



The Roman Odysseus

Citation

Miller, Rebecca Anne. 2015. The Roman Odysseus. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Graduate School of Arts & Sciences.

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:17467359>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

The Roman Odysseus

A dissertation presented

by

Rebecca Anne Miller

to

The Department of the Classics

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the subject of

Classical Philology

Harvard University

Cambridge, Massachusetts

May 2015

© 2015 Rebecca Anne Miller

All rights reserved.

The Roman Odysseus

Abstract

This dissertation investigates how Roman authors, especially of the Augustan period, comment on their literary relationship with their Greek literary predecessors through the complex character of Odysseus. It argues that Roman writers emphasize Odysseus' deceptive qualities to distance themselves from the Greek literary tradition, and at the same time to underscore their own inheritance of and indebtedness to that tradition. Odysseus' multi-faceted character and wide-ranging travels, I suggest, made him an ideal lens through which Roman authors, spanning from Livius Andronicus in the 3rd century BCE to Juvenal in the 1st century CE, could consider their own position as poets in a simultaneously Greek and Roman literary tradition.

The dissertation focuses on Odysseus as he is portrayed in extended scenes of Latin poetry and considers the evolution of Odysseus' Roman character chronologically, beginning with Livius Andronicus' translation of the *Odyssey* and the establishment of the Latin literary tradition. His next major appearance is in Plautus' *Bacchides*, where he serves as an *exemplum* for the tricky slave as well as the playwright himself. Odysseus is later picked up in the comedic vein by Horace in *Satire* 2.5, in which the hero acts as a model for the duplicitous figure of the inheritance hunter. After Horace, Ovid employs Odysseus in two different works, first as the ideal Roman orator in *Metamorphoses* 13 and then later as a foil for the poet's own trials and travails throughout his exile poetry. Lastly, there is a return to satire, where Odysseus is brought in by Juvenal as an antithesis to his own poetic authority in *Satire* 15.

All of these examples of Odysseus in Latin literature demonstrate how Roman authors use this particular Homeric epic hero to articulate issues that are temporally and culturally specific to Rome. Roman authors furthermore reimagine Odysseus in Roman terms and contexts in an effort to construct and tear down bridges between their own Roman culture and that of their Greek predecessors, which in turn renders Odysseus as a stand-in for the Latin literary tradition vis-à-vis the Greek literary tradition.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	vi
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1. <i>Meus Ulixes</i> : The Greek Hero of Roman Literature.....	15
Chapter 2. Hook, Line, and Sinker: Ulysses the <i>Captator</i> in Horace, <i>Satire 2.5</i>	39
Chapter 3. Of the Roman Persuasion: Ulysses the Orator in Ovid's <i>Armorum Iudicium</i>	69
Chapter 4. Stranger than Fiction: The (In)Credible Tales of the Wandering Odysseus.....	107
Conclusion.....	135
Abbreviations and Works Cited.....	137

Acknowledgements

Unlike Odysseus' homecoming, it truly took the effort of a crew infinitely more worthy and steadfast to bring this dissertation safely into port. Of this vast crew, my greatest thanks are owed to my committee, Richard Thomas, Dave Elmer, and Leah Whittington. Individually and collectively they inspired and challenged me with their insightful feedback, and they often knew more clearly what I was doing than I knew myself. This journey would not have been nearly so enjoyable without their continuous support and enthusiasm.

Emma Dench has been there since the beginning of my graduate career as a voice of reason and balance, which helped me stay true to myself, especially in moments of uncertainty. Alex Sens and Charlie McNelis encouraged me down this path more than a decade ago; without their advice and a fateful email exchange with Charlie, this dissertation would not exist. Rob Cioffi and Lauren Curtis have been dear friends and colleagues; they read various parts of the dissertation in the early stages and helped me to see the bigger picture of my project.

So many friends have kept me going through the dissertation process and beyond. Sarah Rous, Alyon Lynch, Teresa Wu, Sarah McCallum, and Charlie Bartlett have been boundless sources of comfort, laughter, generosity, and true friendship. It was a joy to share an office space with Chris Parrott, who was a sympathetic sounding board and drinking buddy. Liz Engelhardt and Dave Camden were always ready for a night of pub trivia or to open up their home for a delicious meal of collard greens and pulled pork. All of the participants in my fantasy sports leagues (no matter their level of dedication...) proved to be a wonderful support network in their own right as well as a welcome outlet for my occasional need to trash talk.

To my family I owe the most. There are not enough words to express my gratitude to my parents, who have been there for me during every high, low, and in-between. My brother has been an inspiration to me, both in graduate school and in life, and he never lets me forget to keep taking risks. Justin Brown has given me more in this past year than I ever thought possible, and I'm excited to take the next steps beyond graduate school with him.

This dissertation is dedicated to my grandparents, Rosi and Albin Gaspar, who survived their own post-war odyssey and made all of this possible.

Introduction *

Odysseus,¹ even outside of his eponymous epic, is a seemingly ubiquitous figure in Greek mythology, and his actions often trigger significant events during the Trojan War—he is not only the mastermind behind the Trojan Horse, but he is also a key instigator and leader of so many of the elements that were necessary to bring about the fall of Troy. Many of these exploits exemplify his cunning, including his own attempt to evade entering the war and his ploys to bring Achilles and later Philoctetes to Troy.² Others reveal a nebulous morality, such as his actions in the *Doloneia*, his killing of Astyanax, and his theft of the Palladium.³ This catalogue is by no means exhaustive, and the addition of variants of many of these episodes intensifies the sense of Odysseus as a constant presence in Greek literature, in its enduring tradition long after Homer. The primary characterization of Odysseus in the *Odyssey* nonetheless remains crucial to

* I have used the following standard editions of the primary texts discussed in this dissertation: Horace: Shackleton Bailey (1985); Plautus: Leo; Livius Andronicus: Blänsdorf (1995); Homer, *Odyssey*: van Thiel (1991); Homer, *Iliad*: West (1998–2000); Ovid, *Metamorphoses*: Tarrant; Ovid (amatory poetry): Kenney; Ovid, *Tristia*: Hall (1995); Ovid, *Ex Ponto*: Richmond (1990); Virgil: Mynors (1969); Juvenal: Clausen (1992). Translations of Homer are by Lattimore; Virgil, *Aeneid* by Mandelbaum; Horace, *Satires*, *Epistles*, and *Ars Poetica* modified from Fairclough’s Loeb; Ovid, *Metamorphoses* modified from Miller’s Loeb, *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto* modified from Wheeler’s Loeb; Juvenal from Braund’s Loeb; Plautus, *Bacchides* by Barsby (1986). All other translations of ancient authors, unless indicated otherwise in the footnotes, are modified or directly from the most recent Loeb editions.

¹ Throughout the dissertation, I use “Odysseus” and “Ulysses” not only to refer to the character and his actions in a given text, but also, more frequently, the collected associations, actions, behaviors, and characterizations that his name has accrued since before Homer (cf. Bonifazi (2010), 98–99, and the “high meaningfulness” of Ὀδυσσεύς, despite its being the first word of the *Odyssey* with no explicit referent). For the purposes of this study, I consider “Odysseus” to be primarily a site for Roman authors to negotiate their cultural and literary values vis-à-vis those of their Greek predecessors. “Ulysses” represents the translation of those values into Roman terms, which still carries with it all of the previous amassed associations, but now with the addition of those associations made by the Roman poets discussed herein.

² For Odysseus’ feigned madness and the consequent death of Palamedes, who outwitted him, see the fragments of the *Cypria* in West (2012), 102–103. Extended representations of the recruitment of Achilles and Philoctetes were composed respectively by Statius in his *Achilleid* and the *Philoctetes* by Sophocles.

³ In the *Iliou Persis* it is Odysseus who kills Astyanax, whereas in the *Little Iliad* it was done by Neoptolemus (see West (2012), 240). The theft of the Palladium likewise is told in multiple versions, but frequently Odysseus and Diomedes are linked as the agents; see West (2012), 165 and 199–203.

later versions of Odysseus,⁴ for example in Virgil, Ovid, Dante, Tennyson, Joyce, and the Coen brothers, among many others. His ability to adapt is unparalleled among mythological heroes,⁵ due in large part to the “many turns” of his nature as well as to his symbolic story of the human condition and the prototypical man as outlined in the *Odyssey*.⁶ The “everyman” quality of his travels and desires, as well as his embodiment of the slippage between truths and lies, provide infinite points of contact and reference for poets, writers, and scholars.

Consequently, and true to his nature, Odysseus has taken many different forms in previous scholarship on the question of his character; he is Odysseus the traveler,⁷ the lover,⁸ the trickster,⁹ or the philosopher,¹⁰ just to name a few roles. There is also no shortage of approaches one can take when examining the character and influence of Odysseus, as evidenced by the massive bibliography on the hero alone (and not including similar studies on the *Odyssey* itself).¹¹ The reception of Odysseus across time, cultures, and genres has generated enormous scholarly interest, yielding monographs and edited volumes that expand upon W. B. Stanford’s

⁴ For studies of Odysseus in the *Odyssey* specifically, see, e.g., Bergren (1983), Heubeck (1988), 19–23, Crane (1987), Schwinge (1993), Loudon (1999), Citati (2002); cf. Brommer (1983) on Odysseus in ancient art and literature more broadly.

⁵ Cf. Galinsky (1972) for a study on Herakles similar to Stanford (1963), and Burgess (2009) on Achilles.

⁶ For examples of this interpretation, see Calvino (1986), Boitani (1994), and Costantino (2007).

⁷ Hartog (2001).

⁸ De Caro (2006).

⁹ Barnouw (2002), esp. 21–36; Pucci (1987), 56–62; Detienne and Vernant (1978), 22–23; cf. Hynes and Doty (1993) on the trickster figure more generally.

¹⁰ Montiglio (2011).

¹¹ See, e.g., Hall (2008) and Luther (2005) on reception studies of the *Odyssey*; cf. Marincola (2007) for discussion of the influence of Odysseus and the *Odyssey* on ancient historians. For an anthropological approach, see esp. Malkin (1998); for interpretations of Odysseus in historico-cultural terms, see Andreae (1982), Boitani (1994), and Costantino (2007).

foundational study of the multifaceted hero.¹² What is noticeably absent from these analyses, however, is consideration of how the Greeks' nearest and most immediate literary successors viewed their most adaptable heroic import.¹³ This study aims to fulfill that need by considering the primary characterizations of Odysseus in Roman poetry, from its inception with Livius Andronicus to its satiric heights with Juvenal in the 2nd century CE.

Throughout the following chapters, I demonstrate how Roman authors use this particular Greek hero to articulate issues that are temporally and culturally specific to Rome and, more broadly, to show how Odysseus becomes an iconic figure for Roman authors, standing in for the Latin literary tradition vis-à-vis the Greek literary tradition. By considering the contexts and genres in which Odysseus appears in Latin literature, from his first appearances in Livius Andronicus and Plautus to his later portrayals in Horace, Ovid, and Juvenal, I argue that Roman writers emphasize Odysseus' deceptive qualities to distance themselves from the Greek literary tradition, and at the same time to underscore their own inheritance of and indebtedness to that tradition.

First Encounters

Odysseus, despite the rather heavy and troublesome baggage of his actions before, during, and after the Trojan War, nonetheless looms large in Roman literature, history, and imagination, where he provides a lens through which Romans can explore their literary and

¹² Stanford (1963); this was followed up by *The Quest for Ulysses* (1973), in which Stanford and J. V. Luce combine archaeological and literary evidence in their analysis of Odysseus. In this vein, Jouanno (2013) is the most ambitious study undertaken in a monograph; cf. Yves Laberge's review of Jouanno in *BMCR* 2014.05.46. See also Hofmann (1999), and Zampese (2003) who focuses in particular on Odysseus in Italian literature. Ball (1988) offers a succinct summary of references to Odysseus and the *Odyssey* in Greek and Latin literature. Edited volumes on the reception of Odysseus include: Bloom (1991), Fuchs (1994), Boitani and Ambrosini (1998), Babbi and Zardini (2000), and Nicosia (2003).

¹³ Previous studies on Odysseus in Latin literature or Italian culture include: Phillips (1953); Knauer (1964); Clarke (1981), 249–63; Tolkiehn (1991); Berres (1993); de Caro (2006); Perutelli (2006); and Scuotto (2009).

cultural identity especially in light of Greece. His connection to Rome can be assessed even at the level of physical geography. During his wanderings in the *Odyssey*, Odysseus establishes a relationship with Italy, in particular Campania, where the entrance to the Underworld and Circe's palace were thought to be located.¹⁴ Not only does the Greek hero stop at various locations in Italy and Sicily, but he is also named as the father, or founder, of Italian peoples and cities, including Rome, as early as Hesiod.

In Hesiod's *Theogony*, the poet lists the offspring of Circe and Odysseus, named Agrios, Latinos, and Telegonos; the former two ruled over the Tyrsenians, commonly identified as the Etruscans.¹⁵

Κίρκη δ' Ἡελίου θυγάτηρ Ὑπεριονίδαο
 γείνατ' Ὀδυσσεύος ταλασίφρονος ἐν φιλότητι
 Ἄγριον ἠδὲ Λατῖνον ἀμύμονά τε κρατερόν τε·
 Τηλέγονον δ' ἄρ' ἔτικτε διὰ χρυσοῖν Ἀφροδίτην.
 οἳ δὴ τοι μάλα τῆλε μυχῶ νήσων ἱεράων
 πᾶσιν Τυρσηνοῖσιν ἀγακλειτοῖσιν ἄνασσον.

And Circe, daughter of Helios Hyperionides,
 took as her lover Odysseus, whose resolve never flagged,
 and bore him Agrios and the blameless and stout Latinos,
 and also Telegonos, under the spell of golden Aphrodite.
 The first two ruled over all the glorious Tyrsenians,
 very far away in the inner enclave of the sacred islands.¹⁶

Th. 1011–16

Later in the Roman tradition, Telegonus is considered to be the founder of Tusculum, but there is

¹⁴ See Phillips (1953) for a full discussion of the geography of Odysseus' wanderings in Italy as well as for additional bibliography. Specifically, Phillips connects the locations of Odysseus' adventures with regions of Greek settlement in Italy, e.g. Campania, which is, as Strabo notes, the earliest Italian region of Euboean settlement (p. 61). On Odysseus' priority in Italy, see Galinsky (1969a) and Solmsen (1986); cf. Gabba (1991), 12–13, and Goldberg (1995), 50n44.

¹⁵ Phillips (1953), 55–56, argues for the identification of Agrios as Faunus; cf. West (1966), ad 1013, for a summary of other possibilities, and ad 1016 for discussion of the *Tyrsenoi*.

¹⁶ Translation by Athanassakis (2004).

no mention of Agrios or Latinos;¹⁷ Odysseus is thus kept just out of reach from Rome's own history, at least in this instance, but his influence and lasting legacy in the region are still acknowledged.¹⁸

Elsewhere in the Greek tradition, however, Odysseus is named explicitly as a founder of Rome with Aeneas. In the 5th century BCE, the historian Hellanicus of Lesbos, in a fragment preserved in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, suggests that the two heroes founded Rome together.

ὁ δὲ τὰς ἱερείας τὰς ἐν Ἄργει καὶ τὰ καθ' ἑκάστην πραχθέντα συναγαγὼν Αἰνεΐαν φησὶν ἐκ Μολοττῶν εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἐλθόντα μετ' Ὀδυσσεύος οἰκιστὴν γενέσθαι τῆς πόλεως, ὀνομάσαι δ' αὐτὴν ἀπὸ μιᾶς τῶν Ἰλιάδων Ῥώμης. ταύτην δὲ λέγει ταῖς ἄλλαις Τρωάσι παρακελευσαμένην κοινῇ μετ' αὐτῶν ἐμπρῆσαι τὰ σκάφη βαρυνομένην τῇ πλάνῃ.

But the author of the history of the priestesses at Argos and of what happened in the days of each of them says that Aeneas came into Italy from the land of the Molossians with Odysseus and became the founder of the city, which he named after Romê, one of the Trojan women. He says that this woman, growing weary with wandering, stirred up the other Trojan women and together with them set fire to the ships.

Dion. Hal. *AR* 1.72.2 = *FGrHist* 4 F 84

The authenticity of this historical account is not at stake here,¹⁹ but rather the fact that this possibility, first posited in the 5th century BC and then included by Dionysius in his *Roman Antiquities*, marks its allure and intensifies the mystery surrounding from where, and whom, Rome and Romans actually arose. Dionysius tells this foundation story among many others, including another Odysseus-link expressed by Xenagoras; he records that Odysseus and Circe had three other sons, Rhomos, Antias, and Ardeias, who became the eponymous heroes of Rome,

¹⁷ Telegonus and Tusculum are named at Horace, *Odes* 3.29.8; Prop. 2.32.3–5; and Ovid, *Fasti* 4.65 ff. See also *Fasti* 6.417 ff. for Ovid's multiple explanations for the Palladium's arrival in Rome.

¹⁸ Additional offspring of Odysseus are established elsewhere in the Mediterranean, namely his son, Polypoites, with the Thesprotian princess Kallidike and Penelope's son Ptoliporthes, or Arkesilaos, perhaps with Odysseus or Telegonus; see Burgess (2001), 11 and 170, on the possibility that Arkesilaos, so named in the *Telegony*, might have been cited as the mythological forebear of the kings of Cyrene.

¹⁹ For a discussion on this, and on how this version of Rome's founding came to be, see Solmsen (1986).

Antium, and Ardea.²⁰ That Dionysius details many possible foundation stories, with Greeks leading the way, is not surprising, as Gabba notes that Dionysius emphasizes and holds as a tenet the “original Greek character of the Roman people.”²¹ While many Romans did not adhere to this tenet, their relationship with Greece nonetheless becomes both more straightforward, if they are directly descended from a Greek hero, and more complicated as they establish themselves in power over Greece and the Mediterranean.

In addition to these historical references, there is one more mention of this alternative Roman foundation myth in the Hellenistic period; Lycophron, in his riddling poem *Alexandra*, again links Aeneas and Odysseus in the story of Rome’s foundation.

Σὺν δέ σφι μίξει φίλιον ἐχθρὸς ὦν στρατόν,
ὄρκοις κρατήσας καὶ λιταῖς γουνασμάτων
νάνος, πλάνασι πάντ’ ἐρευνήσας μυχὸν
άλός τε καὶ γῆς.

And with him shall an erstwhile foe join a friendly army,
winning him by oaths and prayers and clasped knees:
even the Dwarf who in his roaming searched out every recess
of earth and sea.

1242–45

Gruen argues for the lasting impact of this joint foundation story, noting that Odysseus still occupied a place of importance in stories of Rome’s foundation well into the third century BCE, despite the “shaky hypotheses and uncertain chronology” of the evidence.²² This staying power of Odysseus as not only a Roman mythological and literary figure, but also as a key player in Rome’s origins, is noteworthy. It must be acknowledged, however, that all of the sources named thus far have been written or preserved by Greeks. But these sources have still revealed a variety

²⁰ On Xenagoras, *FgrH* 240 F 29, see Solmsen (1986), 98; Gruen (1992), 19; and Malkin (1998), 188.

²¹ Gabba (1991), 10.

²² Gruen (1992), 19.

of ways that Greeks, at least, have used Odysseus to tie themselves historically into Italian and Roman foundation stories. The Romans, on the other hand, avoided that link, choosing to pursue rather a Trojan genealogy,²³ and working to incorporate Romulus and Remus into Aeneas' story, which are brought together most completely in the *Aeneid*. The *Aeneid* in a way severs these earlier connections between Greece and Rome, but those connections run deep and cannot be completely forgotten or erased. It is the case that even in Virgil's codification of Rome's founding myth, Odysseus and his influence in the West are not entirely absent; the figure of Ulysses serves primarily as generic link to Homer for the *Aeneid* and its hero, but additionally as a potential reminder of his influence on and relationship with Italy before Aeneas' arrival.²⁴

Ships in the Night: Ulysses and Aeneas in the *Aeneid*

As has been acknowledged many times over, Odysseus and the *Odyssey* more generally stand starkly in the background of much of the first half of the *Aeneid*, where Odysseus serves as the first heroic foil for Aeneas.²⁵ The two heroes follow roughly the same itinerary on their journeys from Troy, and they begin their respective tales in a remarkably similar manner.²⁶

Infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem,
Troianas ut opes et lamentabile regnum
eruerint Danai, quaeque ipse miserrima vidi
et quorum pars magna fui.

O Queen—too terrible for tongues the pain
you ask me to renew, the tale of how
the Danaans coul destroy the wealth of Troy,
the kingdom of lament: for I myself
saw these sad things; I took large part in them.

²³ See Gruen (1992), 21 ff. on how and why the Romans turned to Troy, rather than Greece; cf. Bömer (1951).

²⁴ Cf. Fletcher (2006) for Virgil's rewriting of the Homeric Diomedes and his importance in Italy, in particular Apulia.

²⁵ See, e.g. Knauer (1964), Galinsky (1981) with bibliography, Schmidt (1983), and Mackie (1988), esp. 16–46.

²⁶ See *VE* s.v. Ulysses.

Aen. 2.3–6

ἀργαλέον, βασίλεια, διηνεκέως ἀγορευῆσαι,
κήδε' ἐπεὶ μοι πολλὰ δόσαν θεοὶ Οὐρανίωνες·

It is a hard thing, O queen, to tell you without intermission,
all my troubles, since the gods of the sky have given me many.

Od. 7.241–42

Despite the alignment of their beginnings and because of the enmity between their peoples, Virgil keeps Ulysses at arm's reach from Aeneas throughout the rest of the epic; Ulysses does not directly enter the world of Virgil's Aeneas, but rather through the flashback narrative of Aeneas and other figures included in his story, such as Sinon and Achaemenides.²⁷ Right at the outset of his narrative, Aeneas even mentions Ulysses: *quis talia fando / Myrmidonum Dolopumve aut duri miles Ulixi / temperet a lacrimis?* ("What Myrmidon or what Dolopian, / what soldier even of the harsh Ulysses, / could keep from tears in telling such a story?" *Aen.* 2.6–8). This first reference draws a faint parallel between the story Aeneas is about to unfold and Odysseus' extensive narrative in the *Odyssey*, which was triggered in part by his own tears at Demodocus' tales of the Trojan War. The initial characterization of Ulysses in the *Aeneid* here, as *durus*, meaning both capable of endurance and unsympathetic,²⁸ is in keeping with his stereotypical endurance in Homer, but it is accentuated and amplified by Aeneas when he later describes Ulysses twice as *dirus*, one who inspires terror.²⁹ In each instance, both of which occur at line end,³⁰ the hero is *dirus Ulixes*; this epithet-noun pair, as Fletcher notes, occupies the same *sedes* as Homer's δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς (e.g. at *Od.* 4.280).³¹ The formulaic position of *dirus* and the

²⁷ Cf. Barchiesi (2001), 16.

²⁸ *OLD* s.v. *durus* 3 and 4.

²⁹ *OLD* s.v. *dirus* 2a (of people); cf. Stanford (1963), 128–37, on this adjective applied to Ulysses.

³⁰ At *Aen.* 2.261 and 762.

anagrammatic play that occurs between *duri* to *dirus* fills out Aeneas' description of the absent Ulysses who is nevertheless able to seamlessly switch characters and modes depending on the situation.³²

The picture of Ulysses in the *Aeneid* becomes even fuller through the character of Sinon, a surrogate-Ulysses figure who takes the lead role in Aeneas' narrative and lambasts his model in front of the Trojans, all the while following in his deceptive footsteps.³³ When Sinon first appears, Aeneas, now narrating with full knowledge of the Greeks' deception from the beginning, describes Sinon's intentions toward the Greeks as: *seu versare dolos seu certae occumbere morti* ("to win through stratagems or meet his death," *Aen.* 2.62). *Versare dolos* harkens back to two different descriptions of Ulysses before the *Aeneid*. Firstly, *versare* recalls Livius Andronicus and the programmatic *virum versutum* of his Latin translation of the *Odyssey*;³⁴ secondly, *dolos* links Sinon's deception in *Aeneid* 2 with Horace's employment of *dolus* in his version of Ulysses in *Satire* 2.5, where Teiresias instructs Ulysses on how to cheat a rich old man out of his wealth.³⁵

The relationship between Sinon and Ulysses, and the high degree to which Sinon follows Ulysses' deceptive example, is further revealed in the way Aeneas describes Sinon at *Aen.* 2.195–96, which again recalls the language Horace uses to describe inheritance hunting in *Satire* 2.5:

³¹ Fletcher (2006), 226, goes on to say, "The Latin translation of *dios* would be *di(v)us*, which is so similar to *dirus* that the manuscripts disagree on the reading... This phrase, though, is a pun on *dios Odysseus*, which serves to remind us of the Homeric formula and possibly its appearance in the Trojan horse passage in the *Odyssey*."

³² For discussion of focalization in the *Aeneid*, see Fowler (1990). For Aeneas' view of Diomedes, see Fletcher (2006), 227–35; for his view of Achilles, see Smith (1999), 225–62.

³³ On the exceptional craft of Sinon's speech, see Austin (1964), ad 2.163, and Clausen (2002), 68.

³⁴ See discussion in Chapter 1 on p. 18f.

³⁵ For full discussion of Hor. *Sat.* 2.5, see Chapter 2.

Talibus insidiis periurique arte Sinonis
credita res, captique dolis lacrimisque coactis

Such was the art of perjured Sinon, so
insidious, we trusted what he told.
So we were taken in by snares, forced tears—
Aen. 2.195–96

Line 196 of this passage especially fulfills Teiresias' instructions to and ultimate goal for Ulysses the inheritance hunter in *Satire* 2.5. In that poem the primary object for Ulysses upon his return to Ithaca is to retrieve his wealth (*res*) and capture (*captare*) his place in a will through bait, trickery (*dolus*), and feigned tears. The success of the Trojan Horse is wholly dependent on its ability to conceal its true purpose inside, the method in which Odysseus' own character frequently operates; the fact, then, that Virgil uses the same language as Horace is unsurprising and not necessarily an allusion to the earlier text, but at the same time the similar language reinforces Horace's previous characterization of the Greek hero and allows Virgil to weave Horace's version of Ulysses into his own portrayal of the hero's proxy, Sinon.

In *Aeneid* 3, the paths of Aeneas and Ulysses continue to remain parallel yet distinct. The Trojan refugees sail past Ithaca, characterized: *terram altricem saevi Ulixi* ("the land that nursed cruel Ulysses," 273), and the surrounding islands, which are catalogued in a list adapted from Homer;³⁶ they also pass by the palace of the Phaeacians and the dangers of Scylla and Charybdis (lines 291 and 420 respectively). Additionally, they actually stop at the island of the Cyclopes, where they meet Achaemenides, a member of Ulysses' crew who was left behind.³⁷

Achaemenides identifies himself: *sum patria ex Ithaca, comes infelicis Ulixi* ("I come from the land of Ithaca, a companion of luckless Ulysses," 613). The change of adjective to describe

³⁶ *Aen.* 3.270–73; see Chapter 4, 113f., for discussion of this catalogue in Ovid.

