the heroic age. By comparing his brief picture of Asyanax with the Satirist's dinner party Ausonius brings into high relief the degeneration of the heroic age into the Satirist's decadent *cena*: the principle of *hospitium* has become a farce, heroic rewards are no longer won by the sword, but bought by the purse, and inheritance of the family name has become less important than the family strongbox. In Ausonius' epitaph for Asyanax we have a pathetic picture of a child who has fallen victim to war (12, 15):

*Flos Asiae lantaque unus de gente superstes,
parvulus, Argivis sed iam de patre timendus,
hic iaceo Asyanax, Scaeis delectus ab alis.
pro dolor! Iliaci, Neptunia moenia, muri
viderrunt aliquid crudelius Hectoris tracto.*

(„Flower of Asia, and sole survivor of so great a race, / a little boy, but feared even now by the Argives because of my father, / here I Asyanax lie, hurtled from the lofty gates. / Oh the suffering! The Trojan walls, Neptune's ramparts / [5] have seen something more cruel than the dragging of Hector.”)

The first two words—the echo, notably, is in the same metrical position—of the passage recall from Juvenal a different young Anatolian life claimed by war, a slave at Virro's sybaritic dinner party (5, 56–59):

56 *flos Asiae ante ipsam, pretio maiore paratus
quam fuit et Tulli census pugnacis et Anci
ei, ne te leneam, Romanorum omnia regum
frivola.*

(156) „The flower of Asia stands before Himself, procured at greater cost / than was the census of warlike Tullius and Ancus / and, not to keep you, all the trinkets of the Roman kings.”)

The connection between Juvenal's picture of extreme decadence and Ausonius' pathetic portrait of the young prince dashed to death beneath Troy's walls is not immediately apparent. The origin of Virro's slave (*flos*

Asiae) provides a clue. It has been suggested that the slave comes from Miletus,²⁸ but at 10, 265/266 the Satirist refers to Troy simply with the word *Asia: omnia vidit / eversa et flammis Asiam ferroque cadentem*. The *flos Asiae* is, it seems, Trojan. This suggestion gains further support, by mentioning *larbas* (5, 45; see below) and by parodying Dido's words at Aeneid 4, 225–230 (5, 137–139; below) the Satirist links Virro's *cena* and the appalling treatment of his guests with the *cena* at Carthage in Aeneid 1 and Dido's dutiful adherence to the age-old principle of *hospitium*. That is the dinner at which Dido is overcome by the little Cupid disguised as Ascanius, the very image of his father.

The Satirist recalls the aftermath of that *cena* as he warns Trebius, the guest at Virro's dinner party (5, 137–139):

137 *dominus tamen et dominix
sivis tunc ferri, nullus tibi parvulus aula
luserit Aeneas nec filia dulcor illo.*

(1137) „Nevertheless if you want to be master and king of a master, / let no little Aeneas of yours / sport around the halls, nor a daughter sweeter than he.”)

If Virro's great throng of hangers-on is any indication, it would seem that he has followed the sinister advice to remain childless. The scene at Dido's *cena* is driven by a contrasting theme of father and son. In the presence of Aeneas and Ascanius/Cupid (*parvulus Aeneas*) Dido is affected by divinely inspired love but also by the genuine desire to secure a line of succession and inheritance to her new African throne. She is as devoted to this succession and the principle of *hospitium* as Virro is to „buying” his successor and making a mockery of *hospitium*. The Satirist capitalizes on this connection by parodying directly the desperate Dido's rebuke at Aeneid 4, 325–330:

325 *quid moror? an mea Pygmalion dum moenia fratel
destruat aui captam ducat Gaetulus larbas?
salem si qua mihi de te suscepta fuisset
ante fugam suboles, si quis mihi parvulus aula
luderet Aeneas, qui te tamen ore referret,
non equidem omnino capta ac deserta viderer.*

(1325) „Why do I delay? Until brother Pygmalion may lay low my ramparts, / or until Gaetulian *larbas* takes me away captive? / If some child by you at least had been conceived for me / before your flight, if in my court some little Aeneas were / sporting about, to bring you back with his looks anyway, / then I would not seem so utterly taken and abandoned.”)