³⁷ Ovid invents a similar figure, the Neritian Macareus, who serves to rework and duplicate Achaemenides; see Myers (2009), ad 158–440; cf. Barchiesi (2001), 16, for discussion of this near point-of-contact, both temporal and physical, between Virgil and Homer through the invention of Achaemenides.

Ulysses, from *saevus* by Aeneas in line 273 to *infelix* by the Ithacan Achaemenides in 613, is rather dramatic.³⁸ The latter characterization is reinforced by Aeneas in lines 691, where he repeats Achaemenides' own words: *Achaemenides, comes infelicis Ulixi*. Williams notes that this kind of repetition is rare in Virgil, and the poet may have implemented it here to mark firmly the end of the fantastical Homeric section of Aeneas' journey and the beginning of his experiences in and around Italy.³⁹ While the repetition does work to that end, *infelicis Ulixi* additionally supplants the repeated *dirus Ulixes* at line end in Book 2, making for a more complicated and evolving image of the absent Greek hero both in the eyes of Aeneas and as a heroic model for Aeneas himself.

The shifting accounts of Ulysses in books 2 and 3 of the *Aeneid* are further counter-balanced and complemented by two more descriptions of him by Achaemenides and Sinon. Achaemenides proudly describes the actions of his captain in the cave of the Cyclops: *nec talia passus Ulixes / oblitusve sui est Ithacus discrimine tanto* ("Ulysses did not stand for this, nor did the man of Ithaca forget who he was at this dreadful time," 3.628–30). In this moment, Ulysses is neither *passus* nor *oblitus*, both of which could be deemed contrary to his character and many of his actions in the *Odyssey*, where he is much enduring (πολύτλας) and must disguise himself in order to accomplish his goals. But for Achaemenides here, Ulysses is most himself at a moment of crisis, when he must take action. This confident assessment and clear description of Ulysses' character is supported by Sinon in Book 2, when in line 90 he describes Ulysses as *pellax* ('seductive, winning, glib'), which is the only occurrence of this adjective in classical

³⁸ Cf. *OLD* s.v. *infelix* 3, and Williams (1962), ad 613, on the sympathetic connotation of *infelix*.

³⁹ Williams (1962), ad 690–91; cf. Horsfall (2006), ad 691, who clarifies and elaborates on Williams, stating, "691 takes up 613 (and note the name, 614) and serves as a caesura both between the first set of Greek cities and the remainder and between the world of Odysseus and the increasingly Roman universe of Aeneas and his father."

Latin.⁴⁰ And just like *dirus* and *infelicitis*, *pellax* occurs with Ulysses' name at line end, adding yet another facet to his multidimensional character even among the Trojans and stylistically Homericizing via another noun-epithet formula.

The simultaneous fluidity and predictable duplicity of Odysseus' character—seeming one thing while being another, representing both the familiar and the strange, being both a known quantity and unknown variable—suffuses the background of Aeneas' narrative in books 2 and 3 as well as the representation of Ulysses elsewhere in Latin literature, both before and after Virgil. The Ulysses of the *Aeneid* was not only the product of Virgil's imagination, but he had been translated and adapted into the Latin language and Roman poetry long before.

The Roman Odysseus

Odysseus' two-facedness become the hallmark of the Roman Ulixes, who serves as a model for both the tricky slave and playwright of Roman comedy, both the fortune hunter and satirist of Horace's *Sermones*, both the questionably persuasive orator of Ovid's *Armorem Iudicium* and the unreliable narrator of Ovid's and Juvenal's poems on suffering and travel. Already in the *Odyssey*, however, there is a convergence of narrator's voice with that of Odysseus, especially in books 9–12. Roman authors exploit this duality of the Greek Odysseus in particular to comment on their position in both the Greek and Latin literary traditions as well as to rewrite the persuasive and influential Greek hero into Roman terms and contexts.

Additionally, Odysseus' primary Greek and Latin epithets (Homeric *πολύτροπος* and Livian *versutus*) make his character especially suitable for exploring the ideas of “troping” and “translating,” which are key issues for writers of any age in dealing with the literary tradition. Some authors approach these issues by imagining how Odysseus would behave if he landed at

⁴⁰ Austin (1964), ad 2.90; cf. *OLD* s.v. *pellicio*.

Rome, instead of back home on Ithaca, and they employ anachronism and Romanization to highlight not only the temporal distance between the literary golden ages of Greece and Rome, but also their cultural differences. In my two central texts, Horace, *Satire 2.5*, and the *Armorum Iudicium* in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 12–13, the poets create a Ulysses who derives from the Homeric epic tradition, but who behaves in a very Roman way. In Horace, we find Ulysses learning how to hunt fortunes from rich old men at Rome; in *Met.* 13, Ulysses wins Achilles' arms, to which he has no hereditary claim, through persuasive rhetoric. In both cases, Horace and Ovid are dealing with the question of literal inheritance, but this question also has repercussions in the figurative realm, where one can discuss issues of the inheritance of the literary tradition, and trace the ways that inheritance is conditioned by generic or Roman social and cultural peculiarities. Furthermore, Odysseus appears in many genres and his eponymous epic recounts his travels and encounters with cultures across the Mediterranean, which also makes him a rich character through which we can examine questions of genre and cultural appropriation.

Throughout this study, I consider how Roman authors construct, or tear down, bridges between their own Roman culture and that of their Greek predecessors. In Chapter 1, I focus in particular on Odysseus' first appearances in Latin: Livius Andronicus' epic adaptation of the *Odyssey* and Plautus' comedic *Bacchides*. It is no coincidence that at the beginning of the Latin literary tradition stands the most well-traveled and well-spoken of the Greek heroes, who could provide the strongest model of poetic authority for writers venturing into uncharted territory. Similarly in Chapter 2, Horace relies on the figure of Odysseus to supply him with an authoritative connection to Homer as well as a malleable figure whom he can fit into the Roman genre of satire. He casts Odysseus in the role of the satiric student who learns from Teiresias the

morally ambiguous art of inheritance-hunting.

After Horace and by the time of Ovid and Juvenal, the use of Odysseus' poetic authority as a positive model for Roman poets has undergone a reversal. In Chapter 3, Ovid portrays at length the debate between Ajax and Ulysses over Achilles' arms. The outcome of the debate is a given, but the manner of Ulysses' speech in particular, which is littered with Roman terms and imagery, reveals the dubious authority that potentially lies behind the rhetoric. In the final chapter of the dissertation, I consider the portrayal of Odysseus and his reliability as a narrator in Ovid's exile poetry and Juvenal's satire; both poets use Odysseus as a foil, rather than a model and support, for their own poetic authority, diminishing the importance of his voice while esteeming the perspective and account of the poet himself.

In all of the Latin texts surveyed in this dissertation, Odysseus remains consistently duplicitous, but how each poet in his respective time and genre takes advantage of that duplicity is unique. The evolution of Ulysses' function at key points in the Latin literary tradition opens a window on how Latin poets viewed and commented upon their position in the Latin literary tradition. Odysseus' programmatic adaptability allows for his character to be constantly refigured and rewritten; thus the Odysseuses created by Roman writers reveals less about the nature of Odysseus himself than the poets who reimagine him.

Chapter 1

Meus Ulixes: The Greek Hero of Latin Literature

What's in a name? Odysseus himself tells us at *Od.* 19.407–409 that his grandfather Autolycus named him either because he has “come here after cherishing anger against many” or “after having been the object of many people’s anger” (πολλοῖσιν γὰρ ἔγωγε ὀδυσσάμενος τόδ’ ἰκάνω, / ἀνδράσιν ἠδὲ γυναιξὶν ἀνὰ χθόνα βωτιάνειραν· τῷ δ’ Ὀδυσεὺς ὄνομα ἔστω ἐπόνυμον. “Since I have come to this place distasteful to many, women and men alike on the prospering earth, so let him be given the name Odysseus, that is ‘distasteful’”). Homer plays on the etymology from ὀδύσσομαι, ‘to be angry with or against,’ elsewhere in the poem,⁴¹ but this meaning is lost once the name of Odysseus is transliterated into Latin. Before Odysseus could be anything for the Romans, his name first had to be manipulated at the fundamental level of linguistic sound change, which consequently suppresses, or rather masks, an aspect of his Homeric, epic character. This is a point of interest for Quintilian, who uses Odysseus as an example of the interchange of *o* and *u*:

sic Ὀδυσσέυς, quem Ὀλισσέα fecerant Aeolis, ad ‘Ulixem’ deductus est.

So too *Odusseus* (which the Aeolians had made *Olisseus*) came to be *Ulixes*.
Inst. 1.4.16

As Quintilian explains this aetiology, it is not a simple Greek-to-Latin transition, but rather Odysseus’ name goes through an intermediary dialect, Aeolian. As we can see in Visser’s

⁴¹ At *Od.* 1.62, 5.340 and 423, 19.275. For discussions of the etymological connections of Odysseus’ name with pain, see Stanford (1952); Dimock (1962); Austin (1972); Peradotto (1990), 119, 164–66, and Chapter 5 *passim*; Segal (1994), 33 and 90–91.

outline below,⁴² ‘Odysseus’ actually comes into Latin via Doric:

Homeric: Ὀδυσσεύς/Odysseús
Attic inscriptions: Ὀλυττεύς/Olytteús
Corinthian: Ὀλισ(σ)εύς/Olis(s)eús
Doric: Οὐλιξεύς/Ulixéús

The English ‘Ulysses’ does not even come from the Homeric or Doric/Latin dialect, but rather the Corinthian. The hero’s ability to adapt, down to his given name, is remarkable, and the Romans’ awareness of Odysseus’ versatility in linguistic, literary, and cultural arenas was indeed acute.

The multiform nature of Odysseus’ name is reflected in his standard Homeric epithet *πολύτροπος*, the man of many turns, tropes, and guises.⁴³ This same multiplicity finds a synonym in the Latin *versutus*, the adjective Livius Andronicus used to first describe Odysseus in Latin. Livius Andronicus is traditionally heralded as the “inventor” of Latin literature for his Latin dramas as well as his adaptation of the *Odyssey* from Greek hexameters into Latin Saturnians.⁴⁴ Gruen discusses Livius’ incentive to produce plays at Rome,⁴⁵ but there seems to have been no such motivation for Livius to compose an epic, or more specifically a translation of the *Odyssey*, in Latin. Why then did Livius choose the *Odyssey*, and what helped the epic and its hero become the starting point for adapting Greek literature to a Roman context? The answer

⁴² Visser, *Brill’s New Pauly* s.v. Odysseus. Visser elaborates on the change between /l/ and /d/ and between /y/ and /i/, noting that, “The change between the epigraphically older /l/ and /d/ and between /y/ and /i/ ... indicates that the name is of pre-Greek origin...While the Etruscan form *utuze* is influenced by Homeric epic [2], the Latin form *Ulixes* is borrowed from the Doric; the area of transmission may have been lower Italy.” For the linguistic change, see also Sihler (1995), 151; cf. Brommer (1983), 18, for variant spellings of Odysseus’ name on Greek vases.

⁴³ *LSJ* s.v. *τρόπος* V and II.

⁴⁴ Citroni (2013) brings together discussions of the beginning of Latin literature found in Varro, Cicero, Livy, and Horace. Livius did indeed write dramas before embarking on his own *Odyssey*, but epic, as the highest of literary genres, comes to mark the true beginning of Latin literature; cf. Conte (1994), 39–42. For the dating of Livius’ first play produced at Rome, see Gruen (1990), 83–84; and for more bibliography, see Citroni (2013), 185n14.

⁴⁵ See Gruen (1990), 83–84 and 92.

may seem obvious: the *Odyssey* pushed the boundaries of Hellas westward and into Italy itself, whereas the setting and characters of the *Iliad* are firmly rooted in the eastern Mediterranean. Goldberg elaborates on the mythological aspect of the choice, “Links to the great age of heroes established Rome’s place in the Greek world, while the legend of Trojan origin through Aeneas also marked its difference. Romans could thus assimilate Greek cultural influences without surrendering their own identity.”⁴⁶ As noted in the introduction, however, Odysseus’ Italian connections run deep.⁴⁷ In more than one instance, in the 3rd century BCE in particular, he is connected to the very founding of Rome with Aeneas or through his offspring with Circe. This possibility would seriously complicate Romans’ relationship with Greece on literary, cultural, and societal levels. It would also make Livius’ choice of the *Odyssey* even more apropos, as it would be, in a way, a foundational epic of not only Roman literature, but also Rome itself.⁴⁸

Additionally, the fact that Livius was a Greek from southern Italy who wrote poetry in Rome lends another layer to the self-conscious decision to make Odysseus the first Latin epic hero.⁴⁹ Sciarrino describes the situation for Livius and other poets living in Rome in the mid-to-late 3rd century BCE, “Once in the city, the main job of the poets was to translate literary materials produced in the Greek-speaking world for Roman consumption... In the process, the poets who performed this cultural relocation tried to carve out for themselves a space next to this

⁴⁶ Goldberg (1995), 50–51; cf. Sciarrino (2006), 459, “Livius exploited for the benefit of his addressees the mythological link between Greece and Rome inherent in Odysseus’s travels in the west, a link that the Greeks themselves had used to expand their own ideological legitimacy.”

⁴⁷ See Introduction, 3ff.

⁴⁸ Cf. Gruen (1990), 85, “One will not conclude that Livius Andronicus translated the *Odyssey* to propagate a particular version of Rome’s beginnings. But the selection of that epic betokened both the Hellenic heritage ascribed to Rome and the Italian connections of the hero. The epic, like the poet, represented a cultural amalgam: the Hellenic nourishment that fostered a national sensibility.”

⁴⁹ Suetonius describes Livius and Ennius: *et poetae et semigraeci erant (Livium et Ennium dico, quos utraque lingua domi forisque docuisse adnotatum est)* (“[They] were both poets and Italian Greeks (I refer to Livius and Ennius, who gave instruction in both tongues at home and abroad, as is well known),” *Gramm.* 1); cf. Gruen (1990), 83.

elite by capitalizing on their transformational skills.”⁵⁰ Livius enters Rome as an outsider, where there is not yet an established Latin literary tradition,⁵¹ and so much like his hero the poet had to establish himself and secure a livelihood using only his words. Before I move on to discuss the lasting impact of Livius’ own foray into uncharted waters, I will first consider what Livius wrote.

Unfortunately Livius’ poem survives only in fragments,⁵² but Odysseus nonetheless endures as the first inspiration for and epic hero of the Latin literary tradition. Fortuitously, the first line of this first Latin epic has been preserved, and so we can start at the beginning’s beginning, to try to understand Livius’ conception of Odysseus and how his word choice impacted Romans’ reception of the Greekest of Greek heroes.

Virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum

Tell me, [Goddess of Song], of the man of many turns...⁵³
Odusia fr. 1

This first line of Livius’ epic has been much discussed in scholarship, and *versutus* in particular has received its own fair share of attention.⁵⁴ Since *verto* comes to be the standard word used to mean ‘translate’,⁵⁵ it can represent both how Livius envisions his unique Odysseus as well as his own project as a Latin poet who is translating Greek literature and culture to Rome. Hinds

⁵⁰ Sciarrino (2006), 452; cf. Plautus and his acknowledgement of his transformational and translational skills at *Trin.* 18–19, *Asin.* 11, *Merc.* 9–10; on *verto*, see n. 55 below.

⁵¹ That is not to say, however, that poetry and songs were not being composed; on Latin cultural production before Livius, e.g. the *carmina convivalia*, see McElduff (2013), 48–49.

⁵² Blänsdorf (post Büchner) (1995), 21–37, counts 40 fragments from Livius’ *Odusia*; cf. Morel (1927), who counts 35. See Courtney (1993), 46, who notes that Livius’ original translation was not divided into books, “since the *Odyssey* itself was not so divided when Livius translated it.”

⁵³ Translation by Hinds (1998).

⁵⁴ For bibliography, see McElduff (2013), 53n43.

⁵⁵ *OLD* s.v. *verto* 24; cf. Plautus, *Trin.* 19: *Plautus vortit barbare* (“Plautus turned it into a foreign tongue,” translation by Hinds (1998)). See McElduff (2013), 53, on *verto* and Plautus, and on *verto* in the Latin poetic tradition more generally, see Traina (1970), 55–65.

describes this collapsing of heroic adjective and poetic programme neatly, “Here in this programmatically loaded context our poet introduces a Ulysses in whom the very linguistic switch to which he owes his textual existence has been made part of his proverbial versatility.”⁵⁶ Sciarrino adds, “In fact, if by choosing *versutus* Livius ‘troped’ his linguistic versatility into Odysseus’s *polutropon*, it is also true that he ‘troped’ Odysseus’s mythological cunning back onto himself.”⁵⁷ *Versutum* replaces Odysseus’ name in this line, just as Homer avoids naming his protagonist until line 21,⁵⁸ but because we no longer have the remainder of Livius’ proem, Odysseus’ character has been collapsed into *virum versutum* – an emblem or embodiment of Livius’ project of adapting Greek to Roman as well as reconciling indigenous Roman forms with a foreign Greek tradition.

The suitability of *versutus* for Livius himself can already be seen in the first line in *insece*, the poet’s translation of Homer’s ἔννεπε. *Insece* seems to already have been archaic by Livius’ day,⁵⁹ and it has an additional meaning of ‘following after,’ either physically or with words,⁶⁰ which reinforces the meaning of *versutus* and highlights Livius’ awareness of his place in the Greek literary tradition. He is at once pursuing something wholly new in Latin, and at the same time relying upon another culture as his foundation. This dichotomy is reflected in the Greek content and Saturnian meter of the *Oduisia*, but this arrangement was not to last. Livius’ juxtaposition of the indigenous *Camena* with the thoroughly Greek subject matter is inverted by

⁵⁶ Hinds (1998), 61.

⁵⁷ Sciarrino (2006), 457.

⁵⁸ Odysseus is first named here in the dative case, and at *Od.* 1.57 in the nominative case; cf. Chapter 2, 43n118. Cf. Pucci (1982) for a detailed analysis of the proem of the *Odyssey*.

⁵⁹ For further discussion of *insece* and its rarity, which, as Hinds puts it, “[bears] witness as it does to [Livius’] detailed sophistication as a translator,” see Hinds (1998), 61; Mariotti (1986), 28; Goldberg (1995), 64; and McElduff (2013), 53. Cf., however, Suerbaum (1968), 8–11, on the “Ich” of Livius’ proem as rather a pronoun referring to Homer.

⁶⁰ Ernout and Meillet (1959), s.v. **insequo*. See n. 66 below on *insector* at Horace, *Ep.* 2.1.69.

Ennius, who composes an epic poem on a Roman subject that he then balances with the return of the Greek *Musa* as his inspiration. Ennius goes so far as to subtly, yet explicitly correct Livius in the proem of Book 10 of his *Annales*, where he picks up Livius' *insece*, but restores the *Musa* to her proper place.⁶¹ Greek forms loaded with Roman, or Romanized, content become the norm for writing poetry in Rome. While the Saturnian did not stay in vogue long, Livius' Odysseus nonetheless remained a symbol of how to adapt Greek content for a Roman audience, and he became a vehicle used by later Roman poets to examine their world, both literary and cultural, in contrast to the many foundational and inspiring Greeks who came before. Through his adventures, Odysseus comes up against monsters, foreign peoples, and his own countrymen, and in each of these encounters he does not reveal himself at the outset, but uses false names and disguises to test the waters. In this way, he can safely confront other cultures, transitioning his way seamlessly into and out of them. As we shall see below and throughout the following chapters, Roman authors employed Odysseus to explore their own origins within the literary tradition and the Mediterranean cultural landscape more generally, often envisioning Odysseus as a dangerous Trojan Horse constructed by the Greeks, but one that was also common among Romans themselves both when dealing with other Romans and abroad in the empire.

Inheriting the *Odusia*

Livius Andronicus was considered the first (*primus*) Latin poet by many later Roman writers, including Cicero, Valerius Maximus, Livy, and Quintilian.⁶² At *Epistle* 2.1.60–62, Horace uses Livius to stand in for the beginning of Latin literature: *hos ediscit et hos arto*

⁶¹ See Hinds (1998), 59. *Ann.* 322–23 Sk. reads: *insece Musa manu Romanorum induperator / quod quisque in bello gessit cum rege Philippo*. See Skutsch (1985), 144, for commentary on the Greek vocabulary Ennius reinserted into his *Annales* (e.g. not only *Musa* for *Camena*, but also *poema* for *carmen* and *poeta* for *vates*).

⁶² Cic. *Brut.* 71, *Cato* 50, *Tusc.* 1.3; Val. Max. 2.4.4; Liv. 7.2.8; Quint. *Inst.* 10.2.7; cf. Gell. 17.21.42.

stipata theatro / spectat Roma potens, habet hos numeratque poetas / ad nostrum tempus Livi scriptoris ab aevo (“These authors mighty Rome learns by heart; these she views, when packed in her narrow theatre; these she counts as her muster-roll of poets from the days of Livius the writer to our own”), as does Varro: *An potius mea verba illa quae hereditate a Romulo rege venerunt quam quae a poeta Livio relicta?* (“And in fact are those words mine which have come to me by inheritance from King Romulus, rather than those which were left behind by the poet Livius?” *Ling.* 5.9).⁶³ Although Livius himself receives credit for his poetic innovation and his *Oduvia* did provide a spark for the Latin literary tradition, his epic poem did not have an impact anywhere near that of Homer,⁶⁴ whose *Odyssey* and *Iliad* became foundational source texts for all subsequent Greek and Latin literature. Assessments of Livius’ quality vary,⁶⁵ but his text did remain in circulation at least through Horace’s lifetime. Horace remarks on his experience reading Livius’ epic in school,⁶⁶ but he had also read the *Odyssey* in Greek, preferring to read the original, rather than Livius’ Latin version, while spending time in the countryside in *Epistle*

⁶³ Translation from Kent’s Loeb. Cf. Citroni (2013), 186–87.

⁶⁴ See Farrell (2004), 267, on why the *Aeneid* came to supplant Livius’ epic; cf. Mariotti (1986), 14.

⁶⁵ Cicero says rather disparagingly at *Brut.* 71: *nam et Odysssia Latina est sic [in] tamquam opus aliquod Daedali et Livianae fabulae non satis dignae quae iterum legantur* (“It is as he says, for the Latin *Odyssey* is as it were a statue of Daedalus, and the plays of Livius are not worth a second reading”). Hinds (1998), 69, interprets Cicero’s choice of *Daedali* here thus, “Give the customarily numinous associations of ‘Daedalic’ statuary, his analogy for Livius’ *Oduvia* may carry just a fleeting implication of reverence or awe for the antique artefact despite its lack of even a Canachan degree of finish;” Citroni (2013), 195, simply defines *Daedalus* as “the emblem of archaic stiffness.” Cf. Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.71–75: *sed emendata videri / pulchraque et exactis minimum distantia miror. / inter quae verbum emicuit si forte decorum / si versus paulo concinnior unus et alter, / iniuste totum ducit venditque poema* (“But that they should be held faultless, and beautiful, and well-nigh perfect, amazes me. Among them, it may be a pleasing phrase shines forth, or one or two lines are somewhat better turned—then these unfairly carry off and sell the whole poem”).

⁶⁶ Horace remembers his experience reading Livius Andronicus at *Ep.* 2.1.69–71: *non equidem insector delendave carmina Livi / esse reor, memini quae plagosum mihi parvo / Orbilium dictare* (“I am not crying down the poems of Livius—I would not doom to destruction verses which I remember Orbilius of the rod dictated to me as a boy”); cf. Hinds (1998), 61 and 71n37, on the ancient debate over the spelling and meaning of *insece* and Horace’s play on that here with *insector*. Livius himself was a schoolmaster, but Conte (1994), 40, argues for the artistic merits of Livius’ translation and that it was not meant to be *only* a school text. On Homer’s place in Roman education, see Bonner (1977), 213.

1.2.⁶⁷ In this letter, Horace renders his own version of the beginning of the *Odyssey* in order to demonstrate to Lollius the utility of reading Homer and the lessons to be learned from Ulysses:

rursus, quid virtus et quid sapientia possit,
utile proposuit nobis exemplar Ulixen,
qui domitor Troiae multorum providus urbis
et mores hominum inspexit latumque per aequor,
dum sibi, dum sociis reditum parat, aspera multa
pertulit, adversis rerum immersabilis undis.

Again, of the power of worth and wisdom he
has set before us an instructive pattern in Ulysses,
that tamer of Troy, who looked with discerning eyes
upon the cities and manners of many men, and
while for self and comrades he strove for a return
across the broad seas, many hardships he endured,
but he could never be overwhelmed in the waves of adversity.

Ep. 1.2.17–22

Within the relative clause, Horace describes Ulysses as *providus* and the *domitor* of Troy who has seen the *urbes* and *mores* of men. In the *Ars Poetica*, Horace more concisely paraphrases the opening of the *Odyssey* into Latin, abandoning Livius' *Camena*, *insece*, and *versutum*, but retaining the *mores hominum* from *Ep.* 1.2 to create another version of the epic's *incipit*.

dic mihi, Musa, virum, captae post tempora Troiae
qui mores hominum multorum vidit et urbis.

Sing, Muse, for me the man who on Troy's fall
saw the wide world, its ways and cities all.

AP 141–42

Horace does not include here any adjective to match *πολύτροπος*, choosing again to modify Ulysses with a relative clause. In both passages Horace seems to deliberately suppress Odysseus' most famous quality—versatility—as well as Livius' striking and apt translation of *versutus*. Especially here in the *Ars Poetica* Horace supports his theory with his practice; he

⁶⁷ Farrell (2004), 269, remarks, “The *mise-en-scène* of the epistle is significant as well. Horace claims to have written this letter from Praeneste, which was traditionally regarded as a foundation of Telegonus, son of Odysseus and Circe.” For discussion of the history of interpreting Homer allegorically, see Buffière (1973); Lamberton (1986), 1–43; Lamberton and Keane (1992), *passim*; and Hardie (1985); cf. Farrell (2004), 269n45.

instructs poets to make common material their own by taking the most well known material in both Greek and Latin and rendering it in their own peculiar way.⁶⁸ The fact that he even reuses the same words from the relative clause in *Ep.* 1.2 (*qui domitor Troiae multorum providus urbes / et mores hominum inspexit latumque per aequor*) to construct a slightly different, yet unique relative clause in the *AP* (*qui mores hominum multorum vidit et urbis*) is noteworthy.

The omission of *versutus* is almost glaring, but Horace makes another more subtle change to the *Odyssey*'s *incipit*, that of turning Homer's *νόος* into Roman *mores*.⁶⁹ The shift in focus to the 'customs', 'habits', and 'characters' of men, rather than their minds or intentions, reflects the importance of customs and inheritance at Rome (e.g. the *mos maiorum*) as well as putting an emphasis on how Romans and other people *do* things, rather than *think about* things. By attributing to Ulysses an interest in how other people behave, and not just how they think, lends a particularly Roman flavor to the hero's epic travels and places him more firmly in a Mediterranean controlled from Rome.