²⁸ See Ferguson (n. 19), ad loc.

Without a son Dido is easy prey (*captam, captia*) for the Gaetulan prince Iarbas (note the Satirist's *zelotypo* ... *Iarbae*: 4, 45; below), without an heir, and without ties of obligation to Aeneas. Similarly, without a son Virro is an easy target for greedy *captatores*, without a blood heir, and without ties of obligation to family or clients (such as Treblius). The circumstances are closely parallel; the motives of the two childless characters are diametrically opposite. Juvenal's parody creates a rich cluster of ironic associations. In describing the relationships between host and guest, childless and parent, we might say that Dido : Aeneas :: Virro : Treblius. A strong tension results from this analogy. As hosts Dido and Virro stand in sharp contrast. The guests' roles are reversed too: Aeneas betrays Dido, while Treblius is insulted by Virro. The childless Dido would have Aeneas' child lest she become prey to the jealous prince Iarbas. The childless Virro eagerly establishes himself as such in order to ensure the 'friendships' of many eager *captatores*. Aeneas' child is an asset to him and would be to Dido. Treblius' child is a liability – another mouth to feed – to him and a pathetic plaything to Virro.

If Virro has regard neither for the heroic principle of *hospitium* nor for legitimate agnate succession, he shows equal disdain for honor that is won by the sword (5, 43–45):

45 *nam Virro, ut nulli, gemmas ad pocula transferi
adigitis, quas in vaginae fronte solebat
ponere zelotypo iuvenis praelatus Iarbae.*

(„For Virro, like many, moves from his fingers to his cups, gems, / which that youth who was preferred to jealous / [45] Iarbas used to wear on the front of his scabbard.”)

The Satirist upbraids Virro for his extravagance. Rome's founding father, Aeneas, carries a bejeweled sword and scabbard; Virro wields a bejeweled goblet. Whereas Aeneas travelled the known world in order to found Rome, Virro, as far as the Satirist is concerned, travels the world in the privacy of his own luxurious dining hall (5, 49/50):

50 *si stomachus domini fervet vinoque ciboque,
frigidor Geticis petitur decocta prunis.*

(„If the lord's stomach burns from wine and food / [50] a concoction colder than Getic ice is sought.”)

The Satirist, in a gross exaggeration, describes Virro's drinks as if they were chilled by „designer ice-cubes” from the farthest north-eastern extent of the Roman world. Virro's apples are so luscious that they warrant comparison to the kind that the Phaeacians used to have (5, 151), the kind that

another heroic wanderer ate. Less fancy, but no less exotic, are Virro's North African table servants (5, 52–55):

55 *... tibi pocula cursor
Gaetulus dabit aut nigri manus osses Mauri
et cui per mediam nox occurrere nocent,
clivosae veheris dum per monumenta Latinae.*

(„To you some Gaetulan runner / will provide the cups, or the bony hand of a black Moor / and one whom you would prefer not to encounter in the middle of the night / [55] while driving by the monuments of the hilly *via Latina*.”)

Even they are less exotic than the slave from the East (*flos Asiae*). The Gaetulan, evoking Dido's *Gaetulus Iarbas* (4, 226), and Moorish slaves come from the southern and south-western reaches of the empire. Their contrast with the old-fashioned Roman dinner guests is sharp. The Satirist likens the barbarian slave who serves Treblius and Virro's other guests to the sort of cutthroat or highway robber whom one might encounter along the *via Latina*. The mention of one of the oldest roads out of Rome is emphatic. The *via Latina* does not call to mind a single great man (such as the *Appia* or *Flaminia*), but it recalls the earliest origin of the Roman people and their conquest and assimilation of the nearby Latins. These somewhat frightening African slaves are as foreign to the stern, old-fashioned Treblius as Virro's manners are to stern, old-fashioned, Roman manners.