The potential epic associations of *mores* are perhaps best exemplified by Virgil in Book 1 of the *Aeneid*. Beginning at line 257, Jupiter speaks to Venus, reassuring her of Rome's future greatness:

hic tibi (fabor enim, quando haec te cura remordet,
longius et volvens fatorum arcana movebo)
bellum ingens geret Italia populosque ferocis
contundet moresque viris et moenia ponet,
tertia dum Latio regnantem viderit aestas
ternaque transierint Rutulis hiberna subactis.

⁶⁸ Horace does essentially compose a word-for-word rendering of the first line of the *Odusia* in the first four words of *AP* 141, but he replaces *insece* with *dic* (which was a possible synonym; cf. Ernout and Meillet (1959), s.v. **insequo*), and switches the positions of *mihi* and *virum*.

⁶⁹ McElduff (2013), 144, interprets Horace's choice, "The Latin also turns the Greek's *nous*, mind or ways of thinking, into *mores*, customs or ways of doing things, subtly Romanizing the line even as it retains Homer's Muse over Livius Andronicus's *Camena*;" cf. *ibid.*, 231n66, on Horace's text of Homer, which may have had *nomos*, a word closer in meaning to *mores*.

Your son (I now speak out—I know this anxiousness
is gnawing at you; I unroll the secret
scroll of the Fates, awake its distant pages)
shall wage tremendous war in Italy
and crush ferocious nations and establish
a way of life and walls for his own people—
until the time of his third summer as
the king of Latium, until he has passed
three winters since he overcame the Latins.

Aen. 1.261–66

In his commentary, Austin remarks, “Conington well notes that the word [*mores*] conveyed to a Roman many of the notions which political institutions and a social system convey to us ... Thus early in his epic Virgil stresses Rome’s unique and special gift to the world, as he saw it: the *artes* of 6.852 f., *pacique imponere morem, / parcere subietis et debellare superbos*.”⁷⁰ The endurance and preservation of Italian and Roman *mores* are confirmed by Jupiter in his speech to Juno at the end of the *Aeneid*.

sermonem Ausonii patrium moresque tenebunt,
utque est nomen erit; commixti corpore tantum
subsident Teucrici. **morem** ritusque sacrorum
adiciam faciamque omnis uno ore Latinos.

For the Ausonians will keep
their homeland’s words and ways; their name will stay;
the body of the Teucricians will merge
with Latins, and their names will fall away.
But I shall add their rituals and customs
to the Ausonians’, and make them all—
and with one language—Latins.

Aen. 12.834–37

Virgil uses *mores* to bookend the *Aeneid*, taking advantage of the word’s multiple connotations, starting with the introduction and establishment of civilization in Book 1 and ending with the

⁷⁰ Austin (1971), ad 264; cf. also Evander at *Aen.* 8.316: *quis neque mos neque cultus erat* (“They had no rule and no refinements”).

preservation of traditions and civilization in Book 12.⁷¹ This multiplicity reinforces Horace's own conception of Odysseus, making the Greek hero at once an observer of other cultures as well as one who potentially brings culture and traditions with him (e.g. to the island of the Cyclopes). Before we delve deeper into our exploration of Horace's Odysseus, however, we must first backtrack and consider Odysseus' other appearances in early Latin literature.

A Comic Ulysses

After Livius Andronicus, our cunning hero makes an appearance in a number of Plautus' comedies; he is not cast as a character himself, however, but rather as a mythological model for the tricky slave. The most extensive description and manipulation of Odysseus and his exploits during the Trojan War are in the *Bacchides*,⁷² where Chrysalus spends over 50 lines (925–78) comparing his deception of the old man Nicobolus to the sack of Troy in mock-heroic terms.⁷³ This passage contains a number of inconsistencies, for which Barsby offers possible justifications, and which Jocelyn decries as nonsense resulting from interpolations.⁷⁴ Skaft Jensen, on the other hand, argues against the seeming incoherence of Chrysalus' identifications in this passage, following Fraenkel and Austin.⁷⁵ While it is impossible to be certain of the

⁷¹ Cf. the epic inclusion of *mores* in the *Georgics* at 4.3–5: *admiranda tibi levium spectacula rerum / magnanimosque duces totiusque ordine gentis / mores et studia et populos et proelia dicam* ("The wondrous pageant of a tiny world—chiefs great-hearted, a whole nation's character and tastes and tribes and battles—I will in due order to you unfold"); and elsewhere in the *Aeneid* at 6.683, 9.254, and 11.347.

⁷² For discussions on how familiar Plautus and his Roman audience would have been with Trojan cycle, see Fraenkel (2007), 65–67; Skaft Jensen (1997), 322; Barsby (1986), ad 935–44.

⁷³ Plautus' *Bacchides* is adapted from Menander's *Dis exapaton*; for specific examples of adherence to or deviation from the original, see Barsby (1986), *passim*; McElduff (2013), 63; Bain (1979); and Danese (2002), 134–36. On the relationship between Plautus' Roman comedies and their Greek models more generally, see Fraenkel (2007), 1–4; Sharrock (2009), 18–21; Halporn (1993); and Slater (1985), 6–7.

⁷⁴ There is no evidence in the surviving text of Menander's play to suggest a parallel mythological triumphal ode. It is therefore generally agreed that Chrysalus' *canticum* is an original addition composed by Plautus; see especially Fraenkel (2007), 46–49; Barsby (1986), ad loc.; Jocelyn (1969).

⁷⁵ Skaft Jensen (1997), 318; Fraenkel (2007), 52–53; Austin (1964), 34.

authenticity of these lines, the inconsistencies and hyperboles help to further characterize Chrysalus (and Plautus), who is clearly playing with and taking pleasure in mishandling a well-known story.⁷⁶ Chrysalus and Plautus stretch the limits of the audience's imagination by fitting every odd detail of the Trojan War to the scheme of the play; as Skafte Jensen notes, there are "no limits to [their] inventive powers."⁷⁷ Odysseus, as the most malleable of the Greek heroes, offers the ideal model for the character and the playwright on how to adapt to a strange situation and make it work for oneself.

In the course of his song, Chrysalus heaps up associations between famous Trojan War figures and their common comedic counterparts. He does not stop at a one-to-one identification, however; he goes so far as to identify himself as not one, but two epic heroes. By assigning the identities of Greek and Trojan warriors to the lowly characters in the play, Chrysalus at once reduces the loftiness of the heroic past, while he simultaneously elevates the style of his comedic monody. Additionally, Plautus, using Chrysalus as a mouthpiece, calls attention to his own versatile abilities to devise a plot and carry it out successfully.⁷⁸ Unsurprisingly, the primary mythological hero in Chrysalus' song is Ulysses, a master storyteller himself and chief plotter of the Greeks. He is the premier *exemplum* for both the tricky slave and skillful playwright.

Consequently, thievery and deceit loom large in Chrysalus' monody, where in addition to drawing the broader similarity between his deception of Nicobolus and the sack of Troy, he more

⁷⁶ Barsby (1986), ad 935–44, argues for Plautus' and his audience's familiarity with written accounts of Odysseus and the Trojan Horse, citing for the Latin side Livius Andronicus' *Odusia*, the *Equos Troianus* plays of Livius and Naevius, and the *Alexander* of Ennius; on the Greek side, there are Homer, the *Ilias Parva* and *Iliupersis*, Sophocles' lost *Laocoon* and *Sinon*, among other mentions in Aeschylus, Euripides, Aristophanes, and Menander. Cf. Farrell (2004), for Etruscans' and Romans' familiarity with the Homeric epics as demonstrated in both art and literature.

⁷⁷ Skafte Jensen (1997), 318.

⁷⁸ Sciarrino (2006), 457n22, argues, "The clever slave is also the character through whom Plautus speaks of himself as a poet;" see Plaut. *Pseud.* 401–405. Cf. Slater (1985), 168ff., for discussion of Plautus, the nature of illusion, and metatheatre.

specifically compares himself to the mastermind behind the Trojan horse, Ulysses—claiming, in fact, to be Ulysses in the story.

Epiust Pistoclerus: ab eo haec sumptae; Mnesilochus Sino est
relictus, ellum non in busto Achilli, sed in lecto accubat;
Bacchidem habet secum: ille olim habuit ignem qui signum daret,
hunc ipsum exurit; **ego sum Ulixes, cuius consilio haec gerunt.**

So Pistoclerus is Epeus, from whom the tablets were taken, and Mnesilochus is Sinon, who lies not on Achilles' tomb but, as you see him, on a couch, and Bacchis with him. Sinon had lighted a flame to give the sign: His flame burns *him*. And I'm Ulysses, master-planner of it all.

Bac. 937–40

Chrysalus begins his monody by mapping his current situation onto the Greeks' sack of Troy, aligning the citadel and Priam with Nicobulus and the Trojan Horse with the slave's writing tablets. The mapping continues, however, even to the point of characters in the epic, beginning with Pistoclerus and Mnesilochus as Epeus and Sinon respectively. Epeus is named in Homer only at *Od.* 8.493,⁷⁹ and Sinon is not named in Homer at all (although he is present elsewhere in the epic cycle).⁸⁰ The slave Chrysalus designates himself as the epic hero of this play, the architect of the deception, and condenses his identity, even erases it, to reveal himself as Ulysses. In this way, it seems as if Chrysalus is imagining his own epic play-within-a-play, where he is assigning roles to everyone he knows, to act out Plautus' lowly play on a grander stage. By claiming the role of Ulysses, Chrysalus takes on both directing and acting duties—not content only to orchestrate the plan, but following the lead of his epic model, he remains an active participant in the action.

In line 937, however, Plautus puts a Roman twist on this Greek heroic *exemplum* by using *consilium* to refer to the slave's ultimate stratagem, thereby substituting a Roman word for the

⁷⁹ See also Fraenkel (2007), 70, on Epeus.

⁸⁰ Sinon appears most famously at *Aen.* 2.57–198 (cf. Austin (1959)), but before Virgil, he is named at schol. Lyc. 344 (= *Ilias Parva*) and Procl. *Chr. p.* 107, 26f. (= *Ilioupersis*).

‘trick’ (δόλος) traditionally associated with Odysseus.⁸¹ Sharrock comments on Plautus’ use of *consilium* more generally, “Cognate with *consul*, the word is much in demand in the arena of politics and the law. Plautus, typically, transfers the word from its highly respectable linguistic register into that of comedy, and gives *consilium* a programmatic force, signifying the cunning plan which is also the plot of the play.”⁸² That Chrysalus/Plautus employs the Roman word *consilium* before the Greek term, and at the very outset of the song, provides a Roman context for both the plot of the play and Odysseus’ dealings at Troy, despite the fact that the former is meant to take place in Greece and the latter in Asia Minor. Additionally, the high register of *consilium* elevates the character of both Chrysalus and his model Ulysses, as well as raising the register of the play’s dialogue overall and appealing more directly to its Roman audience.⁸³ Chrysalus thus translates Odysseus into a Roman context through this single word and consequently imbues the Greek hero with a richer literary history, marking him as the fountainhead from which both Chrysalus, the tricky Greek slave, and Plautus, the Roman poet, can take their cues.

The connection between identity and plotting that Chrysalus draws here specifically, by calling himself Ulysses, can be related to Plautus’ comedic program more generally. Sharrock comments on aspects of identity and plot activity that she deems integral to the workings of Roman comedy, “That internal plotting is a programmatic sign for comedy; that internal and external plotting (that is, the best laid plans of the characters *in* the play, and the plot *of* the play) are mutually reinforcing; and that instability of identity within a play slides into the precarious

⁸¹ For an in-depth discussion of δόλος and Odysseus, see Chapter 2, 45ff. Sharrock (2009), 10–11, lists the variety of words used in Roman comedy for ‘trick’ as well as to describe the ‘tricksters’ themselves. See also the discussion on lines 945–52 above.

⁸² Sharrock (2009), 11.

⁸³ Cf. Fraenkel (2007), 262.

construction of identity in the production of a play.”⁸⁴ As is the case with Livius Andronicus’ skillful application of *versutus* to both the epic hero and his own translation project, Plautus is able to take on Ulysses’ more devious side as well as his ability to construct a *consilium* and tell a story. Early on in his appearances in Roman literature, then, poets marshal Ulysses initially in the service of dual functions: he is at once a positive model for poets and a rather negative model for lowly, servile, deceptive behavior.

In his monody, the tricky slave also points to his, and Ulysses’, ability to improvise. As noted above, Ulysses is the absolute ideal vehicle for the voice of the tricky slave as well as the poet himself. In the *Odyssey*, Homer blends his own poetic authority with that of Odysseus in books 9–12,⁸⁵ and we have seen how Livius Andronicus, in his *Odusia*, chose an adjective that could be appropriately applied to the hero ‘of many turns’ as well as to his translator. The self-awareness with which Chrysalus proceeds to outline his similarities to Ulysses brings to mind the self-consciousness of the hero himself in Seneca’s *Troades*. When Andromache attempts to convince Ulysses that Astyanax is dead, Ulysses calls upon his own nature to help him see through her lie: *nunc advoca astus, anime, nunc fraudes, dolos, / nunc totum Ulixem* (“Now, my mind, summon up your cunning, your deceit, your trickery, everything that is Ulysses,” *Tro.* 613–14).⁸⁶ By Seneca’s time, the Latin literary tradition had grown significantly since Plautus’s day, increasing the burden on poets, and in the case of dramas on actors as well, of living up to past performances. In the *Troades*, lines 613–14 apply to the playwright, who must write a convincing portrayal of Ulysses, and the actor, who must bring the tricky hero to life. There is

⁸⁴ Sharrock (2009), 96.

⁸⁵ On the unifying effect that Odysseus’ first-person narrative has on the *Odyssey* as a whole, see Heubeck-Hoekstra, 3–4.

⁸⁶ See Tarrant (1985), ad 53, for other examples of the self-awareness of mythological figures in Seneca’s tragedies, and Tarrant (1995), 222–23, on Medea, who is a particularly rich example.

one more level here than in the *Bacchides*, however; instead of a separate character assuming the role of Ulysses, here Ulysses the character must recall what it means to play the part of “Ulysses.” Will this Ulysses live up to other epic and dramatic Ulysseses? The sequence of playwright-actor-character-*exemplum*, which we see in the progression of Plautus-Chrysalus-Ulysses in the *Bacchides*, is complicated by Seneca’s belatedness in the literary tradition and the character’s self-awareness of his own exemplarity. There was no such burden for Plautus, who instead confronts the Greek literary tradition more irreverently. By mapping the identity of Ulysses onto Chrysalus, Plautus (and Chrysalus himself) displays his awareness of the epic tradition, his ability to insert himself into it, and ultimately, to do it one better.

Chrysalus does not limit his self-identifications to Ulysses, however;⁸⁷ he continues his song, making further claims that he is both Agamemnon *and* Ulysses. The piling up of roles reveals Chrysalus’ dramatic self-consciousness—he wants to play all the parts in the mock epic drama he is envisioning on stage.

nostro seni huic stolido, ei profecto nomen facio ego Ilio;
 miles Menelaust, **ego Agamemno, idem Ulixes Lartius**,
 Mnesilochust Alexander, qui erit exitio rei patriae suae;
 is Helenam avexit, cuia causa nunc facio obsidium Ilio.
 nam illi itidem Ulixem audivi, ut ego sum, fuisse et audacem et malum:
 <in> **dolis** ego prensus sum, ille mendicans paene inventus interiit,
 dum ibi exquirat fata Iliorum; adsimiliter mi hodie optigit.
 vinctus sum, sed **dolis** me exemi: item se ille servavit **dolis**.

To this obtuse old man of ours I give the name of Ilium.
 The soldier’s Menelaus, I am Agamemnon and Ulysses too.
 Mnesilochus is Paris, who’ll destroy the wealth of his fatherland:
 He carried Helen off, for whom I’m now besieging Ilium.
 There Ulysses was bold and bad, or so I’ve heard, as I am now.
 I’ve been caught tricking: *he*, his beggar’s guise exposed, was nearly killed,
 while spying on the Trojans’ plans. The same thing’s happened now to me:

⁸⁷ Farrell (2004), 270, notes, “Such habits seem to imply a very long tradition—longer, perhaps, than the recorded history of Roman literature—of comparing aspects of contemporary life to Homeric paradigms. In fact, self-identification with the actions and characters depicted in Homer’s epics and adoption of ideals embodied in those actions and characters, is characteristic not only of Roman but of other Italian elites as well.”

Tied up, I freed myself by tricks, just as by tricks he saved himself.
Bac. 945–52

He elaborates further here on his similarities with Ulysses, making a direct comparison (*ut ego sum* 949), and balancing the next three lines (950–52) between what he is going through now and what Ulysses went through before. These lines are interlocking, starting with Chrysalus' *ego*, followed by *ille* in line 950; Ulysses starts off line 951, while Chrysalus rounds it off with *mi*; in 952, Chrysalus emphasizes the self-sufficiency of both himself (*victus sum...me*) and Ulysses (*se ille*) and their abilities to get themselves out of trouble. The chiasmic interweaving of these phrases (*a-b-b-a-a-b*) reflects and underscores the parallelism that Chrysalus is creating between himself and the epic hero, while it also reveals Chrysalus' purposeful and artistic arrangement of his monody's plot. The craft and skill necessary for such a composition is reinforced in another way in those same three lines (950–52), where Chrysalus uses *dolus* three times in quick succession, highlighting its importance both for himself and Ulysses. These *doli* follow Chrysalus' declaration above that he is Ulysses, *cuius consilio haec gerunt* (940); the Roman term that established the context has been replaced by the more conventional, and more Odyssean, term for 'trick'. This switch from the Roman *consilium* to the Greek and Roman *δόλος/dolus*, collapses both cultures and brings the audience more securely into the heroic realm. *Dolus* also calls to mind Odysseus' own use of the word in the *Odyssey* to describe the Trojan horse.

In *Odyssey* 8, Odysseus is similarly not shy about the role he played in orchestrating the trick of the Trojan Horse, and this must lie behind, however subtly (perhaps referenced by *audivi* in line 949 above and *ut praedicabant* in 962 below), Chrysalus' telling of his epic accomplishments in the *Bacchides*. While among the Phaeacians, Odysseus, still disguised, requests that Demodocus sing of the Trojan Horse.

ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ μετάβηθι καὶ ἵππου κόσμον ἄεισον
δουρατέου, τὸν Ἐπειὸς ἐποίησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ,
ὃν ποτ' ἐς ἀκρόπολιν δόλον ἤγαγε δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
ἀνδρῶν ἐμπλήσας οἳ ῥ' Ἴλιον ἐξαλάπαξαν.

Come to another part of the story, sing us the wooden horse,
which Epeios made with Athene helping, the stratagem
great Odysseus filled once with men and brought it to the
upper city, and it was these men who sacked Ilion.

Od. 8.492–95

Garvie, in his commentary, describes Odysseus' naming of himself here as “gratuitous,” and goes on to note, “[it] suggests that [Odysseus] is almost teasing his audience and challenging it to make the correct deduction...But in [this passage] the psychology of Odysseus is less important than the poet's purpose. It is Homer who is preparing *us* for the revelation of his identity.”⁸⁸

Odysseus also links his own name with his most famous feat, the Trojan Horse, referring to it as a δόλος. He reiterates and underscores the connection between himself and his cunning when he finally reveals himself to Alcinous: εἴμ' Ὀδυσσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν / ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καὶ μεν κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει (“I am Odysseus son of Laertes, known before all men for the study of crafty designs, and my fame goes up to the heavens,” *Od.* 9.19–20). The hero's self-identification is very similar to that of Chrysalus when he claims to be Ulysses (*ego sum Ulixes, cuius consilio haec gerunt, Bac.* 940), which makes the reversal of Odysseus' reluctance to claim his own identity throughout the *Odyssey* and Chrysalus' eagerness to thoroughly assume that identity all the more striking. Through the chiasmic structure and repetition of *dolis*, Chrysalus adopts Odysseus' own heroic and self-congratulatory mode of storytelling, which propels him to the climax of his narrative and of the action of the play as a whole.

Chrysalus rounds off his extended comparison by elaborating on how Ulysses' way with words in particular saved him, after being recognized by Helen.

⁸⁸ Garvie (1994), ad 487–98.

ibi vix me exsolvi: id periculum adsimilo, Ulixem ut praedicant
 cognitum ab Helena esse proditum Hecubae; sed ut olim ille se
blanditiis exemit et **persuasit** se ut amitteret,
 item ego **dolis** me illo extuli e periculo et decepi senem.
 post cum magnifico milite, urbes **verbis** qui inermis capit,
 conflixi atque hominem reppuli; dein pugnam conservi seni:
 eum ego adeo uno mendacio devici, uno ictu extempulo
 cepi spolia. is nunc ducentos nummos Philippos militi,
 quos dare se promisit, dabit.

I only just escaped a danger like Ulysses', whom, they say, Helen recognized and then betrayed to Hecuba; just as he freed himself by winning words, persuading her to let him go, so I got out of danger here by tricks, deceiving our old man. I then engaged the braggart soldier, sacker of cities by words unarmed, and beat him off, and after that joined battle with the old man here. I vanquished him with a single lie, with a single stroke I seized the spoils then and there. And now he'll pay the soldier what he promised he would pay, two hundred sovereigns.

Bac. 962–70

As Chrysalus tells it, this escape, perhaps more so than the invention of the Trojan Horse, is his, and Ulysses', crowning achievement. Chrysalus expands on the *dolis* in the passage above, and he again highlights his own heroic qualities, describing himself as the “sacker of cities” (*urbes verbis qui inermis capit*, 966). In this line, words become his armor, much as they were for Odysseus when he was recognized by Helen and throughout the *Odyssey* (e.g. in the Cyclops' cave and Circe's palace). Just as Chrysalus conflates epic heroes and comedic slaves, so too does Plautus skillfully jumble together the worlds of Homer and contemporary Rome.

At the end of his song, Chrysalus transitions from the mythological realm to the concrete world of Rome,⁸⁹ where victorious generals, such as himself, celebrate triumphs.

nunc alteris etiam ducentis usus est, qui dispensentur
 Illo capto, ut sit mulsum qui triumphant milites.

And now we need a second sum, two hundred more, to give the troops;
 They shall celebrate their triumph over captured Troy with mead.

⁸⁹ Cf. Fraenkel (2007), 161–65, for discussion of the reality behind Plautus' triumphant slaves, e.g. *Bac.* 1071: *domum reduco integrum omnem exercitum* and a fragment from a triumphal tablet, *CIL* I.541: *exercitum salvom atque incolumen...domum reportavit*. For a complete history of the Roman triumph, see Beard (2007), esp. 42–71 on the triumph's impact on Roman life, culture, and thought.

Through Chrysalus, Plautus is able to collapse Troy and Rome, while also continuing Chrysalus' hyperbolic analogy of his exploits to epic military achievements.⁹⁰ The slave as *triumphator* is a common theme in Plautus, but at this moment in the *Bacchides*, not only is there discordance between the “original” Athenian setting of the play and its production in Rome, but the mythical past also contributes another anachronistic layer to the cultural *mélange* that is Plautine comedy.⁹¹ Through Chrysalus' imitation, and even impersonation, of Ulysses, Plautus brings the story of the Trojan War to life on stage in a way that blends the mythic past, the dramatic reality of the play, and the audience's Roman surroundings to reflect the melting pot of the Latin literary tradition. In lines 958–60, Chrysalus himself actively participates in feats from the Trojan War: *ibi signum ex arce iam apstuli ... nec magis id ceperam oppidum ... ibi occidi Troilum* (“Then I stole the statue from the citadel ... I hadn't got the city yet ... then I murdered Troilus”). The following lines (962–65, above) are an extended comparison between Ulysses and Chrysalus, which culminate in a return to the action of the play emphasized by the repetition of *nunc* in lines 969–71. The fluid movement between epic past, comedic present, and Roman context evidenced especially at the end of Chrysalus' monody, itself an original composition by Plautus,⁹² is especially facilitated by the deployment of Ulysses. That Plautus can, in a sense, cross-pollinate Ulysses' character from one genre to another, from one literary tradition to another, exemplifies the way in which later Roman authors use Ulysses to explore other generic,

⁹⁰ The triumph imagery is picked up again at 1068ff., esp. 1072–73: *sed, spectatores, vos nun ne miremini / quod non triumpho*. See Galinsky (1969b), 75–76, for discussion of and bibliography on the history of the Roman triumph, which was, as he notes, “one of the most venerable, highly coveted, and awe-inspiring Roman institutions.” He also makes mention of the fact that “before the Augustans, only Plautus used the motif of the *triumphator* to any significant extent” (76n3).

⁹¹ See Chapter 3, 100, for discussion of Ulysses as a *triumphator* in Ovid, *Met.* 13; for the original setting of Athens and its effect on the dramatization of characters' behavior, see Segal (1987), 31–40.

⁹² See n. 74 below.

literary, and cultural boundaries.

Elsewhere in the Plautine corpus, the characters of Ulysses and the tricky slave are again united, but in these cases, the identification is not made by the slave himself. In *Pseudolus*, Simo is talking about Pseudolus, who claimed to be able to snatch the courtesan Phoenicium from

Ballio the pimp:

Viso quid rerum **meus Ulixes** egerit,
iamne habeat signum ex arce Ballionia

Now to see what my Ulysses has accomplished, and
whether he has yet got the image from the Ballionian citadel.

Pseud. 1063–64

And again at lines 1243–45, Simo says about Pseudolus:

nimis illic mortalis doctus, nimis **vorsutus**, nimis **malus**;
superavit **dolum** Troianum atque **Ulixem** Pseudolus.
nunc ibo intro, argentum promam, Pseudolo insidias dabo.

What a fellow he is – so clever, so shifty, so damned artful!
Ulysses and that Trojan dodge are quite outclassed by Pseudolus.
Well, I'll go in, produce the cash, and lie in wait for the liar.

Pseudolus goes from being Ulysses to one-upping him – and he does such a good job of playing the trickster that the tricky slave could become the model for the hero! Simo has also applied the adjectives *vorsutus* (cf. Livius' *versutus*) and *malus* (used by Chrysalus at *Bac.* 949 above) directly to Pseudolus, and he has included mention of the Trojan Horse (*dolum Troianum*), solidifying the identification he made only 200 lines previously as well as corresponding with the characterization of Chrysalus/Ulysses fleshed out in the *Bacchides*.

In the *Menaechmi*, Menaechmus I is upset at the parasite Peniculus for ratting him out to his wife after meeting Menaechmus II and becoming confused:

Quae me clam ratus sum facere, ea omnia fecit palam
parasitus, qui me complevit flagiti et formidinis,
meus Ulixes, suo qui regi tantum concivit mali.

Everything I thought I was doing on the sly has got out,
thanks to that parasite who's overwhelmed me with infamy and fear—
that Ulysses of mine who's brewed such a mess for his lord and master!

Men. 900–903

Fraenkel interprets Plautus' use of *meus Ulixes* in the *Pseudolus* and *Menaechmi*, stating, “We could say in a schematic way that *meus Ulixes* functions as a trope here; the mythological element has been reduced to a very general connection.”⁹³ I would argue, rather, that *meus Ulixes* works in a more specific and subtle way; on the one hand, the effect is similar to that of Chrysalus' narrative in the *Bacchides*—the speakers humorously invoke the epic hero to put him on the same level as a slave and to elevate the generic status of their own situations. There may also be a certain degree of self-consciousness here, both on the part of the playwright and of the characters in the play, in that the tricky slave has been aligned with Ulysses elsewhere in Plautus' corpus.⁹⁴ The identification of the tricky slave as Ulysses exploits one facet of the hero's character to create a model, with a mythological pedigree, for the lowliest character in the play.

But just as various aspects of Ulysses' character can be claimed by any number of people (e.g. *versutus/vorsutus* by Livius and Pseudolus), so too can any number of Ulysseses appear within the same work. At the beginning of the *Bacchides* in fr. 15, long before Chrysalus sings his song we find Ulysses invoked as model for the wandering hero:

Ulixem audivi fuisse aerumnosissimum,
qui annis viginti **errans a patria** afuit:
verum hic adulescens multo Ulixem anteit,
qui ilico **errat intra muros civicos**.

⁹³ Fraenkel (2007), 69. Cf. Gratwick (1993), ad *Men.* 902: “tantamount to *Mos.* 1066 (*ludificatorem meum*); Ulysses has most in common with clever slaves (wifeliness) and with parasites (frank fondness of food and drink, resourcefulness, expertise in dissembling and disguise as a beggar).

⁹⁴ Because a secure date for most of Plautus' plays is not available, it is difficult to determine whether references to Ulysses in the *Menaechmi* and *Pseudolus* could be allusions to Chrysalus' monody in the *Bacchides*.

Ulysses was the most toilworn, so I've heard, as he wandered
twenty years away from home. But *this* young man has
far surpassed Ulysses, just wandering within his city's walls.

Bac. fr. 15

Barsby suggests that these lines could be ascribed to Bacchis, who is commenting on Pistoclus' search on behalf of Mnesilochus, or Pistoclus could be delivering the prologue in which he compares himself to Ulysses.⁹⁵ Although the speaker and position of these lines are unknown, it is still possible to comment on the effect of this particular Ulysses and the comparison to, and surpassing of, his wanderings. The first two lines of the fragment have an epic tone, the first being made up of only four words, and the second introducing the audience immediately to the suffering Ulysses of the *Odyssey*'s opening. *Audivi* keeps us slightly removed from the action, similarly to ἔννεπε, and it may also function as an Alexandrian footnote of sorts that is meant to remind the audience specifically of the *Odyssey* (Homer's or perhaps Livius').⁹⁶ With the entire epic in mind, we are primed for the humorous reversal in the next two lines. We are about to see a production that is beyond epic, where a young man outdoes (*antidit*) the most wretched Ulysses in wandering, despite remaining inside his own city's walls (*intra muros civicos*). The contradiction of 'surpassing' while staying within a boundary could be read programmatically here. No matter how heroic, pitiful, or wretched the action and characters will be, they are nonetheless confined to a stage, which brings with it certain physical limitations. But the audience's imagination is free to run wild, which is where Ulysses and all of his epic baggage come into play. This wandering-Ulysses thread at the opening of the play does not find any closure, but rather the long-suffering man is replaced by the tricky and clever hero. Ulysses is

⁹⁵ Barsby (1986), 95.

⁹⁶ Cf. Barsby (1986), ad 11–14, who notes, "The form in which the comparison is cast ('most ... I've heard ... surpassed') is typically Plautine (*Bac.* 925–30, *Mer.* 469f., *Mos.* 775–77)."

not restricted to having only one nature in a given text, but, as Plautus demonstrates, he can appear in multiple guises and be a model for a number of different figures simultaneously.

At the commencement of the Latin literary tradition, we find not an indigenous, Italic hero leading the way, but rather a translation of the clever, ambiguous, and very Greek Odysseus. The versatile virtuoso proved a perfect entry-point for Livius Andronicus to cross over from the Greek literary tradition into the Latin, for which Ulysses has become the unsung hero. The programmatic *versutus* became unprogrammatic because of its very definition, and yet Odysseus continued to be used by later Roman authors to reveal the tensions, both cultural and literary, that exist between Greece and Rome. Plautus explored that tension on stage, where his Greece was “a Greece displaced to the Roman stage and all the more constructed, all the more hyperbolically Greek for that. It is therefore a Greece which invites constant reflection on what it is to be a Roman, just as, in the world outside the theatre, the ever-increasing influence of Greek culture on Rome makes the task of defining true, undefiled Romanity all the more urgent.”⁹⁷ This well describes any Roman satirist along with any other Roman poet claiming to compose in a genre inherited from the Greeks. Odysseus’ geographical and genealogical connections to Italy, and Rome specifically, make him an even more relevant tool for investigating the influence of Greece on Rome and attempting to discern the boundary, if there is one, between the two. In the following chapters, we will see how Roman authors used Odysseus to comment on their contemporary literary and cultural atmospheres, taking advantage of the “slippage” between fiction of ‘long ago and far away’ and the present now especially afforded by Odysseus’ mythological, yet Greek and Roman heritage.⁹⁸

⁹⁷ Leigh (2004), 54; cf. Burrows (2013), 134, and Fraenkel (2007), 259–86, on the differences between the conditions of performance in Athens and Rome and the effects of those differences on dramas performed in Rome.

⁹⁸ Burrows (2013), 135, describes anachronistic (or ‘anatomic’) theater in similar terms.

Chapter 2

Hook, Line, and Sinker: Ulysses the *Captator* in Horace, *Satire 2.5*

The gap between Odysseus' epic past and the realities of Roman culture and society is more fully exposed in Horace, *Satire 2.5*. In this poem, Horace blends the Greek hero's first epic and comedic roles to explore the question: What if Odysseus had returned home to Rome rather than Ithaca? Horace's humorous response to this question offers commentary on satire's, as well as his own, place in the literary tradition, which he had begun in *Satires I*, especially in *Sat. 1.10* and his inheritance of the satiric mantle from Quirinus in a "burlesque dream vision."⁹⁹ Josiah Osgood has noted that already in the first line of the poem, in particular *praeter narrata* ("besides what you have already told"), Horace signals his generic departure from epic, "Since satire finds topics to treat beyond the more limited range of epic."¹⁰⁰ Fittingly, then, in this poem Horace takes as his starting point the *Nekuia* in *Odyssey 11* and supplements Odysseus and Teiresias' conversation as well as Teiresias' prophecy concerning Odysseus' homecoming. In this updated Roman version, when Teiresias prophesies that Ulysses will come home to find nothing, the man of many wives is finally at a loss and asks for Teiresias' help in recovering the wealth that has been consumed by Penelope's suitors. Teiresias' proposed solution is to learn the art of inheritance-hunting,¹⁰¹ or *captatio*.

Captatio involves ingratiating oneself with a wealthy, preferably childless, old man with

⁹⁹ Gowers (2012), 306, on *Sat. 1.10.31–35*. Thank you to Richard Thomas for bringing this passage to my attention.

¹⁰⁰ Osgood (2012), 7.

¹⁰¹ See *ibid.*, 6, for discussion of the use of "inheritance hunting" rather than "legacy hunting," as Osgood's preferred English translation of *captatio*.

the ultimate hope of being named a beneficiary in his will. The terminology (e.g. *captes*, *captator*) used to describe this phenomenon first appears here, in *Satire 2.5*, and as a result this poem has been, more often than not, examined as a social document—literal evidence for this Roman social practice.¹⁰² The social reality of *captatio* is debated,¹⁰³ as some scholars see *Satire 2.5* as proof of a real social phenomenon, while others, in particular Champlin, argue for *captatio* as a purely literary motif. Champlin states,

Captation, or inheritance-hunting, is such a commonplace among ancient writers that it is important first to remember that it is precisely that, a literary commonplace. In origin and development it is a fishing metaphor: the captator ‘angled’ for inheritance, baiting his hook with kindness, services, and gifts to the testator. The major problem is that it was as difficult for the Romans as it is for us to distinguish the cold-hearted captator from the ordinary friend who would be duly rewarded.¹⁰⁴

The question of authenticity, both hereditary and literary, posed by the figure of the *captator* is one ideally suited for consideration through the character of Odysseus, who is notorious for his ability to transgress boundaries through disguise (e.g. hidden within the Trojan Horse, underneath a ram’s belly, and in beggar’s rags) as well as for his own disputed and double lineage (from Sisyphus and Autolycus). Odysseus also proves to be perfectly made for the fishing metaphor, which will be discussed below.

Just as Odysseus is a slippery figure to pin down, so too is the meaning of this poem. Other interpretations of *Satire 2.5* include a) a philosophical parody of the Cynics and Stoics in the late Republic,¹⁰⁵ b) a commentary on the decline of contemporary Roman society,¹⁰⁶ and c)

¹⁰² See especially Rudd (1966), 224–42; cf. Palmer (1891), 328; Fedeli (1994), 672; Alexander (1999), 350n1.

¹⁰³ For a reexamination of the evidence for and reality of *captatio*, see Mansbach (1982); cf. Last (1934), who considers *captatio* a real growing problem in the late Republic.

¹⁰⁴ Champlin (1989), 211–12.

¹⁰⁵ Montiglio (2011), 120–23; cf. Coffey (1976), 86, who places this satire in the tradition of Hellenistic sillographers.

the idea that Horace is parodying his own rise into Maecenas' inner circle.¹⁰⁷ My aim is to extend beyond these interpretations, to try to understand the importance of Ulysses in this poem,¹⁰⁸ what he signifies for a Roman audience, and how Horace manipulates this figure in order to say something about what it means to be a Roman Odysseus in both a literary and social capacity. I argue that by casting Ulysses in *Satire 2.5*, Horace opens up a multiplicity of options as to what this satire is actually doing. Ulysses serves as a means by which Horace can establish himself in (or even initiate) a literary tradition, mock or support a variety of contemporary philosophical tenets,¹⁰⁹ comment on the problematic but persistent social practice of inheritance-hunting, and blur the lines between Roman and Greek, high and low, history, myth and the present.

The choice of Ulysses and the Underworld as character and setting afford Horace a great amount of freedom to explore the Greek epic past, contemporary Roman society, and his poetry's place within both realms. Horace himself does not appear in this satire, the only poem in *Satires II* from which he is absent. This absence offers the poet not only distance from the poem's content,¹¹⁰ allowing Horace to speak more freely about contemporary society,¹¹¹ but also

¹⁰⁶ Martonara (1926), 76; Roberts (1984).

¹⁰⁷ Connors (2005), 135; Oliensis (1998), 57; Keane (2006), 116–17; Nadeau (2013), 40–48; cf. Osgood (2012), 6–7, for his own interpretation, which takes into account Champlin (1991) and Oliensis (1998).

¹⁰⁸ Pace Rudd (1966), 235, who argues that Ulysses is used purely as a comic abstraction in this poem.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. *Ep.* 1.2, where Horace considers Ulysses a model of *virtus* and *sapientia*.

¹¹⁰ Lejay (1911), 482, offers the explanation that *captatio* was too new a phenomenon to have type characters. The language of *captatio* is first encountered in Latin literature here, in *Sat.* 2.5 (see n. 157 below), but the goals of the *captator* are not dissimilar from those of the parasite, a character familiar from Greek and Roman comedy. Other scholars view *captatio* as a perversion of *amicitia* (e.g. Champlin (1989), 212).

¹¹¹ Cf. Martonara (1926), 76–77; and Muecke (1993), 178–79. Hooley (2007), 77, argues that Horace is not really absent: “The voice and many of the satiric exempla are familiar from the first book, and it might be more accurate to see the conspicuous dialogism of Book 2, its diffraction of the satiric voice, as satire not necessarily in retreat or retirement, but rather as a complicating challenge to the Trebatiuses (Drydens) of his world.”

the opportunity to engage more directly with epic, crossing generic lines in order to comment upon and further define the satiric genre.¹¹² The Homeric epic backdrop also provides a rich setting in which Horace can set conventions of contemporary society and literature against one another;¹¹³ the boundary between Roman and Greek, however, is complicated by the fact that both epic and satire are written in hexameters,¹¹⁴ and that the Romans claimed satire as wholly their own, as Quintilian famously asserts: *satura quidem tota nostra est* (*Inst.* 10.1.93). Gowers elaborates on the Roman origins of satire, noting that the “invention” of satire “at least recognizes the potential of this form to be a proud (or abashed) carrier of Roman identity.”¹¹⁵ She goes on to highlight the contradiction brought out by grammarians, who both claimed satire as Roman and “gave Latin satire a Greek past and linked it to many existing branches of literature.”¹¹⁶ Indeed this is precisely the contradiction that Horace exploits to link his poem to Greek literature while rewriting a famous moment in the *Odyssey* in a “new,” Roman context. By writing Ulysses as the first student of *captatio*, Horace creates not only a Greek *aition* for a contemporary Roman social practice, but also the kind of character—a parody of the epic Ulysses—about whom satire is written. Gowers remarks on the this type of generic self-reflection and self-consciousness often expressed in satire: “Roman satire, like Roman pastoral, is essentially nostalgic: it mourns the lost conditions for its existence and classifies itself at the moment of potential extinction.”¹¹⁷ *Satire* 2.5, rather than mourning “the lost conditions for its

¹¹² Cf. *Sat.* 1.5 and Gowers (2012) on Horace’s engagement with and parody of the *Odyssey*.

¹¹³ See Roberts (1984), 432, for the distortion of values between Greek epic and contemporary Rome; and Woods (2012), Chapter 2, for the use of the *character* of Odysseus for artistic purposes.

¹¹⁴ Epic parody is also a genre in itself (e.g. the *Batrochomyomachia*, the Council of the Gods in book 1 of Lucilius); the interview in the underworld may also come from Menippean satire (see Rudd (1966), 237–8).

¹¹⁵ Gowers (2012), 6.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*; “other forms of literature” include comedy, satyr play, or vitriolic iambs.

existence,” reflects a scene that ensures satire’s *continuing* existence through the timeless and infinitely adaptable figure of the Greek Odysseus.

Satire and Fishing

Immediately at the outset of the poem, we are faced with a generic juxtaposition. *Satire* 2.5 opens with a question addressed to Teiresias, a figure familiar from tragedy and epic. The speaker of these first three lines is not named (nor will he be until line 59),¹¹⁸ but by line 4, Horace gives us most of the information we need to understand what is going on, at least for the moment.

Hoc quoque, Teresia, praeter narrata petenti
responde, quibus amissas reparare queam res
artibus atque modis. quid rides? ‘iamne doloso
non satis est Ithacam revehi patriosque penatis
aspicere?’

Answer me one more question, Tiresias, besides
what you have told me. By what arts and means can I
recover my lost fortune? Why are you laughing?
“Is it not enough for the man of wiles to sail back to Ithaca
and gaze upon his household gods?”

Sat. 2.5.1–5

Although our speaker is not named, *Ithacam* in line 3 points us to Ulysses. He asks Teiresias by what arts and ways can he recover his wealth, a question that serves to connect the beginning of this poem to *Odyssey* 11.139–40,¹¹⁹ after Teiresias has prophesied that Odysseus will arrive home with nothing and discover that his property has been devoured by the suitors.

ὄψῃ κακῶς νεῖαι, ὀλέσας ἅπο πάντας ἐταίρους,

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹¹⁸ Odysseus is first named in the *Odyssey* at 1.21, in the dative case, and at 1.57 for the first time in the nominative; cf. Aeneas at *Aen.* 1.92, 128, 170. Cf. Peradotto (1990), 114, for the suppression of Odysseus’ name in the *Odyssey* vs. the immediate naming of Achilles in the *Iliad*.

¹¹⁹ Rudd (1966), 228, identifies these lines as the point of transition.

νηὸς ἐπ’ ἀλλοτρίας· δῆεις δ’ ἐν πῆματα οἴκῳ,
ἄνδρας ὑπερφιάλους, οἳ τοι βίοτον κατέδουσι
μνώμενοι ἀντιθέην ἄλοχον καὶ ἔδνα διδόντες.
ἀλλ’ ἦτοι κείνων γε βίας ἀποτίσσει ἐλθῶν·
αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν μνηστῆρας ἐνὶ μεγάροισι τεοῖσι
κτείνης ἢ ἐδόλω ἢ ἀμφαδὸν ὄξει χαλκῷ

You will come home in a bad case, with the loss
of all your companions, in someone else’s ship,
and find troubles in your household, insolent men,
who are eating away your livelihood and courting
your godlike wife and offering gifts to win her.
You may punish the violences of these men,
when you come home. But after you have
killed these suitors in your own palace, either
by treachery or openly with the sharp bronze...

Od. 11.114–20

Following Teiresias’ lengthy prophesy, Odysseus makes no comment upon the fact that he will arrive home to find suitors courting Penelope and consuming his property, but rather moves on quite abruptly to ask about his mother, Anticleia, whose shade hovers nearby (*Od.* 11.142–44). Horace exploits this lack of concern on Odysseus’ part to pose a reasonable question regarding inheritance as well as to directly insert his narrative into the epic tradition, prompting a rewrite of that tradition by the epic characters themselves. Because Horace does not include his own voice in this poem, he makes Ulysses the instigator of the rewrite and Teiresias the obliging collaborator. Odysseus has played the satirist elsewhere, as Ralph Rosen has argued. Rosen suggests that Odysseus performs a sort of “proto-satire” in *Odyssey* 9, and that Homer the poet is still present in Odysseus’ first-person narrative:

This complex narratological layering ... has several ramifications: First, it distances Homer’s authorial voice from that of Odysseus in Book 9, and so encourages the audience to judge Odysseus’s self-presentation independently from what they presume to be Homer’s perspective. Second, in making Odysseus self-consciously play the role of a poet, we can catch a rare glimpse of how Homer conceptualized the specific *kind* of poetry that he has his character perform.¹²⁰

¹²⁰ Rosen (2007), 124ff.

The question of voice and focalizing is problematized in *Satire 2.5*, where the reader no longer hears the narrative voice of Ulysses (e.g. “So spoke Teiresias. And then I answered him...”), but Horace instead presents a more straightforward dialogue, as if it were a script for performance.¹²¹ The structure, therefore, of Horace’s satire is closer to that of a Plautine comedy rather than *Odyssey 11*, which is the clear inspiration for the poem’s content. This blending of form and content leaves the genre of the poem in question, and Horace further complicates the tone by expressing his own authorial voice through both Ulysses and Teiresias. Ulysses’ question of “by what arts and means” (*artibus atque modis*) helps initially to align his voice with that of Horace, as *artes* and *modi* can refer to poetic skill and genres.¹²² Teiresias then provides the answer with *doloso* and *satis*, both of which offer some clues as to Horace’s programme concerning his hero, Ulysses, and his overall agenda in *Satire 2.5*. Horace as the poet is clearly in control of the dialogue he presents, but the fact that he can be read in both characters accomplishes what Rosen describes above, that is, the disassociation of the poet’s authorial voice from that of Ulysses and Teiresias, which in turn forces the reader to focus on the dialogue at hand rather than on what Horace is doing behind the scenes.

The programmatic language, namely *artibus* and *doloso*, that Teiresias employs in line 3, however, does encourage us initially to imagine Horace behind the mask of the seer. *Artibus* and *doloso* fittingly enclose line 3—the former asks the question “how,” and the latter offers a solution. Horace chooses this adjective with care, in order to highlight in particular the hero’s “artful, sly, deceitful” nature,¹²³ as well as to take advantage of his connection to δόλος. The

¹²¹ Cf. Roche (2012), 204–209, on Horace’s positioning of himself away from the central character or speaker of his satires, especially in Book 2, and his influence on later satirists.

¹²² Thank you to Sarah McCallum for this point.

¹²³ *OLD* s.v. *dolosus* 1. This is also the only instance of this adjective applied to Ulysses himself; cf. Seneca,

bilingual wordplay initiates the theme of blending the Greek and the Roman that runs throughout this poem, and it also introduces a multitude of implications. In the passage above, Teiresias reveals that Odysseus will kill the suitors either with trickery (δόλω) or with sharp bronze (*Od.* 11.120); he ultimately uses both deceit and a sword to kill the suitors, but the fact that δόλος is associated with Odysseus' homecoming is significant. Before this passage, in *Odyssey* 11, Odysseus explicitly connects his name with δόλοι, when he identifies himself to Polyphemus: εἶμ' Ὀδυσσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν / ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καί μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει ("I am Odysseus son of Laertes, known before all men for the study of crafty designs, and my fame goes up to the heavens,"¹²⁴ *Od.* 9.19–20). Horace's use of the epithet *dolosus* to stand in for Ulysses' name at the beginning of *Satire* 2.5 marks the poet's importation and manipulation of the Odyssean Odysseus, but the fact that Teiresias uses it sarcastically here to describe Ulysses undercuts the hero's self-professed and world-renowned abilities in trickery.

The bilingual play with δόλος continues, however, with the word's additional, and primary meaning. The first entry under δόλος in *LSJ* is, "prop[erly], bait for fish."¹²⁵ Therefore, not only does being *dolosus* indicate that Ulysses is cunning and deceitful, but it also proleptically implies he is literally equipped with the "bait" (the *praeroso hamo* in line 25) necessary for *captatio*.¹²⁶ Fedeli notes that *doloso* is a possible "translation" of πολυμήχανος

Troades 857: *et nocens saxis Ithace dolosis.*

¹²⁴ Cf. Peradotto (1990), 141–42, and Segal (1994), 90–91; as well as additional discussions of these two lines in Chapter 1, 32 (in Plautus), and Chapter 4, 118 (in Ovid).

¹²⁵ *LSJ* s.v. 1a; at *Od.* 12.252 δόλος means literal bait for fishing, and therefore comes to mean any cunning scheme for deceiving or catching (e.g. the net in which Hephaestus catches Ares, *Od.* 8.276; the Trojan horse, 8.494; and the robe of Penelope, 19.137).

¹²⁶ Cf. Rudd (1966), 232, who superficially connects *dolosus* to δέλεαρ ("bait"). The fishing metaphor, and *hamus* specifically, also occur at *Mart.* 4.56.5: *sic avidis fallax indulget piscibus hamus* ("Thus the deceitful hook blandishes greedy fish"), 5.18.6–7: *odi dolosas munerum et malas artes: / imitantur hamos dona* ("I hate the wily, wicked tricks of presents. Gifts are hooks"), and 6.63.5–6: *'munera magna tamen misit.' sed misit in hamo; / et piscatorem piscis amare potest?* ("'However, he sent me valuable presents.' But he sent them on a

specifically,¹²⁷ but it serves as Horace’s translation of any of Odysseus’ many Homeric epithets, including πολύτροπος, πολύμητις, and ποικιλόμητις.¹²⁸ Horace’s choice of *dolosus* makes this Ulysses his very own and also translates the Greek noun into a Latin epithet; the translation of πολυμήχανος (among the other epithets) creates an additional set of connotations, in particular here of fishing and hunting, but *dolosus* may also bring with it some negative connotations found in Cicero.¹²⁹

At *De Officiis* 3.60, Cicero describes the criminal fraud, *dolus malus*, suffered by Gaius Canius, a Roman knight. Canius desired to purchase an estate in Syracuse; a certain Pythius, a banker of Syracuse, had such an estate and invited Canius over to dine. Before Canius arrived, Pythius persuaded all of the fishermen along the coast to bring their boats on that particular day and show off their catch, in order to demonstrate the fishermen’s “need” for the estate; Pythius’ fraudulent creation of apparent demand would, in turn, inflate the price of the estate. Needless to say, Canius himself had been caught; after buying the property he discovered that no fishermen were actually in the habit of fishing near the estate. Gaius Aquilius, a friend and colleague of Cicero, defined this type of criminal fraud, *dolus malus*, as: *cum esset aliud simulatum, aliud actum* (“Pretending one thing and practicing another,” *Off.* 3.60). This language is part of Aquilius’ *de dolo malo formulae*, which he promulgated after this incident and which was meant

hook. And can the fish love the fisherman?”).

¹²⁷ Fedeli (1994), 675.

¹²⁸ Peradotto (1990), 115–16, discusses the epithet πολύτροπος as the stand-in for Odysseus’ name at the beginning of the *Odyssey*: “The word chosen to characterize the yet unknown hero of the poem in lieu of his name is a rich and unstable ambiguity...thus *polytropos* accomplishes the very opposite of a name, for instead of fixing its referent, as a name would, in an identifiable location within the social matrix or locking him into a narrative destiny manifest in the name, it suggests polymorphism, mutability, plurality, variability, transition, the crossing of borders, the wearing of masks, the assumption of multiple roles.”

¹²⁹ Cf. Martonara (1926), 75n2, and Fedeli (1994), 675 ad 3–5, who cites Isid. *diff.* 1.174: *dolosus est, qui occulta machinatione grassatur.*

to protect buyers from fraud.¹³⁰ Cicero declares anyone who pretends one thing and practices another, just as Pythius had done, to be *perfidii, improbi, and malitiosi* (*Off.* 3.60). Disgust at this type of dissimilitude between action and intention was expressed much earlier and more famously in the literary tradition by Achilles at *Iliad* 9.312–13, who speaks these lines to Odysseus: ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κείνος ὁμῶς Ἀΐδαο πύλησιν / ὅς χ' ἕτερον μὲν κεύθη ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλο δὲ εἶπη (“For as I detest the doorways of Death, I detest that man, who hides one thing in the depths of his heart, and speaks forth another”). It may also not come as a surprise to Cicero’s audience that the salesman of the estate is a Greek, Pythius by name. While Cicero does not make any explicit connections between Pythius’ Greekness and his propensity to cheat or between the “bait” definition of *dolus* and the legal term for fraud (*dolus malus*), the stereotype and the irony of the language nonetheless make the scene seem fit for the Roman stage.

Moving on to line 4 in the satire, the reader encounters more word play and further blending of Greek and Roman. Line 4 is fronted by *non satis est*—a play on the etymology of *satura*,¹³¹ which Horace uses to move from his epic beginning more firmly, but not completely, into the satiric mode. The line continues *Ithacam revehi patriosque penatis / aspicere?* Ulysses is returning not only to his home island of Ithaca, but also to his *patrios penatis*—his homeland Penates.¹³² The Roman generic context initiated by *satis* earlier in the line is emphasized by the inclusion of the Penates as an important aspect of Ulysses’ homecoming. Horace’s immediate interweaving of Greek and Roman genres and language, along with his characterization of a

¹³⁰ For more details on this situation and contractual rights at Rome, see Dyck (1996), ad 58–71.

¹³¹ See especially Freudenburg (2001), 28–32, on *Sat.* 1.1.62 (*nil satis est*) and the connection between *satura* and σῶρός ‘pile’, which is possible with *acervos* in this poem in line 22. Cf. also Schlegel (2005) on *Sat.* 1.1–3; Freudenburg (2005), 7–8, notes the connection of *satis* (‘enough’) with Callimachean aesthetic principles; cf. Gowers (2005), 58–61; Rutherford (2007), 254. For extended discussions of the etymology, see van Rooy (1965), 1–29; Knoche (1975), 7–16. Cf. Labate (2009) on Horace’s redefining of satire after Lucilius.