This distinction between Roman and foreigner (old-fashioned Roman piety : foreign decadence :: Virro's guests : Virro) is most emphatically made in the passage which Ausonius echoes. Virro has purchased his beautiful slave boy, the *flos Asiae*, for as much as Tullius Hostilius and Ancus Marcius, and the rest of the kings, had altogether. But unlike the Romans of old, Virro has acquired his reputation with his wallet, not with his name. A bloated decadent, he simply purchases the benefits of foreign conquest. He chills his wine as if with exotic ice; he staffs his dining hall with exotic slaves from Mauretania, Africa and Asia, and all this at a cost far above the fortunes of Rome's founding fathers. Yet in spite of his wealth Virro is niggardly with the menu, saving the delicacies for himself, while his guests take only scraps – a blatant affront to the traditional ideal of *hospitium*.²⁹ Virro's great legacy, moreover, will not be passed from father to son, but instead it will fall perhaps to the greedy hands of one or more of the *captatores* at his table.

Ausonius taps into this dense nexus of themes in his short epigraph for Asylanax. Of the twenty-six Epitaphia only the hopelessly damaged four

²⁹ See M. Morford, Juvenal's Fifth Satire, *AJP* 98 (1977), 219–245, on the interplay of client and patron at the *cena*.

lines of Achilles' epitaph (12,4), the four lines of Diomedes' epitaph (12, 6), and the five lines of Astyanax's epitaph are written completely in dactylic hexameter. All the other epitaphs are composed in elegiac couplets. Astyanax is the only Trojan in Ausonius' list of heroes who receives an epitaph in hexameters. The young boy, who might easily be described as the least heroic of the group, is ranked among the greatest of men. The reason that Ausonius gives for this elevation reveals the connection between the epitaph and the passage in Juvenal (12, 15, 17): *Flos Asiae tantaeque unus de gente superstes* / *parvulus, Argivis sed iam de patre timendus*. As a *tanta de gente superstes*, Astyanax is no different from Virro's exotic, Moorish, Gaetulian and Asian slaves. All are casualties of war. Astyanax, however, is a source of fear that he will one day avenge his father, fear that he may one day become as mighty as his father. His heroism is his descent, not his deeds. Astyanax is not shipped off to Greece as a slave with the other women and children of Troy, but instead he is thrown from the Scaean gates.

Hector and his son *parvulus Astyanax* (12, 15, 2), both of whom die beneath the walls of Troy, recall Juvenal's careful emphasis on their cousins Aeneas and his son Ascanius, and further on Trebius and his *parvulus Aeneas* (5, 138/139), and Dido and Virro who conspicuously lack offspring – the missing element. Astyanax is hated and feared by the Greeks because of his heroic father. The unheroic Virro is cultivated because of his lack of heirs. Ausonius' Astyanax is the greatest Trojan hero of them all, and the one whose death is most heroically tragic, because of the legacy of heroism which he would have inherited. Trebius' children are destined to inherit no such legacy (5, 142–145):

... ipse loquaci
gaudebit nido, viridem thoraca iubebit
adferri minimsaque mices assenque rogatum,
 145 *ad mensam quotiens parasitus venerit infans.*

([sc. Virro] „himself will delight / in the babbling clutch, and will order a green vest / to be fetched and tiny nuts and a sought-after penny, / [145] every time that infant parasite comes to the table.“)

The offspring of Trebius are heirs to a life of parasitism, not heroism. According to the Satirist Virro lives in a debased age; the age of heroism is no more. The Satirist contrasts the extravagant wealth and pathetic nature of Virro with the stern and warlike kings of early Rome, as well as her heroic founder Aeneas. He mocks Virro, who stays at home, but imports the rest of the world to his own dining hall. He holds up the base Virro against Aeneas, the great father of Rome, and against the heroic age in which he lived.

This sense of an overturned order that the Satirist creates, in which the mythico-heroic tradition is in a state of collapse, legacies of heroism are a farce, and children are born hopeful young parasites, gives poignancy to Ausonius' epitaph of Astyanax. The *parvulus Astyanax* must not be allowed to live as a servant at some rich Virro's table, lest he avenge the death of his father; the heroic age is still alive in Astyanax's day. The relationship between him and his father parallels that between Aeneas and Ascanius. The one pair died at Troy; the other escaped to found Rome and to serve as the basis for the Satirist's scathing comparison with Virro. Ausonius' tragically heroic picture of Astyanax's death epitomizes all that has gone wrong in order to produce Virro and his world: *hospitium* has turned to *niggardliness*, martial vigor to flashy decadence, inheritors of heroism to *captatores*.