¹³² Cf. Ovid, *Met.* 1.174, and the Penates of the Olympian gods.

dolosus Ulysses, creates a tension between what is Greek and what is Roman that runs throughout the poem. The questions about origins, both literary and social, that this tension raises, are continually and purposefully negotiated through the very ambiguous character of Ulysses.

Horace's *vates*

After the first four lines, Ulysses replies to Teiresias' question about what is *satis*:

O nulli quicquam mentite, vides ut
nudus inopsque domum redeam te vate, neque illic
aut apotheca procis intacta est aut pecus; atqui
et genus et virtus nisi cum re vilior alga est.

O you who have never spoken falsely to any man,
you see how I am returning home, naked and in need,
according to your prophecy; and there neither cellar
nor herd is unrifled by the suitors. And yet birth
and manliness, without substance, are worth
less than seaweed.

Sat. 2.5.5–8

The hero's response now firmly locates us in the *Nekuia* of *Odyssey* 11, after Teiresias has prophesied that Odysseus would arrive home with nothing to find nothing left. What stands out first in these lines is *te vate* "according to your prophecy." While a *vates* is firstly a prophet or seer,¹³³ it becomes for the Augustan poets, and Horace in particular, a loaded poetic term. This is the only occurrence of *vates* in *Satires* II, and as it is used of an actual seer, it does not, as Newman argues, contribute to the poetical connotations the word has in the *Odes*.¹³⁴ Woods takes a different position, arguing that because this is the only appearance of *vates* in *Satires* II, poem 2.5 "is particularly important for understanding the evolution of Horace's poetic

¹³³ *OLD* s.v. *vates* 1.

¹³⁴ Newman (1967), 44.

identity.”¹³⁵ It is difficult not to think of the last line of *Epode* 16, in which Horace refers to himself as *vate me*. The similarity in the phrasing of *te vate*, and the fact that 2.5 is the only poem in *Satires* II where Horace is absent, *vates* might then allow us to hear Horace’s voice in that of Teiresias. There are a number of programmatic elements in this poem, not to mention the creation of a new set of vocabulary for *captatio*, and using the mask of a divine seer to describe *captatio* adds legitimacy to the phenomenon.

Conversely, however, the earlier, and more pessimistic, context of *vate me* in *Epode* 16 may work to undercut Teiresias’ authority in *Satire* 2.5. In his commentary on the *Epodes*, Watson deems *vate me* a “disturbingly ambiguous term for Horace to apply to himself as the *auctor* of the proposal to quit Rome,”¹³⁶ and both Watson and Mankin comment on the original pejorative connotations of dubious authority and deceit associated with *vates*.¹³⁷ Teiresias’ ethically challenged advice in the next few lines supports this negative view of *vates*, and encourages the reader to see less of Horace in the ‘seer’ and more of him in the struggling epic hero. It is also possible, however, to see Ulysses as a satirist, who in this poem prompts Teiresias to move away from the standard Odyssean plot-line and rewrite the epic’s ending.¹³⁸ The means to this ending that Teiresias suggests, as just noted, are less than ideal for an epic hero, but not unexpected by anyone familiar with the Rome of *Epode* 16. Through the charged

¹³⁵ Woods (2012), 43.

¹³⁶ Watson (2003), 484.

¹³⁷ Watson (2003) and Mankin (1995), ad 16.66; cf. the *vates* in Propertius 4.1.

¹³⁸ A number of scholars read Horace in Ulysses; see Rosen (2007), quoted on p. 44, and n. 107 above. Keane (2006), 117, argues, “The consultation scenario recalls 2.1, in which the satirist seeks poetic legitimacy in a new world order just as Ulysses struggles to re-establish himself through material gain. The satirist comes out of this comparison looking far more respectable than his heroic counterpart.” See additionally Osgood (2012), 6–7, who interprets Ulysses and Teiresias as both reflecting Horace’s voice. Cf. Gowers (1993), 189, on Juvenal, “Juvenal’s literary claims are part of his satirical pose: as someone excluded from his rights to property, status, and power, as a genuine Roman reclaiming his inheritance.”

phrase *te vate*, then, one can see Horace in both Teiresias, who provides the plot of the poem, and Ulysses, who inspires the plot and offers an alternative, Homeric plot that lies behind the poem as a whole.¹³⁹

The conflicted connotations of *vates* are additionally revealed by Teiresias in his first words of advice to Ulysses: he must look for a rich old man (*res ubi magna nitet domino sene*, 12) and win him over. To start this process, Teiresias explains:

dulcia poma
et quoscumque feret cultus tibi fundus honores
ante Larem gustet venerabilior Lare dives;
qui quamvis periurus erit, sine gente, cruentus
sanguine fraterno, fugitivus, ne tamen illi
tu comes exterior, si postulet, ire recuses.

Your choice apples or whatever glories your trim farm bears you, let the rich man, more revered than the Lar, taste before your Lar. However perjured he may be, though low of birth, stained with a brother's blood, a runaway slave, yet, if he ask you to walk with him, do not decline to take the outer side.

Sat. 2.5.12–17

Ulysses is to make what are essentially offerings from his harvest to the rich man before the Lares, the household gods who traditionally receive the first fruits,¹⁴⁰ thus promoting the rich man to the status of a Roman divinity.¹⁴¹ Teiresias goes on to caution that even if the rich man is a perjurer, of low birth, or a runaway slave, his demands are to be met.¹⁴² After sacrilegiously suggesting that Ulysses honor an old man as a god, the seer underscores the already perverse

¹³⁹ Thank you to David Elmer for expressing this dichotomy to me so clearly.

¹⁴⁰ See *OCD* s.v. Lares.

¹⁴¹ Cf. Muecke (1993), ad loc.

¹⁴² The list of characters could also have a metapoetic resonance: Ulysses could attach himself to a character in a comedy (where he does appear as a model for the tricky slave) or in martial epic (thank you again to Sarah McCallum for this point). Cf. Osgood (2012), 7, on Teiresias' advice to Ulysses that he should literally become a character of comedy (*Davus sis comicus*, 91).

nature of his plan by declaring that Ulysses cater even to a “man stained with a brother’s blood” (*cruentus / sanguine fraterno*).¹⁴³ The Roman scene painted here with the inclusion of the Lar and *sanguine fraterno*, an indication of civil war and the ultimate sign of decline in Rome, fills out the Romanization of the satire’s content within its Homeric context. The reference to civil war is made more vivid by the recent end of the war against Antony that came shortly before publication of *Satires* II.¹⁴⁴ Teiresias’ depraved suggestion, to actually pursue someone who participated in the civil war, also directly opposes Horace’s (as a *vates*) in *Epode* 16, which is to flee Rome because of its imminent self-destruction by civil war.

Seaweed and Philosophers

The impetus for Ulysses’ plea for help, and Teiresias’ unexpectedly immoral advice, is, quite simply and crudely, money. In line 8 Ulysses reveals why it is not enough for him just to arrive on Ithaca: *et genus et virtus nisi cum re vilior alga est*. Family and virtue are more worthless than seaweed unless they come with wealth. Looking in particular at this line (and 19–21, on which see below), Silvia Montiglio suggests that this satire mocks the early Cynic idealization of Odysseus, who looked to Odysseus the beggar (among other roles) as a positive model for their way of life.¹⁴⁵ While indeed Horace does establish Ulysses as a model of behavior that flies in the face of the Cynics, this money-hungry and parasitic Ulysses has

¹⁴³ Cf. Catullus 64.399–404: ... *perfundere manus fraterno sanguine fratres ... impia non verita est divos scelerare penates* (“... and brothers sprinkled their hands with brothers’ blood ... and the impious woman did not fear to pollute her family gods”).

¹⁴⁴ The consensus on the date is post-Actium, specifically 31–30 BC; cf. Muecke (1993), 188; and Fedeli (1994), 674.

¹⁴⁵ Montiglio (2011), 70; see *ibid.*, 66–94, for a full discussion of Odysseus in Cynic and Stoic thought. Cf. Fiske (1920), 400–405; Rudd (1966), 234–35; and Stanford (1963), 96–100, on Antisthenes’ positive view of Odysseus as a model or proto-type Cynic (and Stoic).

appeared elsewhere in Roman literature.¹⁴⁶ The additional blending of the proverb *vilior alga est* with the Homeric values of *genus* and *virtus* further helps to characterize Ulysses as a liminal satiric figure able to represent both the high and low, the epic and the everyday.¹⁴⁷

Horace continues to blend the fictional Greek epic context with the contemporary Roman content with Ulysses' response to Teiresias' advice. The hero initially refuses to degrade himself in catering to the needs of a nobody, and he reminds us momentarily of the epic context of this poem: *utne tegam spurco Damae latus? haud ita Troiae / me gessi certans semper melioribus* ("What! Give the wall to some dirty Dama? Not so at Troy did I bear myself, but ever was matched with my betters," *Sat.* 2.5.18–19). Ulysses, although expressing his desire for wealth in line 8, is nonetheless reluctant to move completely out of the Homeric world and into the Roman, still straddling the boundary between his Greek literary past and his current Roman social/satiric setting.¹⁴⁸ He at once references a typical slave name, used often in Latin legal works for a hypothetical slave,¹⁴⁹ and at the same time riffs on Homer, invoking the competitive heroic code such as that expressed by Glaucus at *Il.* 6.208 αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων ("[he sent me to Troy] to be always among the bravest, and hold my head above others").¹⁵⁰ The Greek hero quickly changes his tune, however, in the next couple of lines, and

¹⁴⁶ In two plays by Plautus, at *Men.* 900–902 and *Pseud.* 1063–64; in both cases either the slave or parasite is called *meus Ulixes*; cf. also *Bac.* 949 and discussion in Chapter 1, 25ff. The "unscrupulous flatterer" from *Sat.* 2.5, as well as the poem as a whole, are considered to have influenced Petronius, especially in the scene at Croton (*Satyrica* §117.1–10), on which see Panayotakis (2009), 50–52.

¹⁴⁷ On the proverb, see Otto (1890), 13. At *Od.* 24.506–508, Odysseus encourages Telemachus before the battle with suitors, reminding him of the race of his fathers (πατέρων γένος), who excelled in strength and valor (ἀλκῆ τ' ἠγορέη). Elsewhere in his corpus, Horace invokes Ulysses as an *exemplum* of wisdom and self-control (*Ep.* 1.2.17–18, on which see Mayer (1994), ad loc.).

¹⁴⁸ Odysseus in the *Odyssey* also oscillates between the past, which he recounts at the Phaeacians' palace, and his continuing journey home, which serves as the primary plot of the poem's narrative. Thank you to David Elmer for pointing out this comparison to me.

¹⁴⁹ Muecke (1993), ad 2.7.54; cf. *Sat.* 1.6.38; *Pers.* 5.76.

¹⁵⁰ Muecke (1993), ad 18f., also references *Il.* 11.784 (Pelesus to Achilles); for similar phrasing, cf. *Il.* 21.486

he lets go of the Homeric warrior code and strict social hierarchy.¹⁵¹ That this code can so easily be subverted, especially by the man who chastises Thersites for stepping out of his proper place in *Iliad* 2, adds an uncomfortable humor to the emphasis Ulysses places on wealth as well as on the distorted picture of both social and familial hierarchies.

Horace transitions the reader from Ulysses' discomfort with this topsy-turvy Roman society into complete acceptance of it through none other than Plato. If Ulysses is unwilling to following Teiresias' advice, he will be poor (*ergo / pauper eris*, *Sat.* 2.5.19–20). Ulysses replies:

fortem hoc animum tolerare iubebo;
et quondam maiora tuli. tu protinus unde
divitias aerisque ruam dic, augur, acervos.

I'll bid my valiant soul endure this. I have endured
greater things even before now. Go on, O prophet, and
tell me how I am to pile up wealth and heaps of money.

Sat. 2.5.20–22

Lines 20–21 are well recognized as an allusion to *Od.* 20.18: Τέτλαθι δὴ, κραδίη, καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο ποτ' ἔτλης (“Endure, my heart; an even more dog-like thing you once endured”).¹⁵²

Odysseus says this to himself as he sees the maidservants go off to sleep with the suitors one last time. The comparison of Odysseus to a dog that precedes line 18,¹⁵³ along with κύντερον, adds a

κρείσσοσιν ἴφι μάχεσθαι, which Hera says while scolding Artemis.

¹⁵¹ Cf. Cook (1999), 153, “Odyssean tradition responds to Iliadic heroism by aligning μῆτις with the trickster’s δόλοι and the active exercise of βίη with the persona of the Iliadic warrior...this incomplete union of identities in the person of Odysseus permits a sophisticated interplay among the elements of a matrix in which mind and body, represented by as δόλος and βίη, organize a series of subordinate polarities...” Cook argues primarily for Odysseus as one who suffers both actively and passively, which is also the case in this poem. Rather than suffer the loss of his wealth, he will endure (*tolerare*) something even worse, social degradation. Teiresias’ encouragement to continue with *doloi*, rather than employing force to earn back his money, fits with Cook’s analysis.

¹⁵² This translation is my own.

¹⁵³ *Od.* 20.14–16: ὡς δὲ κύων ἀμαλῆσι περὶ σκυλάκεσσι βεβῶσα / ἄνδρ’ ἀγνοίησασ’ ὑλάει μέμονέν τε μάχεσθαι, / ὡς ῥα τοῦ ἔνδον ὑλάκτει ἀγαιομένου κακὰ ἔργα (“And as a bitch, facing an unknown man, stands over her callow puppies, and growls and rages to fight, so Odysseus’ heart was growling inside him as he looked on these wicked actions”).

literal canine background to the allusion in Horace;¹⁵⁴ this is also one of the few lines of Homer approved by Plato as morally improving (*Resp.* 390d), which complicates the tone of the allusion.¹⁵⁵ While this allusion is quite clear, it is also interesting to note that at the end of the *Republic* in the Myth of Er, Odysseus himself appears as the soul that draws the last lot:

κατὰ τύχην δὲ τὴν Ὀδυσσέως λαχοῦσαν πασῶν ὑστάτην αἰρησομένην ἰέναι, μνήμη δὲ τῶν προτέρων πόνων φιλοτιμίας λελοφηκυῖαν ζητεῖν περιοῦσαν χρόνον πολὺν βίον ἀνδρὸς ἰδιώτου ἀπράγμονος.

And it fell out that the soul of Odysseus drew the last lot of all and came to make its choice, and, from memory of its former toils having flung away ambition, went about for a long time in quest of the life of an ordinary citizen who minded his own business.

Resp. 620c

Odysseus, mindful of the suffering he endured during life, let go of ambition and sought the life of a private man. In *Satire* 2.5, rather than bearing up against an imminent reversal of fortune and embracing the life of a common man, Ulysses reapplies his ability to endure in order to avoid poverty. The Platonic Odysseus is not a precise model for the Ulysses of Horace, but rather works as a model by contrast in the many-layered allusion; the subtlety of Horace's play makes his Ulysses all the more comical, but it also builds on the already complex picture of the multi-faceted hero. Horace brings together the philosophical (both Cynical and Platonic), the comedic, and the epic Odysseus within the first twenty lines of *Satire* 2.5, allowing him to create his own iteration of the hero, one who represents a new kind of balance across genres and between Greek and Roman.

First Lesson in Inheritance-Hunting

Following Ulysses' quick acceptance of the task at hand, Teiresias begins his description

¹⁵⁴ For more on the Cynic parody, see Létoublon (2003), 339, and Montiglio (2011), 121.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Muecke (1993), ad loc.

of *captatio*, which consumes the remainder of the poem. Transitioning into the didactic mode, Teiresias introduces *captatio* in this way:

dixi equidem et dico: captes astutus ubique
testamenta senum, neu, si vafer unus et alter
insidiatorem praeroso fugerit hamo,
aut spem deponas aut artem illusus omittas.

Well, I have told you, and I tell you now.
Fish craftily in all waters for old men's wills, and
though one or two shrewd ones escape your wiles
after nibbling off the bait, do not give up hope, or
drop the art, though baffled.

Sat. 2.5.23–26

Teiresias' first word of advice, *captes*, brings together the reference to fishing made with *doloso* in line 3,¹⁵⁶ and it also becomes the standard language for *captatio* after Horace.¹⁵⁷ Despite similar phenomena in Greece, including such figures from comedy as the greedy slave and the parasite, inheritance-hunting was a Roman practice,¹⁵⁸ and the terminology of *captatio* may have been coined by Horace himself.¹⁵⁹ The fact that a Greek *vates* instructs a Greek hero in the art of *captatio*, however, complicates its origin story and begs the questions: How Roman is it? How surprising is it that this type of excessive and deceptive ploy is initiated by a Greek?¹⁶⁰

Teiresias moves from this “new” language of *captatio* to a very typical Roman

¹⁵⁶ For the association of *capto* with fishing and hunting, see Kiessling and Heinze (1957), ad 23; for the application to inheritance-hunting, cf. *TLL* 3.0.378.1–6 and 379.80–380.8 (*capto*), and 3.0.363.83–364.9 (*captator*).

¹⁵⁷ Cf. *captator* in line 57 of this poem and Petron. *Sat.* 116.6, Sen. *Dial.* 5.34.2, Plin. *Ep.* 2.20.7. For discussion on this language in Latin literature after Horace, see Champlin (1991), 87–89.

¹⁵⁸ Rudd (1966), 224–27; Last (1934); Sallmann (1970) cites Ernst Rabel (1955), *Grundzüge des römischen Privatrechts*, Darmstadt; and Dankwart Schmid (1951), *Der Erbschleicher in der antiken Satire* (Diss.), Tübingen.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Sallmann (1970), 182n2, and Champlin (1991), 87.

¹⁶⁰ Doty (1993), 47, quotes the psychotherapist June Singer on tricksters in contemporary literature: “He is the satirist par excellence...The major psychological function of the trickster figure is to make it possible for us to gain a sense of proportion about ourselves.” That is also true in *Satire 2.5*, where Horace imports the Greek trickster Odysseus into a Roman setting to reveal to his audience how far from the moderate mean inheritance-hunting truly is.

situation—a lawsuit in the forum; this is the first place Teiresias instructs Ulysses to look for his “catch.” Why a lawsuit? The setting is at once typically Roman and perfectly suited to Ulysses’ skills in public speaking.¹⁶¹ In line 27 (*magna minorve foro si res certabitur olim* “If someday a case, great or small, be contested in the forum”), Horace also employs a second meaning of *res*, which so far in this poem has been what Ulysses wants to recover, namely his wealth. In this line, however, it takes on the special meaning of “case.”¹⁶² The multiple meanings of this word suit Ulysses’ own multi-faceted character and the double, or ambiguous (*anceps* below), nature of the law itself. The *res* (case) in the law-court thus becomes Ulysses’ first step toward recovering his *res* (wealth).

Teiresias feeds Ulysses his first bit of dialogue that will help him approach his victim:

“Quinte,” puta, aut “Publi,” (gaudent prae nomine molles auriculae) “tibi me virtus tua fecit amicum. ius anceps novi, causas defendere possum; eripiet quivis oculos citius mihi quam te contemptum cassa nuce pauperet. haec mea cura est, ne quid tu perdas neu sis iocus.”

Say: “Quintus” it may be, or “Publius” (sensitive ears delight in the personal name), “your worth has made me your friend. I know the mazes of the law; I can defend a case. I will let anyone pluck out my eyes sooner than have him scorn you or rob you of a nutshell. This is my concern, that you lose nothing and do not become a joke.”

Sat. 2.5.32–37

Teiresias continues using Roman language and setting a Roman scene with the suggestion that Ulysses address his “mark” by his praenomen, *Quintus* or *Publius*. As an answer to why Horace chooses these names, Frances Muecke suggests that these names indicate the victim is an ex-

¹⁶¹ Muecke (1993), 183, ad 23–44, notes, “Another is the centrality of legal service in exchange of benefits by which relationships of mutual advantage were maintained at Rome...(Cf. Cic. *Off.* 2.65ff., where Cicero outlines the ethics of legal *beneficia*. While based on similar assumptions, Teiresias’s advice is diametrically opposed to Cicero’s.)”

¹⁶² Cf. Muecke (1993) ad loc.; Hor. *Sat.* 1.9.41; Varro, *Ling.* 7.93.

slave who had received his *praenomen* on manumission.¹⁶³ Heather Woods, however, takes a stronger position and argues that, despite the limited number of Roman *praenomina* available, these names also happen to be the first names of Horace and Virgil respectively; Horace’s choice therefore begs further exploration.¹⁶⁴ I do not believe these names are as self-referential as Woods, but out of the possible Roman *praenomina* available, it is worth mention that Horace chose to include his own in the only poem in *Satires* II where he himself is markedly absent. Horace is both Ulysses and Teiresias,¹⁶⁵ but at the same time, he is himself, Quintus, being accosted by someone who wants something, which is not unlike his situation in *Sat.* 1.9.

After calling out to his newfound friends, Ulysses is to profess his knowledge of the law and offer himself as a defender. Teiresias instructs Ulysses to say: *ius anceps novi*, which Fairclough in the Loeb translates as “I know the mazes of the law,” and Muecke as “I know the law’s ambiguity.” True to its definition, *anceps* here agrees both with *ius* and with the unexpressed subject of *novi*, underscoring the practical reference to a jurisconsult’s claim to have both knowledge of the law and the ability to speak.¹⁶⁶ It also points to Ulysses’ own doubleness, however, in his ability to say one thing and mean another as well as his liminal position here on the boundary between practitioner and manipulator of the law.¹⁶⁷ This double ability is also in keeping with Ulysses’ description as *dolosus* in this poem and his descent from the ultimate

¹⁶³ Muecke (1993), ad 32. Persius at 5.73–82 uses Publius as stand-in for any Roman citizen; Dama is used in these lines as common slave name. Fedeli (1994), ad loc., notes that the names are cited *exempli gratia*, supported in particular by *puta* in line 32, which acts adverbially as “for example.”

¹⁶⁴ Woods (2012), 47.

¹⁶⁵ See Keane (2006) in n. 138 above on the parallel between *Sat.* 2.1 and 2.5.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Muecke (1993), ad loc.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. *OLD* s.v. *anceps* 11b for its use of persons, and Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.34–35, where H. uses it to express doubt of his ancestry because of an insecure border: *sequor hunc, Lucanus an Apulus anceps; / nam Venusinus arat finem sub utrumque colonus* (“He [Lucilius] it is I follow – I, a Lucanian or Apulian, I know not which, for the settlers in Venusia plough close to the borders of both lands”).

trickster, Hermes. Doty, in describing Hermes, perfectly encapsulates Ulysses' character, in part inherited from Hermes through his mother, in this poem: "In imagery [Hermes] is represented as both a country bumpkin and a city slicker; he is conceived of both as a reprehensible thief and deceiver and as a responsible public speaker and attorney."¹⁶⁸ That these two qualities can be two sides of the same coin is problematic, but that one is more stereotypically Greek (thievery), and one comes to be heavily appropriated by the Romans (public speaking) makes for a rich dichotomy within the single figure of Ulysses.¹⁶⁹

Teiresias continues with a series of imperatives, further indicating what type of character and behavior is required for Ulysses' success:

fi cognitor ipse;
persta atque obdura, seu rubra Canicula findet
infantis statuas seu pingui tentus omaso
Furius hibernas cana nive conspuet Alpīs.

Become yourself his counsel. Carry on, and stick
at it, whether the red Dog-star splits unspeaking
statues or Furius, stuffed with rich tripe,
bespatters the wintry Alps with white snow.

Sat. 2.5.38–41

Even within this scene full of Roman legal terminology, Horace continues to mix genres, exploiting *satura*'s and Ulysses' wide-ranging and capacious nature of both *satura* and Ulysses. In line 39, Teiresias commands Ulysses to "persist and be firm" (*persta* and *obdura*)—the first is a task usually required of an advocate,¹⁷⁰ and one to which Ulysses' long endurance would be

¹⁶⁸ Doty (1993), 48–49.

¹⁶⁹ The Romans, especially Cicero, acknowledge their reception of Greek rhetorical practices and styles, but they did not have any foundational literature from which to draw inspiration. Pernot (2005), 84, describes this challenge: "Greece had at its very beginnings a literature which made varied and supple use of the art of speaking, and which set forth as models heroes who were clever orators. This did not exist in Rome: no Homer here, no Odysseus. On the contrary, the ancient Roman model is an orator who speaks with careful consideration and who counts on his status – age, nobility, prestige – to guarantee the worth of his words." Some illustrious Roman *exempla* include Appius Claudius, Scipio Nasica, and Scipio Aemilianus.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Muecke (1993) ad loc. and *Sat.* 1.9.39.

well suited. *Obdura* is less formal and possibly comes from everyday speech.¹⁷¹ Capping these commands is a quote from the Roman epic poet, Furius Bibaculus.¹⁷² Horace blends this quote seamlessly into Teiresias' words (and Horace's own), making it difficult to know who is writing this "stuffed" imagery. Jones remarks on the quotation of Roman epic, "It would seem to be strongly reinforced here that epic cannot be used in moral discourse in a straightforward way...but only in a radically altered state."¹⁷³ Horace, despite declining to write epic poetry on a number of occasions,¹⁷⁴ demonstrates in this poem that he can nonetheless manipulate and transform Greek and Roman epic qualities and characters for his own purposes.

Teiresias next imagines what a bystander would say about Ulysses, if he were to see him in the midst of *captatio*: "*nonne vides, aliquis cubito stantem prope tangens / inquiet, ut patiens, ut amicis aptus, ut acer?*" ("Do you not see,' says someone, nudging a neighbor with his elbow, 'how steady he is, how helpful to his friends, how keen?'" *Sat.* 2.5.42–43). The inheritance-hunter Ulysses is here described in the same language as the Homeric Odysseus; *πολύτλας* becomes *patiens*,¹⁷⁵ where again, as in line 20, Horace re-appropriates the Homeric qualities of our hero for his satiric and Roman purposes. The possibility of transferring or translating these epic qualities into satire is supported by Horace's quotation of Furius' Roman

¹⁷¹ Cf. Muecke (1993), ad loc.; Ruckdeschel (1910), 24; and *TLL* 9.2.42.80–85. The imperative *obdura*, paired with *perfer*, also appears at Catull. 8.11, Ovid *Am.* 3.11a.7, *Ars* 2.178, and *Tr.* 5.11.7; cf. Plaut. *Asin.* 322, where it appears in the future with *pernegabo*.

¹⁷² There is debate as to how secure this identification is: Rudd (1966), 289n52, and Fraenkel (1957), 130n1, reject it; Fedeli (1994), 683, and Woods (2012), 33, support it. Horace may be alluding to an unattributed line quoted by Quintilian at *Inst.* 8.6.17: *Iuppiter hibernas cana nive conspuat Alpes*. The scholia on *Epode* 6 identify the unnamed addressee (who is referred to as a dog (*canis*)) of that poem as Furius.

¹⁷³ Jones (2007), 66. Cf. Rutherford (2007), 254, who focuses on the food metaphor.

¹⁷⁴ Specifically at *Sat.* 2.1.30ff. and *Odes* 1.6.7, where Horace refers to the subjects of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as the *gravem / Pelidae stomachum* and *cursus duplicis per mare Ulixei* respectively.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. *Ep.* 1.7.40 (*patientis Ulixei*), and *Ov. Pont.* 4.10.9.

epic language. Quintilian, quoting Callimachus,¹⁷⁶ drew the comparison between Homer and Homer’s ocean, saying: *hic enim, quemadmodum ex Oceano dicit ipse omnium amnium fontiumque cursus initium capere, omnibus eloquentiae partibus exemplum et ortum dedit* (“He is like his own conception of Ocean, which he describes as the source of every stream and river; for he has given us a model and an inspiration for every department of eloquence,” 10.1.46). Just as Homer is the source of all literature, so too could Odysseus, in sailing around the ocean, be able to fit in all genres. In our poem, Horace works in this opposite direction represented by Odysseus, emphasizing that everything, including epic, bad epic, and everyday language, can fit into satire.

A Prophecy

Teiresias quickly brings the first part of his lesson to a close in line 44: *plures adnabunt thynni et cetaria crescent* (“More tunnies will swim up, and your fish-ponds swell”). Ulysses has now successfully “caught” his prey, but not all rich old men are the same. Horace subtly shifts gears with *praeterea* in line 45,¹⁷⁷ and moves on to a different type of victim—one with a natural heir. A *captator* must be prepared for failure, to which Teiresias already alluded to in line 26. To reinforce the point, the seer introduces the story of Nasica and Coranus as a cautionary tale to remind Ulysses that the *captator*, despite taking precautions, can himself become the victim.

Teiresias introduces the story briefly and allusively, dropping the names Nasica and Coranus in the midst of a vague reference to a crow: *plerumque recoctus / scriba ex quinqueviro*

¹⁷⁶ Callimachus, *Ap.* 105–6: ὁ Φθόνος Απόλλωνος ἐπ’ οὐατα λάθριος εἶπεν / ‘οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃς οὐδ’ ὅσα πόντος ἀεῖδει.’ (“Envy spoke secretly in Apollo’s ear: ‘I do not admire the poet who does not sing of as many things as there are of the sea.’”)

¹⁷⁷ See Roberts (1984), 426, on structuring devices in this poem.

corvum deludet hiantem, / captatorque dabit risus Nasica Corano (“Quite often a constable, new-boiled into a clerk, will dupe the gaping raven, and Nasica the fortune-hunter will make sport for Coranus,” 55–57). Although much of the Latin terminology in this dialogue would be unfamiliar to the Greek Ulysses, a number of niche Roman terms and names stand out, including the professional terms *scriba* and *quinqueviro*, the names of Nasica and Coranus, and *captator*—the very thing Teiresias is instructing Ulysses to be. This is the first known appearance of the noun *captator*,¹⁷⁸ and as such, it might have put a contemporary Roman reader in the same position as Ulysses.¹⁷⁹ It is perhaps not surprising to the reader, then, that after hearing these obscure names and the newly-coined word *captator*, Ulysses interrupts Teiresias to demand an explanation: *num furis? an prudens ludis me obscura canendo?* (“Are you mad? Or do you purposely make fun of me with your dim oracle?” 58).

Teiresias responds to Ulysses’ outburst by naming him for the first time in the poem: *o Laertiade, quidquid dicam aut erit aut non: / divinare etenim magnus mihi donat Apollo* (“O son of Laertes, whatever I say will or will not be; for prophecy is great Apollo’s gift to me,” 59–60). Teiresias addresses Ulysses with the patronymic, immediately elevating the style of the scene, bringing us momentarily out of the satire and back into the initial epic setting of this poem. More lofty language from oracular epic follows,¹⁸⁰ creating a sharp contrast between the obscure Nasica and Coranus and the very well known Laertiades as well as between the Roman content

¹⁷⁸ Cf. Muecke (1993), ad loc.; elsewhere after Horace at Sen. *Ben.* 4.20.3, Petron. *Sat.* 125.3, 141.1, Juv. 5.98.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Sallmann (1970), 182n2. Similarly, the names Nasica and Coranus cannot be connected to any historical figures, which could help us situate the anecdote at a point in Roman history. And so we (at least the modern-day readers) are also in the same position as Ulysses here: we have no idea who these characters are and why they are important. Rudd (1966), 134, classifies Nasica among the names of living people mentioned in Horace’s *Satires*. Muecke (1993), ad 57, states, “Unfortunately the names, which sound specific, do not help us situate the anecdote.”

¹⁸⁰ For the use of *edere* of oracular utterances, cf. Enn. *Trag.* 58J; Cic. *Fin.* 5.79, 2.20; Lucr. 1.121; for its use in dialogues, see Hor. *Sat.* 2.4.10 and 2.7.45.

and the Homeric epic context. The prophet continues in an oracular style and answers Ulysses' question with a prophecy:

tempore quo iuvenis Parthis horrendus, ab alto
demissum genus Aenea, tellure marique
magnus erit, forti nubet procera Corano
filia Nasicae metuentis reddere soldum.

In the days when a youthful hero, the Parthian's
dread, descendant of high Aeneas's lineage, shall be
mighty by land and sea, the tall daughter of Nasica,
who dreads paying up in full, shall wed gallant Coranus.

Sat. 2.5.62-65

Rather than reach back in time for a cautionary tale of inheritance-hunting, Teiresias surges ahead into Roman society after Actium. Jones describes the blending of epic past and Horace's Roman present, noting that in Tiresias' dialogue contemporary names, characters, and features have been imported into the "epic" world of the poem, rather than the inverse of epic features being brought into contemporary discourse.¹⁸¹ Teiresias uses prophetic language to keep the time (*quo tempore*) and place (*iuvenis...tellure marique*) somewhat vague, but he makes the connection between this future time and Homeric epic explicit by naming Aeneas in the middle of line 63.¹⁸² The epic language continues with *forti...Corano*, which casts an heroic light around the old man;¹⁸³ the scene and style devolve quickly, though, with the colloquial *soldum* in line 65,¹⁸⁴ followed by the simple paratactic narrative of Nasica's failed *captatio*. The shift in style as well as the mixing of epic and satiric language in the hexameters blurs even more the line

¹⁸¹ Jones (2007), 66.

¹⁸² See Rudd (1966), 255–57, for discussion of Horace's positive or negative view of Octavian.

¹⁸³ Cf. Roberts (1984), 432. At *Sat.* 2.3.216, *fortis* describes a bridegroom; cf. its application in an epitaph at Livy 21.44.2 and its mock-heroic application in the epitaph of Trimalchio at Petron. *Sat.* 71.21. *Vir fortis* regularly describes strong leaders, such as Livy 4.3.16.2, 10.8.3.3, and 38.49.84; and at Cic. *Phil.* 8.11.1 (Fufius), 10.16.2 (Hirtius), 12.6.4 (Pansa), *Ad fam.* 9.17.2.4 (himself), to name only a few; in poetry, see, for example, Plaut. *Mil.* 9, Ter. *An.* 445, Ov. *Met.* 13.121 and 616.

¹⁸⁴ Cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.113; Ruckdeschel (1910), 98–99, Muecke (1993), ad loc.

between Greek and Roman genres. Teiresias introduces Augustus as the “descendant of high Aeneas” (*alto / demissum genus Aenea*, 62–63), but mention of this preeminent figure is not made again in the remainder of the poem. As Osgood argues, the mention and rejection of Augustus represents Horace’s own rejection of epic.¹⁸⁵ And while the exemplary figures of Rome and Roman epic *par excellence* are dropped from the poem, Horace introduces an unknown character who becomes an *exemplum* for the hero Ulysses. Teiresias is explaining the art of inheritance-hunting for the very first time, and so there are no practitioners of it yet. But by the end of this satire, Ulysses will be fully equipped to perform a successful *captatio* and therefore able to serve as a model for future *captatores*. This is a striking reversal of the common practice in Roman literature and life to look to Roman history for examples of behavior, for example in figures such as Lucretia and L. Junius Brutus in Livy’s *Ab urbe condita*.¹⁸⁶ This reversal is compounded by the fact that Teiresias looks to the future for his models, and after he finishes instructing Ulysses in *captatio*, those future Romans will then be able to look *back* to Ulysses. The tangled web of who is influenced by whom is reflected in the very form and content of this satire. Horace takes his inspiration from Homer, but includes this poem in a collection of satires, a genre that a Roman invention.¹⁸⁷

Horace continues to overturn the world of Homer, and he is even able to reinterpret Penelope, the paragon of female virtue; her epic qualities, much like those of Ulysses, are translated by Horace into their new satiric context:

‘*ultro*
Penelopam facilis potiori trade.’ putasne,

¹⁸⁵ Osgood (2012), 7.

¹⁸⁶ See Ogilvie (1965), ad 1.57–59 for his discussion of Livy’s treatment of this episode as a tragedy in order to highlight the exemplary aspect of Lucretia’s fate.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. quotes from Gowers (2012), 6–7, on p. 42 above.

perduci poterit tam frugi tamque pudica,
quam nequiere proci recto depellere cursu?

Yourself obligingly hand over Penelope to your better.
“You think so! Can she be tempted, —she so good,
so pure, whom the suitors could not turn from
the straight course?”

Sat. 2.5.75–78

Teiresias suggests that Ulysses essentially play the pimp to Penelope’s prostitute. Earlier in the satire Ulysses was reluctant to cater to his social inferiors, but now there is no hesitation to do everything possible in the name of *captatio*. The canine imagery and simile, in the background of *Sat. 2.5.20–21*, returns explicitly here, in a simile in which Penelope is compared to a dog: *ut canis a corio numquam absterrebitur uncto* (“she will be like the hound, which can never be frightened away from the greasy hide,” 83). This is a proverbial image of persistence and insatiability,¹⁸⁸ but its application to Penelope is a bit startling. As Ulysses’ equal, however, it may not be unexpected that the Homeric quality of endurance that helped her to outwit the suitors in the *Odyssey* is put to the same use here as Ulysses’ *fortem animum*.

The final lines of Teiresias’ advice before the successful climax of the poem are full of last-minute tips on striking the right balance between being overzealous and too cautious:

neu desis opera neve immoderatus abundes.
difficilem et morosum offendet garrulus; ultra
non etiam sileas
[...]
importunus amat laudari? donec “ohe iam!”
ad caelum manibus sublatis dixerit, urge,
crescentem tumidis infla sermonibus utrem.

Neither fail in zeal, nor show zeal beyond measure.
A chatterbox will offend the ill-tempered and morose;

¹⁸⁸ Cf. G. Williams. 1959. “Dogs and Leather.” *CR* 9: 97–100. There may also be a connection to Horace’s Canidia; although the root of her name is disputed, *canis* is one possibility (see Mankin (1995), 300), which brings the new satiric Penelope in line with the character of the relentless and dangerous matron in the *Epodes*. Cf. also Horace’s ironic application of *pudica* to Canidia at *Epod.* 17.40, and Oliensis (1991) on *canis*, Canicula, and Canidia.

yet you must also not be silent beyond bounds.
[...]
Does he bore you with his love of praise?
Then ply him with it till with hands uplifted
to heaven he cry “enough!” and blow up the swelling
bladder with turgid phrases.

Sat. 2.5.89–91, 96–98

Throughout the poem, there have been references to and parodies of the Cynics and Stoics, and now Teiresias begins to dispense advice on finding the Golden Mean of approaches to *captatio*. Moderation, though, can only help someone so much in a satire, where excess, fullness, and accumulation are always the goal. The moderation preached in lines 89–91 is left behind when Teiresias encourages Ulysses in lines 96–98 to really go overboard with praise, “blow[ing] up the swelling bladder with turgid phrases.” The comparison of men to an empty bladder (*utrem*) is proverbial,¹⁸⁹ but this kind of inflatable bag may also remind the reader of the bags carrying Aeolus’ winds in *Odyssey* 10. Odysseus’ crew believes hidden in the bags are gold and silver, but when they open them, there is only wind, and that does not stay inside for long. The pursuit of wealth backfires, literally, and serves as a cautionary backdrop to Ulysses’ current endeavor. The inclusion of *tumidis sermonibus*, in a silver line of hexameter,¹⁹⁰ rings a programmatic note before the final crescendo of the poem. As Michael Roberts notes, *tumidis* is often used in a literary context to describe extravagant bombast, and so it is particularly well chosen here.¹⁹¹ The bombast that Horace has employed throughout the poem, as well as the blurring of generic lines and heroic characters, comes to a head in this line. This is what Teiresias (and Horace) has been doing throughout the poem—filling Ulysses, a figure with an abundance of facets, with

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Muecke (1993), ad loc.; Otto (1890), 359f.; Petron. *Sat.* 42.4.

¹⁹⁰ Wilkinson (1963), 216–17. The Silver Line, as Wilkinson calls it, has the scheme *a b C B A*, the chiasmic version of the Golden Line; cf. Virg. *G.* 2.540.

¹⁹¹ Roberts (1984), 429. Cf. *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.10.15, Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.73, Pliny *Ep.* 9.26.5; see Lejay (1911), 484–90, on the character of the flatterer and Teiresias’s style.

swollen *sermonibus*, satire, to then be passed on and repeated by him. Ulysses is being instructed to be the first inheritance-hunter, primed for later Romans to model themselves on, and as such, Ulysses here also becomes the figure about whom Horace is writing satire—a greedy, self-interested, and insatiable character just waiting to be lampooned.

After this programmatic line, we finally come to the climax of the poem—the imagined success of Ulysses the inheritance-hunter:

cum te servitio longo curaque levarit,
et certum vigilans, QUARTAE SIT PARTIS ULIXES,
audieris, HERES: “ergo nunc Dama sodalis
nusquam est? unde mihi tam fortem tamque fidelem?”
sparge subinde et, si paulum potes, illacrimare: est
gaudia prodentem vultum celare.

And when from your long care and servitude
he sets you free, and wide awake you hear the words,
“To one-fourth let Ulysses be heir,” then, now
and again, scatter about such words as these, “Ah!
is my old friend Dama now no more? Where shall
I find one so firm, so faithful?” and if you can do a
bit of it, drop in some tears. If your face betray joy,
you can hide it.

Sat. 2.5.99–104

Ulysses is finally named as a successful heir of a fourth part, good news under the *Lex Falcidia* of 40 BCE.¹⁹² We have also come full circle with Dama, who was initially *spurco* in line 18, and has become a *sodalis...tam fortem tamque fidelem*.¹⁹³ The reapplication of *fortis* again here, from Ulysses’ *animus* in line 20 to Coranus in line 64, and now to Dama, works on multiple levels. Lines 20 and 21 serve as a parody of Homer, distorting the heroic values emphasized in both the *Iliad* and the Platonic context. Coranus, as the old man who did not fall for Nasica’s scheming, receives the epithet in an epic context but Roman situation; *fortis* links the two worlds

¹⁹² For explanation of the law, see Rudd (1966), 226–25; and Muecke (1993), ad loc.

¹⁹³ Cf. Roberts (1984), 426–27; Muecke (1993), ad 101, notes the appropriateness of this language for the epitaph of a soldier, “epitomising the highest Roman ideals.”

and helps the Roman material pass into the Greek epic context. Finally, Dama, the slave who fell prey to *captatio*, becomes *fortis* in a final upheaval of heroic values; Ulysses himself, in the speech imagined by Teiresias, applies the epithet to Dama, just as he did to himself in line 20, bringing the parody full-circle. Instead of parodying Homer here, Horace uses *fortis* to parody Ulysses' initial reluctance to have anything to do with a *spurco* Dama. Much like the fact that *virtus* and *genus* are worthless without *res*, Dama has been elevated to the level of epic because of his wealth.

Even after Dama's death, however, the *captator*'s work is not done. Ulysses must, if he can, cry a little bit and disguise his joy.¹⁹⁴ This is the behavior Achilles criticizes in *Iliad* 11 (above), but when Odysseus does cry in the *Odyssey*, he rather tries to hide his tears, which he sheds while hearing about his lost companions.¹⁹⁵ The Ulysses of *Satire* 2.5 is an inversion of the Homeric hero, used here to tell a very Roman story. By the end of this poem, Ulysses has become an example of a contemporary Roman with perverted (or nonexistent) values. That Horace gives the contemporary practice of *captatio* a Greek origin story, complete with a Greek heroic founder, serves to distance the practice from actual Roman values; it is a Greek phenomenon, hence of course it is adding to Roman decline. But at the same time, the Greek Odysseus has become thoroughly Romanized, speaking in the forum, addressing fellow Romans by their praenomen, and modeling himself after Romans.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Lucil. 790W, Stat. *Silv.* 4.7.38.

¹⁹⁵ At *Od.* 8.85 he hides his face (κάλυψε δὲ καλὰ πρόσωπα); at 8.521–31 he is compared to a sobbing woman, holding on to her dying husband in front of their city.

Chapter 3

Of the Roman Persuasion: Ulysses the Orator in Ovid's *Armorum Iudicium*

Horace's exercise in satiric didactic poetry finds an active counterpart in Ovid's invented dialogue between Ulysses and Ajax in their verbal duel over the rightful inheritance of Achilles' arms. For Ovid, the literal implications of Ulysses' insertion of himself into Achilles' family line are constrained by the epic and tragic traditions (i.e. Odysseus is victorious and Ajax commits suicide), but the manner in which Ulysses wins his inheritance is open to interpretation. Despite the familiarity and variety of representations of the *Armorum Iudicium*, ranging from tragedy, vase painting, and rhetorical exercises,¹⁹⁶ the contest over Achilles' arms as imagined by Ovid nonetheless stands out among the episodes in the *Metamorphoses*, in particular because of the length of its speeches (Ulysses' speech is close to 250 lines long, more than twice that of Ajax' concise 117 lines) as well as for the Homeric context blended with tragic and rhetorical content. This scene has been the focus of much modern scholarly attention, but it was also a source for emulation and quotation in antiquity. Juvenal parodies the opening of *Met.* 13 at *Satire* 7.115–17 (*consedere duces, surgis tu pallidus Ajax / dicturus dubia pro libertate bubulco / iudice*, “The leaders are seated and you stand up, a pale Ajax, to make a case for your client's contested liberty in front of a yokel judge.”), and Quintilian quotes from this scene twice, at *Inst.* 1.5.43 and 5.10.41.¹⁹⁷ The rhetorical structures of both Ajax's and Ulysses' speeches have also

¹⁹⁶ E.g. Sophocles' *Ajax*, the black-figure vase of Ajax planting his sword in the ground attributed to Exekias (in the Musée des Beaux-Arts et d'Archéologie, Boulogne), and rhetorical handbooks, which are discussed below.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Hopkinson (2000), ad 5–8.

received their own fair share of attention,¹⁹⁸ which has been further fueled by Ovid’s insertion of a line written by one of his teachers of rhetoric, M. Procius Latro. Seneca, at *Controv.* 2.2.8–12, remarks that *Met.* 13.121–22 (*arma viri fortis medios mittantur in hostes: / inde iubete peti*) began as a *sententia* of Latro (*mittamus arma in hostes et petamus*).¹⁹⁹ The poet’s play with a school *controversia* in the middle of an epic complicates the tone and adds an additional layer to the multi-faceted literary history of Ulysses’ character and speech in *Metamorphoses* 13.²⁰⁰

My primary interest in this chapter, however, is focused on the rhetorical and Roman content of the speeches, and of Ulysses’ speech in particular, in an effort to understand how and to what effect Ovid portrays Ulysses as a consummate Roman orator.²⁰¹ Ulysses is deceptive and manipulates his well-known narrative throughout Ovid’s account, and he ultimately succeeds in winning Achilles’ arms, which seems problematic from both a rhetorical and cultural viewpoint. In addition to demonstrating his familiarity with Roman rhetorical practices (and his own traditional oratorical prowess), Ulysses employs Roman political language and other Roman imagery to support his case. His fictional audience consists of the Greek chiefs, but beyond them he is speaking to Ovid’s Roman readership as well. By incorporating Roman terms into Ulysses’ speech, Ovid renders the Greek hero more familiar to his Roman audience and, at the same time,

¹⁹⁸ For discussion of the structures specifically, see Otis (1970), 288; Duc (1994), 127; and Solodow (1988), 88–89; see Huyck (1991), 54–62, on the influence of rhetoric on the structure. Cf. Hopkinson (2002), 20, who notes: “There is nothing extraordinary in the arrangement of Ulysses’ material.” For Ulysses as an exemplum of the ideal orator in Cicero specifically, see Perutelli (2005).

¹⁹⁹ For further comment on this quotation of Latro, see Pernot (2005), 197; Leigh (1995), 199n9; Duc (1994), 129; Fantham (2009), 35. Cf. Schiesaro (2002) on Ovid’s rhetorical training; Higham (1958) on the rhetorical nature of Ovid’s poetry more generally; and Kennedy (1994) for a general history of classical rhetoric.

²⁰⁰ See Lorenzetti (2001) on the particularly epic nature of and the Homeric/Virgilian echoes in this episode.

²⁰¹ At *Inst.* 12.1.1, Quintilian quotes Cato, who describes the ideal Roman orator: *Sit ergo nobis orator quem constituimus is qui a M. Catone finitur vir bonus dicendi peritus* (“So let the orator whom we are setting up up be, as Cato defines him, ‘a good man skilled in speaking.’”). It is beyond the scope of my current project to examine the *bonus* or *malus* character of Ulysses as it relates to oratory, but see Montiglio (2011) for her discussion of the evolution of Odysseus’ positive to negative characterization in philosophical thought. See also Pernot (2005), 83–127, on the “Roman-ness” of Roman rhetoric.

more alien to his Greek past. Furthermore, Ovid imposes a Roman (and perhaps more specifically Roman Republican) identity on the Greek chiefs, which collapses together the fictional internal and real external audiences of the *Metamorphoses*. Richard Martin comments on Odysseus' abilities of persuasion in the *Iliad* and how he is able to win over an audience, unlike Agamemnon; Odysseus has "a fascination with the act of communication itself, which shapes his muthos genres of commanding, flyting, and recalling, and foregrounds the act of speech rather than the performance of an action by the hero. The latter feature allows Odysseus to put himself in the position of the audience."²⁰² Having a sense of one's audience is a crucial aspect of successful oratory more generally, but the fact that in *Metamorphoses* 13 Ulysses is able to win over his audience, composed of the Greek chiefs, through Roman political language illuminates Ulysses' protean ability to understand, adapt to, and integrate himself into any setting—be it physical, political, or literary.

My reading of this episode is done in the context of Ulysses more holistically, rather than specifically in the *Metamorphoses*, with an awareness of his portrayal in earlier depictions of the *Armorum Iudicium* as well as in Horace, *Satire* 2.5. In that poem, Ulysses is a Greek acting in the Roman genre of satire and learning the art of *captatio* to insert himself into the will of a wealthy acquaintance.²⁰³ Similarly in *Metamorphoses* 13, Ulysses makes a case to disrupt the familial and familiar lines of inheritance, adopting and adapting Roman legal language to successfully persuade his audience. Ovid's importation of non-epic, rhetorical discourse into an established epic context upsets the epic literary tradition, but it also draws attention to Rome's, and Ovid's place in changing that tradition. Thomas Greene comments on the issue of literary

²⁰² Martin (1989), 120.

²⁰³ The issue of inheritance is also one of the basic concerns of the *Odyssey*—whether or not Telemachus is Odysseus' son is crucial to the *Telemachy*, and Telemachus' inheritance is nearly realized when he is stopped from stringing Odysseus' bow.

imitation in Rome after Greece:

Greek critics had to deal with the decay of their tradition. Roman critics had to deal with a sense of inferiority to Greece. Both had to deal with linguistic, literary, and social change. The classic looms inimitable and unavoidable, nourishing and threatening. The tradition commands allegiance and must be maintained, but its maintenance requires innovation, which is to say some degree of rejection. As the cultural center of gravity shifts to Rome, the crucial problems surround the *translation* of a tradition.²⁰⁴

Greene's "translation" of the tradition can be encapsulated by the very figure of Ulysses, whose first Latin epithet *versutus* introduces at the beginning of the Latin literary tradition the question of how to translate Greek literature at Rome—how to inherit it and make the transference believable on both the literary and cultural levels.²⁰⁵ The acquisition of someone else's property is done through words, as Teiresias explains in *Satire* 2.5, as is the composition of poetry, and both acts have the ultimate goal of persuasion. In *Metamorphoses* 13 especially, Ovid demonstrates through Ulysses his ability to take a character with a long and complicated history and reinterpret him, revealing a certain uneasiness in translating a Greek figure into Roman terms. This uneasiness allows for the distance between what is Greek and what is Roman to remain, but it also forces Ovid's readers to ask which aspects are originally Greek or Roman and which have been "translated" from Greece to Rome, or vice versa.

Additionally, just as one can read Horace's voice in the character of Ulysses in *Sat.* 2.5, so too is it possible to consider Ulysses as a mouthpiece for Ovid, who frequently acknowledges his bending of generic boundaries and who once was training to become a lawyer himself.²⁰⁶ In this line of interpretation, there are two scholars whose arguments warrant attention, even though

²⁰⁴ Greene (1982), 57.

²⁰⁵ On translation and *verto*, see esp. n. 55 above.

²⁰⁶ E.g. at the very beginning of the *Metamorphoses*, which Ovid describes as a *carmen perptuum* (*Met.* 1.4); at *Tr.* 4.10.23–40, he describes his childhood studies, ignoring the Muses to focus on prose (*totoque Helicone relicto / scriber temptabam verba solute modis*, 23–24), only to come back to poetry after the death of his brother.

they consider Ulysses very much within the *Metamorphoses* as whole. Throughout her book, *The Image of the Poet in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Barbara Pavlock argues for Ovid's use of poet-figures in the *Metamorphoses*, including Arachne, Narcissus, and Daedalus. For Pavlock, the traditionally rhetorical character of Ulysses becomes a perfect surrogate for Ovid's poetic voice. She states, "Ulysses, I believe, in effect blurs the boundaries between rhetoric and poetry, combining the 'muscle' of rhetoric with the 'brilliance' of poetry. This chapter argues that Ulysses is an imaginative and deconstructive rhetorician analogous to the poet who thoroughly destabilizes the genre of epic in the *Metamorphoses*."²⁰⁷ For other scholars, the destabilizing force of Ulysses' supreme rhetorical skills, along with Nestor's account of the *Lapiths and Centaurs* in Book 12, deflates the lofty genre of epic and creates an "anti-war" narrative in direct contrast to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.²⁰⁸ Gross argues that in this episode Ovid undermines Ulysses' own dignity, particularly through the allusion to *Iliad* 3.217 at *Met.* 13.124–26 (discussed in detail below), and he interprets Ulysses (and the scene as a whole) in a rather negative light.²⁰⁹

In contrast, Sophia Papaioannou, in her study on Ovid's "Little *Iliad*," focuses on Achilles as the key through which we can understand Ovid's "narrative choices and objectives behind the narrative of *Met.* 12.1-13.622."²¹⁰ In the *Armorum Iudicium*, Ajax and Ulysses debate as to who is the rightful heir of Achilles arms, which represent the epic genre more broadly. Papaioannou states, "The fifth chapter is devoted to the oratorical debate between Ajax and Ulixes over the possession of Achilles' armor and, on a second level, over the issues of

²⁰⁷ Pavlock (2009), 112. Cf. Solodow (1988), 32, for the poet-narrator figure in Ovid, and for an opposite interpretation, see Bömer (1982), 199, "Ovid ist nicht Ulixes."