Ausonius brings this complex and compressed allusion around full circle at the close of the epitaph. The first two words echo Juvenal's satiric view of the heroic world of the Aeneid and the closing words allude directly to the Aeneid itself. For *Iliaci, Neptunia moenia, muri / viderunt aliquid crudelius Hectoris iraclo* (12, 15, 4/5) appears to invoke Aeneid 2, 746, *aut quid in eversa vidi crudelius urbe?* The words are spoken by Aeneas. In the context of the narrative the cruel sight is actually no sight at all. Aeneas asks this as he looks upon the assembled fugitives and does not find his wife Creusa among them. His immediate reaction is to hide his father, his son, and his family's *penates*, and to go in search of Creusa (Aeneid 2, 747/748). This is a defining moment for Aeneas; he struggles between moving forward and back as the core of his family faces its first collapse. The severing of this familial link sets the stage for his departure from Troy. Great loss gives rise to great hope. The poet brings down the enormous weight of history and the entire epic narrative on the tragic end of this single relationship.

So too Ausonius pins the utter collapse of the heroic world – as the Satirist portrays it – on a single destroyed relationship. His epitaph for Astyanax is framed by two deaths, Astyanax's and Hector's. The death of these two can be viewed as the end of the heroic tradition, the catalyst that led to the decrepit picture of Satire 5. The echo of Aeneid 2, 746, however, serves as a reminder that the reality of the matter is not so simple or so bleak. Here, as in the former examples, Ausonius plays not only themes off one another, but genres as well. He uses the genre of the epitaph, composed in heroic hexameters, unlike the majority of his Epitaphia, as a tool with which to isolate and restructure the dilapidated ruin that the Satirist makes of the heroic world. The savage stance of the fifth satire looks only backward: the heroic ideal is dead and gone. The epitaph, on the other hand, looks both

ways by its very nature: it stands both as a window on the heroic world of the past and a mirror in the reflection of which that world may be emulated. Ausonius aligns a pair of echoes, one from Juvenal's fifth satire, which parodies the epic tradition and the heroic ideal, and one from the Aeneid. Here we realize the complex interdependence of the Ausonian text and the text that it echoes. The five lines of Astyanax's epiphany make no explicit mention of the collapse of the heroic ideal; they offer no straightforward reaffirmation of it either. Ausonius' positive statement acquires its meaning from its relationship to the Satirist's parody. The full force of the thematic, generic, and moral statement of the epiphany resides not in the text but in that delicate web of allusion in which Vergil invokes the heroic tradition, the Satirist exposes its debasement, and Ausonius recalls both pictures in order to counter the Satirist's bleak Vergilian parody with another echo from Vergil that rings more hopeful. By combining the two echoes Ausonius modifies Juvenal's decrepit and debased version of the heroic world: in Ausonius' portrayal the ideal is broken, but hope remains.

By choosing the picture of Astyanax dashed beneath the Scæan gates Ausonius puts this web of heroic ideals on a continuum that starts at Troy and ends in the decadent corruption of the Satirist's Rome. He begins with the one hero's son who could not be brought back among the spoils of war. He follows the father and son who would ultimately propagate the heroic tradition on Italian soil. And he ends with the wretched collapse of the heroic traditions of *hospitium*, succession and gain gotten by toil. If Juvenal dismantles the mythico-heroic tradition and sneers at its collapse Ausonius responds by reaffirming it with a vivid and compressed picture of all that is valuable in it.

As in the former examples, although here on a miniature scale, Ausonius embeds a two-word and a one-word lexical echo in a matrix of more thematic echoes. The five-line epitaph can be read as a compressed response to the Satirist's savage assessment of the decadent age. By the same token, Ausonius' picture of heroism, the transmission of heroism from father to son, and the nurturing of it through the principle of *hospitium*, is enriched by the Satirist's depiction of the opposite. The heroic epiphany written in hexameters takes its strength from its opposition to the mockery that the Satirist makes of the heroic ideal embodied in epic.