²⁰⁸ See especially Otis (1970), 359–61; Coleman (1971), 474–5; Ellsworth (1980), 29; Hardie (2002), 37; Zumwalt (1977). Although, as David Elmer has pointed out to me, there are already anti-war aspects built into the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; see, for example, the comments by Taplin (1999), 194, on the shield of Achilles.

²⁰⁹ Gross (2000), 56.

²¹⁰ Papaioannou (2007), 9.

succession (*Met.* 12.620–13.398): each hero claims to be the one suited the most to perform Achilles’ role as the epic protagonist *par excellence*.²¹¹ Ulysses wins the debate precisely because he demonstrates the combination of eloquence and physical strength for which Achilles was known.²¹² Papaioannou concludes her analysis of the contest by arguing more for Ulysses’ eloquence, however, stating, “Ulixes’ ‘eloquence’ (*facundia*) convincingly conveys the message that a great epic is above all an epic whose success depends on its ability to be rewritten and reinterpreted, a narrative that may always reinvent itself.”²¹³ Papaioannou confines her analysis of Ulysses and the *Armorum Iudicium* to the epic genre, but as we have seen in *Satire* 2.5, Ulysses brings so much more to the table than his Homeric epic trappings. Ovid has inherited, reinterpreted, and reinvented the figure of Ulysses himself in this episode, and he has manipulated Ulysses’ premier epic abilities in speech and eloquence to comment not only on the epic tradition, but also on the Roman rhetorical tradition.

Ovid’s reinterpretation of Odysseus, with an emphasis on his tragic and rhetorical past, expands the epic boundaries of the *Metamorphoses* and in addition allows Ovid to reconcile the Greek literary tradition and Greek oratorical practices that he has inherited at Rome. While Romanization and anachronism can be found throughout the *Metamorphoses*, the Roman elements included in this episode, I argue, help characterize Ulysses as the ideal Roman orator and establish him as the ultimate source and consummate exemplum of Roman oratorical

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, 22; cf. Smith (1997), 49–50. Cf. Martin (1989), 138 ff. on Achilles’ preeminence in and respect for speech. Martin also notes the number of Achilles’ speeches in the *Iliad* (which is 86), and he speaks nearly 400 more lines than Hector (who gives only 49 speeches): “Nor is this a minor consideration: size and importance are correlated in the ethos of the *Iliad* in many scenes...length is a positive speech value” (138).

²¹² At *Il.* 9.443, Phoenix states that he brought Achilles to Troy to teach him: μύθων τε ῥητῆρ’ ἔμεναι πρηκτιῆρά τε ἔργων (“to be both a speaker of words and a doer of deeds”).

²¹³ Papaioannou (2007), 205.

practice.²¹⁴ The issue of inheritance in the contest, as argued by Papaioannou, also extends beyond that of genre; questions of literary and cultural origin, as well as appropriation, come into play, especially when the Ulysses of *Metamorphoses* 13 is read against the Ulysses in Horace, *Satire* 2.5. In that poem, as we have seen in the previous chapter, what is at stake involves the literary traditions of epic and satire, but the poem also challenges the origin of the Roman social practice of *captatio* and asks what it means for a Greek to be cast as the originator of that practice. In the *Metamorphoses* Ulysses again serves a figure on the border between Greek and Roman social practices, literature, and genres, and through Ulysses Ovid is able to demonstrate the complicated origins of both the Roman rhetorical and epic traditions.²¹⁵

Ulysses' Oratorical Origins

The debate between Odysseus and Ajax for the arms of Achilles has a long literary tradition, stemming from the Epic Cycle and Aeschylus especially.²¹⁶ Often in scenes of the *Iudicium*, such as in the *Little Iliad*, Odysseus is not cast in the most favorable of lights. Pindar also depicts him negatively in *Nemean* 7 and 8.²¹⁷ On the positive side, however, we have Antisthenes' versions of speeches from both Ajax and Odysseus, to which we will return below. At Rome a number of dramatic portrayals of the *Iudicium* were staged, many of which may have influenced Ovid's own version in the *Metamorphoses*.²¹⁸ The *Armorum Iudicium* was also a

²¹⁴ Cf. Pernot (2005), 84–85, on model Roman orators (e.g. Appius Claudius, Scipio Nasica) and the seriousness of the spoken word at Rome.

²¹⁵ Cf. Doty (1993), 48–49, quoted on p. 59 above, on Hermes, the trickster, who can be both a thief and attorney.

²¹⁶ For fuller discussion of the *Iudicium* in the Epic Cycle, see Stanford (1963), 81ff.; Huyck, (1991), 62–64; and Hopkinson (2000), 14–15; for the staging possibilities of the contest in Aeschylus' Ὀπλων κρίσις, see Williams (1980) and Huyck (1991), 20–26.

²¹⁷ Pindar was composing for the Aiacidai, however, so the bias is expected; cf. Wilkinson (1955), 229.

²¹⁸ Ennius composed an *Ajax*, and Pacuvius and Accius each wrote an *Armorum Iudicium*; for reconstructions of these three plays, see Huyck (1991), 43–45, 45–49, and 50–53 respectively.

standard topic of *controversiae* and *suasoriae*, and a common model for training students and thinking through moral and rhetorical issues.²¹⁹ Well before Ovid, at *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 1.18 and *De Inventione* 1.11.3, the circumstances of Ajax' death serve as an example of a controversy over a question of fact, where character plays no part.²²⁰ Later in the *ad Herennium*, at 2.28–30, the author demonstrates the most complete use of the five parts of an argument, using the case of Ulysses and Ajax as an example. In this imagined case, the speaker aims to show that Ulysses had a motive for killing Ajax. Ulysses comes off extremely poorly here; the speaker brings in the case of Palamedes, calling his death *indigna*, and establishes a dichotomy between Ajax, who is *fortissimum, integerrimum, inimicitarum persequentissimum, iniuria lacessitum, ira exsuscitatum*, and Ulysses, who is described as *timidus, nocens, conscius sui peccati, insidiosus*. Similarly, in the *De Inventione*, Cicero identifies different types of arguments, such as self-evident, discreditable, and disputable, for which the *Armorum Iudicium* again provides a sample exercise.

non concessum est, cum id, quod augetur, in controversia est, ut si quis, cum Ulixem accuset, in hoc maxime commoretur: indignum esse ab homine ignavissimo virum fortissimum Aiacem necatum.

A disputable argument is one where the point which is being amplified is a matter of controversy; for instance, if anyone in accusing Ulysses should linger over this point, that it is unworthy that Ajax, the bravest of men, should be killed by the most arrant coward.

Inv. 1.92.4–6

²¹⁹ Cf. Prince (1999), 57.

²²⁰ *Rhet. ad Her.* 1.18.20: *Ajax in silva, postquam rescit quae fecisset per insaniam, gladio incubit. Ulixes intervenit, occisum conspicatur, corpore velum cruentum educit. Teucer intervenit, fratrem occisum, inimicum fratris cum gladio cruento videt. Capitis arcessit. Hic coniectura verum quaeritur.* (“In the forest Ajax, after realizing what in his madness he had done, fell on his sword. Ulysses appears, perceives that Ajax is dead, draws the bloody weapon from the corpse. Teucer appears, sees his brother dead, and his brother’s enemy with bloody sword in hand. He accuses Ulysses of a capital crime. Here the truth is sought by conjecture.”) Cf. Cic. *Inv.* 1.11.1: *Ac facti quidem controversia in omnia tempora potest tribui. Nam quid factum sit, potest quaeri, hoc modo: occideritne Aiacem Ulixes?* (“As to the dispute about a fact, this can be assigned to any time. For the question can be, ‘What has been done?’ e.g. ‘Did Ulysses kill Ajax?’”)

The moral coloring of this description (*indignum, ignavissimo, fortissimum*) stands in contrast to the factual-based controversies in both the *ad Herennium* and *De Inventione*. The superlatives used to describe both heroes, here and in the *ad Herennium*, might indicate that the verdict on this question is straightforward, but the extreme characters of the protagonists and the varied circumstances of the debate have helped the *Iudicium* endure as a model subject for *controversiae*.

Not only do the murky circumstances and motives behind the *Iudicium* and Ajax's subsequent death make this a particularly strong test-case for budding orators or lawyers, but Odysseus' preeminence in speaking also makes him an ideal model on which to base one's own rhetorical style. In the *Iliad*, Odysseus is marked out as superior in his speaking abilities in contrast to other styles:

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πολύμητις ἀναΐξειεν Ὀδυσσεὺς
στάσκεν, ὑπαὶ δὲ ἴδεσκε κατὰ χθονὸς ὄμματα πήξας,
σκῆπτρον δ' οὔτ' ὀπίσω οὔτε προπρηνὲς ἐνώμα,
ἀλλ' ἀστεμφὲς ἔχεσκεν ἀΐδρεϊ φωτὶ ἐοικῶς·
φαίης κε ζάκοτόν τέ τιν' ἔμμεναι ἄφρονά τ' αὐτῶς.
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ὅπα τε μεγάλην ἐκ στήθεος εἶη
καὶ ἔπεα νιφάδεσσιν ἐοικότα χειμερίησιν,
οὐκ ἂν ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆϊ γ' ἐρίσσειε βροτὸς ἄλλος.
οὐ τότε γ' ᾧδ' Ὀδυσῆος ἀγασσάμεθ' εἶδος ἰδόντες.

But whenever Odysseus of many wiles arose, he would stand and look down with eyes fixed on the ground, and his staff he would move neither backwards nor forwards, but would hold it stiff like a man of no understanding; you would have thought him some sort of a churl and nothing but a fool. But when he projected his great voice from his chest, and words like snowflakes on a winter's day, then could no other mortal man rival Odysseus; then we were not so astonished at Odysseus' appearance.

Il. 3.216–24

This passage illustrates the power of Odysseus' speech, while also commenting on the disconnect between the hero's outward appearance and his innate abilities, which allows those

abilities to seem all the greater.²²¹ The practices displayed by Odysseus in this description also passed the test of time and continued to be noted and encouraged by Roman authors, including Quintilian, who holds up the Homeric heroes as standard models of rhetorical styles, maintaining Ulysses as the preeminent example:

sed summam expressurus [est] in Ulixē facundiam et magnitudinem illi vocis et vim orationis nivibus [et] copia verborum atque impetu parem tribuit. Cum hoc igitur nemo mortalium contendet, hunc ut deum homines intuebuntur. Hanc vim et celeritatem in Pericle miratur Eupolis, hanc fulminibus Aristophanes comparat, haec est vere dicendi facultas.

But when he comes to express the supreme eloquence, in Ulysses, he gives him a mighty voice, and a force of speech “like a blizzard” in its volume and violence. So “no mortal will contend” with him, and “men will look upon him as a god.” This is the force and speed that Eupolis admires in Pericles and Aristophanes likens to the thunderbolt. This is in truth the power of speech.

Inst. 12.10.64

In the *Brutus*, Atticus remarks on the standard set by Odysseus in the *Iliad*, but adds that because Homer was able to make such a judgment, there must have existed a standard of rhetoric before and beyond Homer:

Nec tamen dubito quin habuerit vim magnam semper oratio. Neque enim iam Troicis temporibus tantum laudis in dicendo Ulixī tribuisset Homerus et Nestori, quorum alterum vim habere voluit, alterum suavitatem, nisi iam tum esset honos eloquentiae; neque ipse poeta hic tam [idem] ornatus in dicendo ac plane orator fuisset.

And yet I do not doubt that oratory always exercised great influence. Surely even in Trojan times Homer would not have allotted such praise to Ulysses and Nestor for their speech unless even then eloquence had enjoyed honor – to the one, you will recall, he attributed force, to the other charm – nor indeed otherwise had the poet himself been so accomplished in utterance and so completely the orator.²²²

Brut. 40

In terms of rhetorical models, Odysseus becomes a standard of rhetoric in general; after Livius

²²¹ Cf. Huyck (1991), 133, and Teiresias, who encourages the inheritance hunter to disguise his inner motives at Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.104.

²²² Cf. Martin (1989), 89–101, for discussion of the appropriateness of individual styles in Homer, and 120–30 for fuller discussion of Odysseus’ (and Diomedes’) style.

Andronicus translated the *Odyssey* and Odysseus into Latin, Odysseus became able to transcend cultural, not just literary, boundaries between Greece and Rome, especially through his ability to craft an argument and present it and himself to an audience. The confluence of Homer's (i.e. the poet's) and Odysseus' oratorical skills that Atticus mentions is also at play throughout Ovid's poetry, and in the *Metamorphoses* specifically,²²³ but it is important that Ovid is able to distinguish his Ulysses from other Odysseuses/Ulysseses and establish him as an *exemplum* for Roman orators and poets.²²⁴ A more purely oratorical Odysseus also exists in Greek, however, discussion of which will be fruitful in light of Ovid's Ulysses in the *Metamorphoses*.

Antisthenes' *Odysseus*

In the Greek oratorical tradition, Antisthenes composed his version of Ajax' and Odysseus' arguments in a diptych of speeches, with no explicit epic context or setting described. Their speeches become disembodied representations of their characters, and therefore they are more readily brought into a philosophical discussion, rather than literary.²²⁵ Nonetheless, there are many points of contact between Antisthenes' exercise and that of Ovid, particularly in Ajax' speeches, where the thrust of his argument similarly comes down to the question of the efficacy of words vs. deeds: λέγω...μη εἰς τοὺς λόγους σκοπεῖν περὶ ἀρετῆς κρίνοντα, ἀλλ' εἰς τὰ ἔργα

²²³ Cf. Pavlock (2009).

²²⁴ In *Met.* 13 Ovid holds up both Ajax and Ulysses as rhetorical models for his Roman audience, using Greeks, rather than native Roman orators; for a similar example of this reversal, see the discussion in Chapter 2 of Teiresias' employment of the Romans Nasica and Coranus as models of inheritance-hunting for Ulysses. Cf. Greene (1982), 62, and his discussion of Cicero's attitude toward rhetoric in the *De Oratore*: "There the gap between model and imitator collapses into the direct contact of Isocratean pedagogy, although this Roman process whereby a student forms himself upon a distinguished native orator is understood to follow a pattern that is originally Greek."

²²⁵ Prince (1999), 60, discusses this abstract aspect of Antisthenes' speeches: "Antisthenes' use of fictional characters to make his Socratic points about persuasion and responsibility is significant in this sense, namely that his characters really are constructions in words, not bodies or souls; but the idea that all identity is in some sense a mask of words may not be alien to his purpose, or to Socrates' paradox." That identity can be a mask of words is also integral to Odysseus' character, which, as noted above, cannot be adequately judged from his outward appearance.

μᾶλλον. (“I enjoin you...not to consider arguments when you are deciding about excellence, but rather to consider deeds,” *Aj.* 7.1; cf. *Met.* 13.9–11).²²⁶ Ulysses’ speech in *Met.* 13 does not resemble Antisthenes’ *Odysseus* as closely, but there are nonetheless similarities. In Antisthenes’ version Odysseus begins his rebuttal with a defense of the theft of the Palladium, with which he ends his speech in the *Metamorphoses*, and he stresses throughout both speeches the deeds he did on behalf of the Greeks as a community (πλείω γὰρ ἀγαθὰ πεποίηκα τὸ στρατόπεδον ἐγὼ ἢ ὑμεῖς ἅπαντες...εἰ μὲν κατορθώσαιμι, ἅπαντα ὑμῖν ἐπετελεῖτο, ὧν ἔνεκα δεῦρο ἀφίγμεθα. “For I have done the army greater good than all of you...if in fact I have executed them successfully, then all the goals for which we came to this place have been accomplished,” *Od.* 1.2, 2.3. Cf. *Met.* 13.188, 373–74). Many of these deeds Odysseus actually accomplished in disguise (εἶτε δοῦλος εἶτε πτωχὸς *Od.* 9.4) or unseen by his fellow Greeks (ἐπεχείρουν ἄν, καὶ εἰ μηδεὶς ὀρώη *Od.* 9.6). As Huyck notes, Odysseus’ assertions here support the Cynic value of ἀναίδεια, ‘shamelessness’ or “a disregard for shabby dress and physical indignities.”²²⁷ A result of these overt philosophical values that are woven into the language and structure of both of Antisthenes’ speeches is a much more positively rendered Odysseus than elsewhere in Greek literature.²²⁸

Based on this portrayal, as well as Horace’s philosophical coloring of Ulysses’ attitude in *Sat.* 2.5, there is similar potential for a philosophical, and specifically Cynic/Stoic, reading of Ulysses in *Metamorphoses* 13, especially at the end of Ulysses’ speech where he again brings in

²²⁶ See Hopkinson (2000), 15, for discussion of the similarities and differences between Antisthenes’ compositions and Ovid’s.

²²⁷ Huyck (1991), 40. See *ibid.*, 40n1, for bibliography on other Cynic elements in Odysseus’ speech.

²²⁸ For more detailed discussion of both the *Ajax* and *Odysseus* of Antisthenes, see *ibid.*, 38–43; and Sier (1996); for the “positive” Odysseus in philosophy, see Montiglio (2011), *passim*. Cf. discussion of Horace’s parodying of Cynic/Stoic values through Ulysses in Chapter 2, 52ff.

the Palladium. W. C. Stephens argues that the theft of the Palladium, though which Ulysses made victory for the Greeks possible, is the key to the speech: “Through his *sapientia*, Ulysses saved the Greeks...The long-suffering Ulysses, like the *vindex* Hercules, is conceived as a prototype and model of the Stoic Sage, as an illustration of the philosophy quietly taught in the didactic passages of Books 1 and 15.”²²⁹ This positive philosophical interpretation of Ulysses’ tactics and success is not a common one, but it adds another complicating layer to his character, further muddying the reader’s ability to see his use of dubious argumentation and rhetorical tricks in a strictly positive or negative light.

The fusion of rhetoric with philosophy in Ulysses may become clearer, if we consider *Metamorphoses* 13 as presupposing *Satire* 2.5 and the instructions Ulysses received from Teiresias therein. In that text we can also see Ulysses straddling the boundary between rhetoric and philosophy,²³⁰ a phenomenon that Cicero discusses in the *De Oratore*, where Crassus speaks of philosophers and orators as originating from the same place, but flowing down their own distinct paths:

Haec autem, ut ex Appennino fluminum, sic ex communi sapientiae iugo sunt doctrinarum facta divortia, ut philosophi tamquam in superum mare [Ionium] defluerent Graecum quoddam et portuosum, oratores autem in inferum hoc, Tuscum et barbarum, scopulosum atque infestum, laberentur, in quo etiam ipse Ulixes errasset.

The streams of learning flowing from the common watershed of wisdom, as rivers do from the Apennines, divided in two, the philosophers flowing down into the entirely Greek waters of the Eastern Mediterranean with its plentiful supply of harbors, while the orators glided into the rocky and inhospitable Western seas of outlandish Tuscany, where even Ulysses himself lost his bearings.

de Orat. 3.69

Crassus is discussing the possibility of oratory without philosophy, and Ulysses is brought in to

²²⁹ Stephens (1958), 282.

²³⁰ For discussion of the relationship between rhetoric and philosophy in Plato, see D. Werner, 2010, “Rhetoric and Philosophy in Plato’s *Phaedrus*,” *Greece & Rome* 57: 21–46. Interestingly, also in the *Phaedrus*, Antisthenes is said to have been present with Socrates on the day of his death (*Phd.* 59b; cf. Huyck (1991), 38).

emphasize the chaotic waters of the western Mediterranean,²³¹ but elsewhere in Cicero, the hero is described as a *sapientissimus vir* (*de Orat.* 1.196, *Leg.* 2.4, *Fin.* 5.49, *Tusc.* 5.7). The simile is set in the bodies of water surrounding Greece and Italy, and Mankin notes the almost chiasmic structure of places and their adjectives: *Graecum* is described with a Latin adjective (*portuosum*), while *Tuscum* is described with a Greek (*barbarum*).²³² Ulysses, himself a Greek, while lost in the waters around Italy, brings together both philosophy and rhetoric, collapsing two strains of wisdom within a single figure and crossing physical (and cultural) boundaries at the same time.

Ulysses in *Metamorphoses* 13

Ovid addresses and crosses many more boundaries through his own peculiar rendering of Ulysses in *Metamorphoses* 13. In this episode we find Ulysses very nearly putting into action the advice given to him by Teiresias in Horace, *Satire* 2.5. The hero argues and persuades his way into becoming the *heres* of the arms of Achilles, despite making obvious changes to his story as told in Homer and constructing the cunning argument that because he brought Achilles to the Greeks, he can therefore take credit for all of Achilles' deeds.²³³ Richard Tarrant comments on Ulysses' rhetoric of persuasion, arguing, "The episode does indeed illustrate the power of rhetoric to move its listeners, but the import of Ulysses' success is thoroughly negative, showing how dishonest rhetoric can extort an unjust victory from an audience wanting in discernment...the effect is to award the victory to the speaker more adept (or unscrupulous) in using the tricks of the rhetor's trade."²³⁴ The fact that Roman rhetorical practices can be used

²³¹ Cf. Mankin (2011), ad 69.

²³² Ibid.

²³³ I have not discovered other instances of this type of argument in antiquity.

²³⁴ Tarrant (1995), 72.

dishonestly is not surprising;²³⁵ that a Greek, and Ulysses in particular, can use these Roman practices and achieve success, on the one hand demonstrates Ulysses' own familiarity with and abilities in public speaking, and on the other underscores the Greekness of the Roman oratorical tradition, which in turn raises questions about the origins and Romanness of those very practices. Similarly to Horace's strategy in *Satire 2.5*, where *captatio* is given a Greek founder to help explain its negative impact on Roman society, Ovid does not allow us to forget that Ulysses is a Greek, who misuses the power of rhetoric to wrongly persuade his audience to trust him and whose Greekness may serve to excuse Ovid's own (perhaps indulgent) integration of Roman terms and imagery into a thoroughly Greek scene.²³⁶

The Romanizing elements of Ulysses' speech also appeal to different audiences; the internal, fictional Greek audience, in a Homeric setting, would indeed be unfamiliar with the language of Rome, while the external Roman reader would recognize that discourse and its transference into a different context. The scene of the debate, on the epic Sigeon shores near Troy, is immediately transformed into a Roman courtroom by, perhaps surprisingly, Ajax (*agimus...ante rates causam, Met. 13.5–6*). Throughout his speech, however, he fights against the use of words to persuade and does not engage often with Roman political language to connect with the Roman courtroom audience he himself acknowledges.

Ajax Takes the Floor

Metamorphoses 13 opens with the crowd settling down and Ajax preparing to speak. While Ajax is not our primary focus, the ways in which Ovid characterizes him in contrast to Ulysses (and how Ajax himself talks about Ulysses) are important for our understanding of

²³⁵ Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 12.1.1 on why the power of eloquence should not fall into the hands of evil (*si vis illa dicendi malitiam instruxerit*).

²³⁶ Cf. n. 33 in the Introduction on the Sinon's eloquence in the *Aeneid*.

Ulysses in this episode. Ovid describes Ajax in these opening lines: *surgit ad hos clipei dominus septemplex Ajax, / utque erat impatiens irae* (“Then Ajax rose, lord of the sevenfold shield and with uncontrolled indignation...,” 13.2–3). Mention of the seven-layered shield draws attention to Ajax’s traditional, and ultimately irrelevant, military prowess as well as to the immediate point of the debate—Achilles’ arms, but the tone shifts quickly in the next line with *impatiens irae*, which may not only foreshadow Ajax’ sudden turn to suicide at the end of the episode, but also contrasts with one of Ulysses’ stock epithets—*patiens* (πολύτλας).²³⁷ Despite his martial and impatient nature, Ajax nonetheless performs an action similar to Odysseus’ in *Iliad* 3 and follows Quintilian’s advice when beginning his speech:

Sigeia torvo
litora respexit classemque in litore vultu
intendensque manus ‘agimus, pro Iuppiter’ inquit,
‘ante rates causam, et mecum confertur Ulixes!’

With uncontrolled indignation he let his lowering
gaze rest awhile on the Sigeian shores and on the fleet;
then, pointing to these, “By Jupiter!” he cried, “in the
presence of these ships I plead my cause, and my
competitor is Ulysses!”

Met. 13.3–6

Ajax looks around him before speaking, makes a gesture, and uses his surroundings to help bring the audience immediately into his argument.²³⁸ Even though he begins his speech on strong footing—with the fleet as a backdrop and a reminder that he saved that very fleet from Hector’s fire—Ajax emphasizes his fatal weakness in this debate: his inability to use words well.

tutius est igitur fictis contendere verbis

²³⁷ Ulysses is described as *patiens* at Hor., *Ep.* 1.7.40; Ovid, *Tr.* 1.5.70, *Ex Ponto* 4.10.9 (here the adjective is applied to his *animus*). *Patiens* is also applied to Ulysses at Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.43, in the imagined comment from an on-looker of Ulysses in the forum. Cf. Antisthenes, *Od.* 14, where Odysseus humorously imagines a future poet, who will describe him as πολύτλαντα και πολύμητιν και πολυμήχανον και πολλίπορθον.

²³⁸ For further commentary on the opening of Ajax’ speech, see Smith (1997), 43–44; Solodow (1988), 88–89; cf. Hopkinson (2000), 18–20, for discussion of the positive rhetorical qualities of Ajax’ speech.

quam pugnare manu. sed nec mihi dicere promptum
nec facere est isti, quantumque ego Marte feroci
inque acie valeo, tantum valet iste loquendo.

It is safer, then, to fight with lying words than with
hands. But I am not prompt to speak, as he is not
to act; and I am as much his master in the fierce
conflict of the battle-line as he is mine in talk.

Met. 13.9–12

Words and deeds again become the dichotomy, just as they were for Antisthenes' Ajax. The tangible, visible nature of deeds makes them a more objective source of merit, which also applies to another of Ajax' grounds for inheritance of the arms—his blood relation to Achilles.

sic a Iove tertius Aiax.
nec tamen haec series in causam prosit, Achivi,
si mihi cum magno non est communis Achille:
frater erat; fraterna peto. quid sanguine cretus
Sisyphio furtisque et fraude simillimus illi
inseriris Aeacidis alienae nomina gentis?