In terms of its basic structure, Ausonius' method of echoing Juvenal is straightforward. An explicit verbal echo is embedded in a matrix of less direct, more thematic echoes. These echoes are carefully interwoven into an intricate web of competing genres and opposing treatments of the same theme. The symbiotic quality of this technique is crucial: the Ausonian echo

is both oppositional and integrative, but imitative only in its initial phase. The lexical echo, the imitation, is merely a signal which alerts the reader to the presence of an intertextual mode. Beyond this initial step the process is entirely oppositional. An Ausonian theme of humility (27, 1) is enriched by its intertextual contrast with satire's decadence (Satire 4). Ausonius' sincere gift (6) takes poignancy from its contrast with the Satirist's depiction of grotesque blandishment and self-abasement (Satire 3). The Ausonian epiphany's hopeful affirmation of the traces of the heroic ideal that still survive (12, 15) gains great force from its rejection of satire's cynical portrait of a dead and rotten heroic world (Satire 5). In generic terms Ausonius sets his scene of hunt, capture and presentation, with all its rustic, pastoral splendor (27, 1), against the grotesque mock-epic portrait of a different hunt, capture and presentation (Satire 4). Ausonius opposes the urban decay of Satire 3 with the charm and moderation of pastoral (6). With the five verses of Astyanax's epiphany, written in heroic hexameters (12, 15), Ausonius rejects the Satirist's mockery of epic and the heroic tradition (Satire 5). In a very crude way it could be said that, in this model of allusion, the best candidate for allusion is the passage that differs most radically from its Ausonian successor. Ausonius refutes the thematic and generic expression of the satire that he echoes, but at the same time he appropriates the poetic material, whose positive value he denies, in order to enrich his own work's handling of theme and genre. This method allows Ausonius to draw the reader in in a fascinating way. The denial of the satiric outlook invites Ausonius' reader to adopt a similar view of the Satirist's text. But at the same time the oppositional nature of the technique reminds Ausonius' reader that the rejected satiric mode is crucial for experiencing and appreciating the full force of the Ausonian text.

It cannot be stressed enough that the Latin poets from Late Antiquity have only recently become the objects of serious literary study; certainly they have not yet found fixed spots in the canon of authors typically taught on any level. The view that late Latin is somehow a degenerate, lifeless, and bookish imitation of classical Latin literature, not worthy of serious literary enquiry, sadly is still common. The current state of scholarship on literary allusion in Vergil, no less, is such that J. Farrell recently could write of the lack of a modern study of Vergilian allusive technique:³⁰ "Traditional Quellenforschung, then, in spite of its critical imitations, has left us with an ample collection of material on which to base the study of Vergilian allusion. What is needed is a suitable means of dealing with this mass of data." If this could

³⁰ Farrell (n. 5), 7.

be said of Vergil, the one Latin poet whose claim to the title as the most widely read Latin author has not been questioned in roughly two thousand years, we can hardly be shocked if Ausonius and his contemporaries have not been the objects of studies as in-depth as Farrell's.³¹ Students of Late Antique Latin poetry, nevertheless, can be thankful for similar endeavors at *Quellenforschung*, which have produced long lists of parallel passages.³² In the light of the vast number of echoes from classical poets in the works of Ausonius alone, no one could deny that Late Antique poetry was at its core no less allusive than its Augustan ancestor. Judgment of the merits and failings of Late Antique Latin poetry cannot proceed until we can acquire a fuller appreciation for the Late Antique art of allusion. The present study has barely scratched the surface of only one Late Antique poet's treatment of only one classical poet; it is hoped that it may be offered as a contribution toward such an appreciation.

³¹ For a recent attempt at defining Ausonian poetics see S. G. Nugent, *Ausonius: Late-Antique Poetics and Postmodern Literary Theory*, in A. J. Boyle (ed.) *The Imperial Muse: Ramus Essays on Roman Literature of the Empire*, Bendigo 1990, 236–260, esp. 247–251.

³² A few notable examples may illustrate the availability of material on which to base studies of Late Ancient patterns of allusion. See n. 1 above for the vast – and still not complete – list of classical echoes in Ausonius. Even Green's masterly edition and commentary does not support the editor's admirable efforts at *Quellenforschung* with literary exegesis of Ausonius' allusions to classical authors. We are in an excellent position, furthermore, to assess the allusive practice of Claudian as well. See, for example, the vast lists of Claudian's echoes (unexplained) of Ovid alone in A. H. Eaton, *The Influence of Ovid on Claudian*, Diss. Catholic Univ. 1943. In contrast to the somewhat dismissive remarks in C. Gruzelzer, *Claudian, De Rapitu Proserpinae*, Oxford 1993, 21–27, stand the more generous comments of A. Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius*, Oxford 1970, 279–284, 315–321 (with additional bibliography). An excellent treatment of the continuity of the satiric tradition in Claudian's *In Eutropium* can be found in J. Long, *Claudian's In Eutropium*: Or, How, When, and Why to Stander a Eunuch, Chapel Hill and London 1996, 17–63; Long is more concerned with the continuities of genre than with literary allusion. For allusions in Paulinus of Nola see R. P. H. Green, *The Poetry of Paulinus of Nola: A Study of His Latinity*, Bruxelles 1971, 41–60. – For their generous assistance and lively criticism I am grateful to Kent Riggsby, Craig Gibson, Joe Romero, and especially, Francis Newton.

ORTWIN KNORR / GÖTTINGEN

Die Parallelüberlieferung zum ‚Panarion‘ des Epiphanius von Salamis

Textkritische Anmerkungen zur Neuausgabe¹

1. Vorbemerkungen

Zu den bedeutenden Werken des Epiphanius, 367 zum Bischof von Constantia (Salamis) auf Zypern geweiht,² zählt das ‚Panarion‘, das heißt ‚Arzneikästchen‘ (geschrieben 374–377).³ Darin stellt der Verfasser achtzig sogenannte Häresien inhaltlich vor und versucht, sie zu widerlegen.⁴ Auf diese Weise möchte Epiphanius seinen Lesern „Gegengifte“ gegen die von ihm behandelten Häresien, die er mit wilden Tieren und Schlangen

¹ Eine Neuausgabe des Panarion wird zur Zeit von Jürgen Dummer vorbereitet, siehe J. Imischer, *Die Epiphaniusausgabe der Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller, Heilkon 22–27* (1982–1987), 535–541; J. Dummer, *Zur Epiphanius-Ausgabe der Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller*, in: *Texte und Textkritik. Eine Aufsatzsammlung*. In Zusammenarbeit mit J. Imischer, F. Pasche und K. Treu hrsg. von J. Dummer, Berlin 1987, 119–125. Der vorliegende Aufsatz beruht auf Vorarbeiten für eine Edition der pseudepiphaniischen Anakephalaïosis, die im Auftrag der Patristischen Kommission, Arbeitsstelle Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, entsteht.

² Zu Leben und Werk des Epiphanius siehe W. Bienert, *Epiphanius v. Salamis*, LThK 3 (1995), 723–725; W. Schneemelcher, *Epiphanius von Salamis*, RAC 5 (1962), 909–927; B. Altaner und A. Stuiber, *Patrologie*, Freiburg i. Br. 1978, 315–318 (ebd. 315 wird irrtümlich 376 als Jahr der Bischofsweihe angegeben).

³ Als Standardausgabe gilt derzeit noch K. Holl (ed.), *Epiphanius*, 1–3, CCS 25, 31.37, Leipzig 1915, 1922, 1933; 2, Berlin 1980, 3, Berlin 1985 (bearb. v. J. Dummer). Eine vollständige englische Übersetzung liegt vor in F. Williams (Übers.), *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, Book I (Secs 1–46), Nag Hammadi Studies 35, Leiden 1987; ders., *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, Book II and III (Secs 47–80, De Fide), Nag Hammadi Studies 36, Leiden 1994.

⁴ Zwanzig dieser „Häresien“ sind zeitlich vor Christ Geburt anzuordnen. Zum Häresienbegriff des Epiphanius siehe zuletzt F. M. Young, *Did Epiphanius know what he meant by Heresy?*, in: *Studia Patristica 17*, 1, hrsg. von E. A. Livingstone, Oxford 1982, 199–205.