Thus Ajax is the third remove from Jove.
But let this descent be of no avail to my cause, O Greeks,
if I do not share it with the great Achilles. He was my cousin;
a cousin's arms I seek. Why do you, the son of Sisyphus,
exactly like him in his tricks and fraud, seek to associate
the Aeacidae with the name of an alien family?

Met. 13.28–33

Ajax is here practicing the argument of the dispossessed cousin, making his close blood relation to Achilles the primary foundation of his claim to the arms. Genealogy is a key component of Homeric duels, where each fighter relates his lineage before engaging with his opponent, and it is no different here where the battle is going to be fought with words rather than swords.²³⁹

Genealogy plays no part in Ajax' argument in Antisthenes, and so here Ajax may be resorting to a tactic familiar from his Homeric battles, where he feels his most confident. This emphasis on

²³⁹ Cf. also the final lines of Ajax's speech: *Arma viri fortis medios mittantur in hostes, / inde iubete peti et referentem ornate relatis* ("Let the brave hero's arms be sent into the enemy's midst; command them to be recovered, and to their rescuer present the rescued arms," *Met.* 13.121–22), on which see Labate (1980).

direct lineage and blood relation, however, does not work here in this Roman courtroom.²⁴⁰ The Roman system of adoption had long been changing family trees,²⁴¹ and as we have seen in *Satire* 2.5, one need not even be a part of a family (through blood or adoption) to inherit property. But Ajax nonetheless describes his relationship to Achilles, using strong language:

nos inhonorati et donis patruelibus orbi,
obtulimus quia nos ad prima pericula, simus?

And shall I go unhonored, denied my cousin's gifts,
just because I was the first to front the danger?
Met. 13.41–42

He describes his position as it now stands after Achilles' death as dishonored (*inhonorati*) and bereft (*orbi*) of his cousin's gifts (*donis patruelibus*).²⁴² He is not speaking metaphorically of, e.g. "brothers in arms", but literally of his familial relationship to Achilles and what that entitles him to, in terms of his inheritance.²⁴³ Unfortunately for Ajax, the literal, physical, and provable evidence he offers is quickly dismantled by Ulysses, who wastes no time in displaying his consummate oratorical skills and knowledge of what is at stake.

Ulysses Speaks

²⁴⁰ Cf. *Aen.* 8.134–42, where Aeneas outlines his genealogical connection to Evander, and this appeal works to secure Aeneas a warm welcome: *Dardanus, Iliacae primus pater urbis et auctor, / Electra, ut Grai perhibent, Atlantide cretus...vobis Mercurius pater est, quem candida Maia / Cyllenae gelido conceptum vertice fudit; / at Maiam, auditis si quicquam credimus, Atlas, / idem Atlas generat caeli qui sidera tollit. / sic genus amborum scindit se sanguine ab uno* ("For Dardanus sailed to the Teucrians / to be the founder and father of Ilium: / and he—the Greeks relate—was born out of Electra. / Your father is Mercury, to whom lovely Maia / gave birth upon Cyllene's icy summit; / bu Maia—if we trust what we are told— / is also Atlas' daughter, that same Atlas / who props the stars. Then both our races branch / out of one blood"). See also Eden (1975), ad 131–41, for a summary of appeals to mythological genealogies in Roman history.

²⁴¹ See Lindsay (2009) for the history of Roman adoption.

²⁴² *Patruelis* is precisely the child of a father's brother (cf. the chart on p. 173 of Sandys (1910)); Ovid uses the term elsewhere at *Met.* 1.352 (*patruelis origo* referring to the relationship between Deucalion, the son of Prometheus, and Pyrrha, the daughter of Epimetheus) and at 4.462, where it describes the "cousin-husbands" of the Belides (cf. Ovid, *Ars* 1.73, *Ib.* 355). It is rare in poetry.

²⁴³ In Antisthenes' *Ajax*, the hero does not mention his familial relationship to Achilles, but rather says that he deserves the arms, so that he can return them to Achilles' φίλοι (3.4).

In contrast to the Ulysses we saw in *Satire 2.5*, where Teiresias was the main speaker and Ulysses the eager student, in *Metamorphoses 13*, Ulysses delivers one of the longest speeches in the entire epic, demonstrating to his audience his mastery of Roman rhetoric as well as supplanting himself as an heir to someone with whom he has no blood relation whatsoever—perfectly executing Teiresias’ advice. In order to accomplish this, Ulysses models himself on his character in the *Odyssey* and borrows words and gestures from Roman rhetorical practices, blending genres and traditions that result in success. Ulysses begins his speech using the technique for which he is famous and that became a recommended practice for Roman orators:

Finierat Telemone satus, vulgique secutum
ultima murmur erat, donec Laertius heros
adstitit atque oculos paulum tellure moratos
sustulit ad proceres exspectatoque resolvit
ora sono, neque abest facundis gratia dictis.

The son of Telamon finished, and the applause
of the crowd followed his closing words. At length
Laertes’ heroic son stood up and, holding his eyes for
a little on the ground, he raised them to the chiefs
and broke silence with the words for which they waited;
nor was grace of manner lacking to his eloquent speech.

Met. 13.123–27

Ulysses’ behavior here is clearly modeled on Antenor’s description of the hero in *Iliad 3*, specifically lines 216–17: ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ πολύμητις ἀναΐξειεν Ὀδυσσεὺς / στάσκειν, ὑπαὶ δὲ ἴδεσκε κατὰ χθονὸς ὄμματα πήξας (“But whenever Odysseus of many wiles arose, he would stand and / look down with eyes fixed on the ground,”).²⁴⁴ While in the *Iliad* Antenor notes that this practice made Odysseus seem slow-witted, Ulysses here adapts the technique slightly, looking down only for a little while (*paulum*). Quintilian encourages Roman orators to use this tactic before speaking, as a way to collect one’s thoughts and to give a moment for one’s audience to

²⁴⁴ Antenor’s full description of Odysseus is quoted on p. 77 above.

gather themselves:

Ergo cum iudex in privatis aut praeco in publicis dicere de causa iusserit, leniter est consurgendum: tum in componenda toga vel, si necesse erit, etiam ex integro inicienda, dumtaxat in iudiciis (apud principem enim et magistratus et tribunalia non licebit) paulum est commorandum...mire enim auditurum dicturi cura delectat et iudex se ipse componit. Hoc praecipit Homerus **Ulixes exemplo**, quem stetisse oculis in terram defixis inmotoque sceptro priusquam illam eloquentiae procellam effunderet dicit.

Accordingly, when the judge in private cases, or the court usher in public ones, calls upon us to speak on our cause, we must get up without hurrying, and then spend a little time arranging our toga, or, if need be, putting it on afresh – in the public courts, I mean, because this will not be allowed before the emperor, a magistrate, or a tribunal – so as both to make ourselves more decent and to give ourselves a little time to think...Care in the speaker is very agreeable to the listener; and besides, the judge can settle himself down. Homer recommends this **by the example of Ulysses**, whom he describes as standing with his eyes fixed on the ground and not moving his staff, before pouring forth his ‘blizzard’ of eloquence.

Inst. 11.3.156–58

Quintilian goes on in more detail, discussing where exactly to place the hands and feet, how to arrange one’s toga, and appropriate and inappropriate gestures to make during this pause. In his commentary, Huyck comments on the shrewd nature of these tactics: “Homer’s Odysseus may have been calculating, but he was never so calculating as this. Once again the poet has excerpted a detail from the ancient tradition with every confidence that his readers will reinterpret it in the light of contemporary refinements, and smile.”²⁴⁵ Gross interprets this gesture rather differently, stating, “By imitating the stance along with its rhetorical implications, Ovid deftly compels his reader to recollect the Iliadic hero’s persuasiveness, yet with *sustulit* (‘he raised his eyes,’ 126), Ovid immediately undermines the allusion.”²⁴⁶ While *sustulit* does break the connection with the Iliadic intertext, Ovid has already prepped the reader by telling us Ulysses kept his eyes down for “a little while” (*paulum*), condensing the Iliadic scene and adapting it to a new, Roman oratorical

²⁴⁵ Huyck (1991), ad 13.125.

²⁴⁶ Gross (2000), 56.

context. Knowing one's audience is an important factor when considering the content and structure of a speech, as well as the set up and gestures that contribute to the overall effect. The brevity of Ulysses' pause is also reflected in Ovid's transition between the two speeches of the contest, which takes all of five lines. But Ulysses' audience, the *proceres*, were not the primary audience of Ajax' speech, which was the *vulgus* (line 123). The chiefs have been waiting for Ulysses' speech (*expectato sono*), and so only a short pause is appropriate here.

After this pause, Ulysses begins his speech, remembering the dead Achilles, but after only four lines, he feigns to wipe away a tear:

‘Si mea cum vestris valuissent vota, Pelasgi,
non foret ambiguus tanti certaminis heres,
tuque tuis armis, nos te poteremur, Achille.
quem quoniam non aequa mihi vobisque negarunt
fata’ (manuque simul veluti lacrimantia tersit
lumina), ‘quis magno melius succedat Achilli,
quam per quem magnus Danais successit Achilles?’

“If my prayers and yours had availed, O Greeks,
there would be no question as to the victor in this
great strife, and you, Achilles, would still have your
own armor, and we should still have you. But since
the unjust fates have denied him to me and you”
(and with his hand he made as if to wipe tears from
his eyes), “who would better be a successor to the
great Achilles than he through whom the Greeks
received the great Achilles?”

Met. 13.128–33

The ingenious play on *succedat...succesit*,²⁴⁷ along with the slightly varied repetition of *magnus Achilles*, verbally underscores the slippery nature of inheritance. Ulysses prefaces this language with a rather unusual gesture, upon which many scholars have commented. For some, it has the effect of undercutting Ulysses' heroic aspirations as well as deflating the epic setting of the scene

²⁴⁷ OLD s.v. 5a and 4b respectively; cf. Hopkinson (2000), ad loc.

as a whole.²⁴⁸ There is also a contrast here with the Odysseus of the *Odyssey*, who cries, sincerely, a total of 16 times (all of which are cited by Stanford).²⁴⁹ Against this backdrop, Papaioannou argues, “In *Metamorphoses* 13, Ulixes fakes tears to elicit a comparison with his counterpart in the *Odyssey*, and in this way to adjust the narrative focus on his more advanced deconstruction of the typical *aristos* model.”²⁵⁰ She also notes a second intertext here, namely Sinon, who persuades the Trojans to accept the horse at *Aeneid* 2.196 with *dolo lacrimisque coactis*. “Ironically and ingeniously, Ovid’s Ulixes is ‘rehearsing’ the tactics of Vergil’s Sinon, his own disciple, in order to deceive his fellow Greeks into judging his arguments more convincing.”²⁵¹ Huyck expands on this interpretation, citing Cicero and Quintilian, who recommend this practice for orators, namely rousing emotions in himself so as to better rouse them in his audience; Ulysses, however, “has advanced so far on archaic precedent that, content to *seem* tearful, he sheds no tears at all (*veluti*).”²⁵²

One intertext that has not yet been mentioned in scholarship on this scene is Horace, *Satire* 2.5, where Teiresias explicitly recommends that Ulysses (and the general *captator*) feign tears while lamenting the passing of his friend: *sparge subinde et, si paulum potes, illacrimare: est / gaudia prodentem vultum celare* (“and if you can do a bit of it, drop in some tears. If your face betray joy, you can hide it,” 103–104). Ulysses does exactly this here at *Met.* 13.130–33—in the middle of remembering and regretting the loss of Achilles, Ulysses “cries.” At *Satire*

²⁴⁸ e.g. Gross (2000), 56–57, “In contrast to the dignified Homeric warrior, Ovid’s hero pretends to wipe tears from his eyes while speaking of Achilles: *manuque simul veluti lacrimantia tersit lumina*...thus removing himself from the realm of the heroic to the rhetorically manipulative and absurd”; cf. Papaioannou (2007), 179.

²⁴⁹ Stanford (1963), 122n9; cf. Huyck (1991), ad 13.132–33.

²⁵⁰ Papaioannou (2007), 179.

²⁵¹ *Ibid.*; cf. Fletcher (2006), 233.

²⁵² Huyck (1991), ad 13.132f., citing Quint. *Inst.* 6.2.27 and 6.2.29.

2.5.102, the *captator* elevates his dearly departed friend, Dama, by describing him in heroic terms, *fortem*, which is used throughout that poem in a variety of ways.²⁵³ The scene in *Metamorphoses* 13 is flipped, however; our fallen hero, Achilles, needs no adjectives for us to understand his importance, and Ulysses has not yet been awarded the arms. But the tears in *Satire* 2.5 are meant to help the *captator* secure another old, rich friend from whom he can inherit—the process of *captatio* never ends. And it even extends in *Metamorphoses* 13 to the taking of goodwill. After wiping away his tears, Ulysses transitions into what Wilkinson and Gross consider the hero’s *captatio benevolentiae*:

huic modo ne prosit, quod, ut est, hebes esse videtur,
 neve mihi noceat, quod vobis semper, Achivi,
 profuit ingenium, meaque haec facundia, si qua est,
 qua nunc pro domino, pro vobis saepe locuta est,
 invidia careat, bona nec sua quisque recuset.

Only let it not be to this fellow’s profit that he seems
 to be, as indeed he is, slow of wit; and let it not be,
 O Greeks, to my hurt that I have always used my wit
 for your advantage. And let this eloquence of mine,
 if I have any, which now speaks for its owner, but
 often for you as well, incur no enmity, and let each man
 make the most of his own powers.

Met. 13.135–39

Gross interprets this gesture negatively: “Ulysses also baldly asserts that he will employ his gift of eloquence for his own advantage (135–39), here the very antithesis of a *captatio benevolentiae*.”²⁵⁴ Contrast Wilkinson, who considers it a Ciceronian move: “*Meaque haec facundia, si qua est*: there speaks the Roman orator making his *captatio benevolentiae*, just like Cicero in the well-known exordium of the *Pro Archia*.”²⁵⁵ The emphasis on eloquence and

²⁵³ See Chapter 2, 67, for discussion of *fortis* in Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.

²⁵⁴ Gross (2000), 56–57.

²⁵⁵ Wilkinson (1955), 232. The more complete text of Cicero’s *captatio benevolentiae* at *Pro Arch.* 1.1–4: *si quid est in me ingeni, iudices, quod sentio quam sit exiguum, aut si qua exercitatio dicendi, in qua me non infitior*

benefit, combined with Ulysses' initial stance with eyes lowered and prefaced by feigned tears, packs an immediate rhetorical punch and demonstrates how the Greek hero can deftly blend together a number of different techniques to one powerful effect.

Following his tears and the *captatio benevolentiae*, Ulysses easily discounts Ajax's claim of hereditary connection based on the number of other surviving relatives Achilles has:

nec mihi quod pater est fraterni sanguinis insons,
proposita arma peto; meritis expendite causam,
dummodo, quod fratres Telamon Peleusque fuerunt,
Aiacis meritum non sit nec sanguinis ordo,
sed virtutis honor spoliis quaeratur in istis.
aut si proximitas **primus**que requiritur **heres**,
est genitor Peleus, est Pyrrhus filius illi;
quis locus Aiaci? Pthiam haec Scyrumve ferantur.
nec minus est isto Teucer **patruelis** Achilli;
num petit ille tamen? num, si petat, auferat ille?

But, neither because through my mother I am more nobly born, nor because my father is guiltless of a brother's blood, do I seek the armor that lies there. Weigh the cause on desert alone. Only count it not any desert of Ajax that Telamon and Peleus were brothers, and let not strains of blood, but the honor of manhood be considered in the award. Or, if you seek for next of kin and lawful heir, Peleus is Achilles' father, Pyrrhus his son. What room is there for Ajax? Bear the armor hence to Phthia or to Scyrus. And Teucer is no less Achilles' cousin than he. Yet does he seek the arms, and if he did would he gain them?

Met. 13.149–158

The list of Achilles' surviving relatives is a long one, and includes his father and son, which seriously weakens Ajax' argument based on familial inheritance. To further make his point, Ulysses uses the technical legal term *primus heres*,²⁵⁶ which indicates the order of succession in

mediocriter esse versatum, aut si huiusce rei ratio aliqua ab optimarum artium studiis ac disciplina profecta ("Gentlement of the jury: Whatever talent I possess (and I realize its limitations), whatever be my oratorical experience (and I do not deny that my practice herein has been not inconsiderable), whatever knowledge of the theoretical side of my profession I may have derived from a devoted literary apprenticeship ..."). This tactic is recommended by Cicero and Quintilian (Cic. *Inv.* 1.16.21–22, Quint. *Inst.* 4.1.6–11).

²⁵⁶ *OLD* s.v. *heres* 1c; Just. *Dig. passim*.

a will, and he reapplies *patruelis* to Teucer, undercutting Ajax's earlier emphatic application of it to himself. The ease with which Ulysses dispenses with Ajax's seemingly logical argument adds to the excess of the overall opening of his speech, including his "tears" and *captatio benevolentiae*, and strengthens his initial appeal as an orator. Beyond merely acting the part of a Roman orator, Ulysses speaks like one too; Ovid's transformation of Odysseus, a successful speaker in Greek, to Ulysses, a highly proficient lawyer in the forum, tests the questions of, firstly, what it means for a Greek to successfully employ Roman language and imagery, and conversely, how successfully can a Roman poet appropriate and engage in a Greek genre, but on Roman terms.

Ulysses the Romanizer

Throughout Ulysses' speech Ovid sprinkles a number of Roman terms, phrases, and images, which render the scene more familiar to a Roman reader. While they may strike a jarring note coming from the mouth of a Greek hero, Ovid also takes advantage of Ulysses' *polytropos* and *versutus* qualities to show what a Greek practicing rhetoric at Rome might look like. Romanization, or anachronism, of mythological scenes is not uncommon in the *Metamorphoses*, and Solodow argues that it is a conscious feature of Ovid's poem, especially when considered in contrast to the *Aeneid*.²⁵⁷ On the phenomenon of anachronism more generally (which he does not distinguish from Romanization), Solodow comments,

Ovid lays a contemporary color over his stories by references to names and institutions that belong to Roman political, social, or private life. Many of these, of course, are at the same time anachronisms: since Rome evolved only after the heroic age of Greece, displacements in time and in space overlap. There is little need to distinguish between them. They are different aspects of Ovid's drive to represent myth in everyday terms.²⁵⁸

²⁵⁷ Solodow (1988), 84–86.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 82.

Horsfall, in his commentary on *Aeneid* 2, includes a brief comment on Romanization under the heading *Kreuzung der Gattungen*, similarly linking Romanization and anachronism and emphasizing the significance of Romanization to the tone of the narrative.²⁵⁹ Following both Solodow and Horsfall, I use Romanization as the primary term, as it is the Romanness of Ulysses and the scene in *Met.* 13, rather than their contemporaneity, that is at the center of my inquiry. Ulysses' ability to relate to Ovid's contemporary audience, however, is also at stake, and I agree with Solodow here, that the anachronism aspect of Romanization that Ovid employs to collapse Greek myth into Roman reality is difficult to distinguish as a completely separate phenomenon.²⁶⁰ While Ovid's practice of Romanization has been called "self-indulgent,"²⁶¹ it is also a demonstration of Ulysses' (and epic's) ability to cross generic boundaries. As the most adaptable of Greek heroes, there is no one better able to embody the mixing of discourses, through which Ulysses transforms, or translates (*verto*), his internal Greek audience into something more similar to his external Roman audience.²⁶²

One section of text that is particularly full of Roman language, specifically legal and political terms, are lines 187–92. Within four lines there occur three forensic phrases:

ego mite parentis
ingenium verbis ad **publica commoda** verti:
nunc equidem fateor, fassoque ignoscat Atrides:
difficilem tenui sub iniquo iudice causam.
hunc tamen **utilitas populi** fraterque datique

²⁵⁹ Horsfall (2008), xxi and n. 22 on the same page, "Romans in a sense *are* Trojans; no wonder if Trojans speak like Romans." The same cannot be said of Odysseus, however.

²⁶⁰ Cf. Solodow (1988), 75.

²⁶¹ e.g. Hill (2000), ad 13.197.

²⁶² Ajax' speech is not entirely lacking in Roman terms (e.g. line 35: *potiorque videbitur*, on which see Hopkinson (2000), ad loc.), but it does not approach the number of legal/political terms and anachronistic images of Ulysses' speech. Ajax also quotes the *Aeneid* at lines 44–45, and one of Ovid's rhetoric teachers, M. Porcius Latro, at lines 120–22 (quoted above on p. 70).

summa movet sceptri, laudem ut cum sanguine penset.

It was I that turned the kind father-heart to a consideration
of the public weal; I indeed (I confess it, and may
Atrides pardon as I confess) had a difficult case to plead,
and that, too, before a partial judge; still the people's good,
his brother, and the chief place of command assigned to him,
all moved upon him to balance praise with blood.

Met. 13.187–92

Ulysses is recounting the story of Agamemnon's sacrifice of his daughter Iphigenia at Aulis, which was necessary in order for the Greek fleet to set sail for Troy. The legal phrases *publica commoda* and *utilitas populi* bracket line 190, which is composed of three standard legal expressions.²⁶³ *Commoda* and *utilitas* are also both legal terms, meaning 'advantage or profit' and 'welfare' respectively, and here the advantages and utility of the sacrifice of Iphigenia are explicitly for the people (*populi*).²⁶⁴ *Publica commoda* also occurs at Horace, *Ep.* 2.1.3, in his letter to Augustus (*in publica commoda peccem, / si longo sermone morer tua tempora, Caesar* "I should sin against the public's well-being if with long talk, O Caesar, I delay your busy hours," 3–4), where the poet, similar to Ulysses in *Met.* 13, is concerned for the public good and acknowledges the connection between the leader and the state. Cicero uses the phrase *utilitas civitatis* at *Flac.* 98.14 to describe what good jurors should consider when deciding a case: *semper graves et sapientes iudices in rebus iudicandis quid utilitas civitatis, quid communis salus, quid rei publicae tempora poscerent, cogitaverunt* ("In reaching their decisions responsible and intelligent jurors have always considered what the interests of the citizens, the common safety, and the circumstances of the body-politic required"), and *ad Brut.* 1.3.3–4,

²⁶³ Cf. Hopkinson (2000), ad 190; *OLD* s.v. *teneo* 16b. *Publica commoda* is also at Suet. *De poetis* 40.46; cf. Bömer (1982), ad 187–88, for additional occurrences. *Difficilem causam* is at Cic. *De fin.* 3.3.1, *ad Att.* 4.3.2.11–12. Cf. Kenney (1969) for discussion of Ovid's legal career/familiarity with real legal situations and their impact on his use of legal language, especially in elegy.

²⁶⁴ Berger (1953), s.v. *commodum* and *utilitas publica*.

where it is the only thing that would make Cicero look backward: *neque respectum ullum quaerere nisi me utilitas civitatis forte converterit* (“I am not looking over my shoulder, unless it so happen that the interests of the community make me turn my head”). In *Metamorphoses* 13, Ulysses describes the intensely emotional scene surrounding the sacrifice in a detached, legalistic mode, demonstrating the supreme ability of words to guide emotions and thoughts. All of this he does in a speech similarly designed to persuade the judges through measured argumentation in contrast to Ajax’ more emotional (*impatiens irae*) appeal.

Ulixes versutus

This passage, full of politically charged language, is introduced by a subtle bit of wordplay, noted by Hopkinson. The similarity between *verbis* and *verti* “seems to invite an etymological association—words are instruments of persuasion.”²⁶⁵ By using a finite form of *verto*, from which Ulysses’ first Latin descriptor, *versutus*, derives, Ovid makes more concrete Ulysses’ ability to adapt and persuade with words. The adjective *versutus* appears twice in Ovid’s corpus, but only once in the *Metamorphoses*, where it describes the Odysseus’ grandfather:

ut sua maturus complevit tempora venter,
 alipedis de stirpe dei **versuta** propago
 nascitur Autolycus, furtum ingeniosus ad omne,
 candida de nigris et de candentibus atra
 qui facere adsuerat, patriae non degener artis.

When the fullness of time was come, a son was born to the wing-footed god, Autolycus, of crafty nature, well versed in cunning wiles. For he could make white of black and black of white, a worthy heir of his father’s art.

²⁶⁵ Hopkinson (2000), ad 188. Though not activated here, *verba* does play a role in deception in the phrase *verba dare* (e.g. at Plaut. *Bac.* 745 and Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.23). Additionally, *versus*, ‘a line of verse,’ derives from *verto* (*EDL* s.v. *ve/ortō*), underscoring the persuasive power of poetry.

Met. 11.311–15

Ovid uses *versutus* only here in the *Metamorphoses*,²⁶⁶ to describe Autolycus, who is known for his thievery (*Od.* 19.395–396, *Il.* 10.266ff.). Livius Andronicus used *versutus* to describe Ulysses in his translation of the *Odyssey*, but Ovid reapplies the adjective to a mythological character two generations before Ulysses, creating a new line of inheritance for the adjective.²⁶⁷ At *Met.* 13.188 above, the action of the *vert-* root is applied by means of *verbis* onto Agamemnon’s *ingenium*; conversely Autolycus is described as both *versuta* (*propago*) and *ingeniosus*. The transference of the term from its programmatic place in Livius Andronicus to a chronologically removed, but nonetheless related, character puts into practice one of the many definitions of the root word,²⁶⁸ through which Ovid can both recall an intertext in Livius Andronicus and establish his own freedom to move within the Greek and Roman literary tradition. Another possible definition of *verto* at work at *Met.* 13.187 is “to subvert, ruin, confound,”²⁶⁹ as indeed Agamemnon was ultimately ruined by his decision to sacrifice his daughter. Ulysses proudly claims that victory and boasts of the overturning and disruptive capabilities of his words. Ovid, too, disturbs the seemingly direct lines of literary inheritance and translation begun by Livius Andronicus, making the earlier poet’s use of *versutum* seem to look ahead to Ovid’s own application of it to Ulysses’ grandfather.

²⁶⁶ The second occurrence is at *Amores* 2.19.9, to describe Corinna: *viderat hoc in me vitium versuta Corinna*. Cf. McKeown (1998), ad loc., who notes in his commentary, “Plautus has the adjective six times, but it is generally very rare in verse.” Cf. also Prop. 4.7.37–38: *ut Nomas arcanas tollat versuta saliuas, / dicet damnatas ignea testa manus* (“Though artful Nomas got rid of her secret concoctions, the red-hot brick will declare hers to be guilty hands”).

²⁶⁷ Cf. Pavlock (2009), 114–15.

²⁶⁸ *OLD* s.v. *verto* 15, 16, 23—all relating to transfer or exchange. *Verto* has 24 different definitions in the *OLD*, with multiple additional sub-definitions, which dramatically emphasizes the *poly-* of *πολύτροπος*.

²⁶⁹ *OLD* s.v. 5b.

Rome at Troy

Following *Met.* 13.193 above, Ulysses paints the scene in Troy where he went to negotiate with Priam, Paris, and Antenor. As he enters the city, his language is evocative of the Roman forum, but the setting now vividly recalls that of Rome itself.

Mittor et Iliacas audax **orator** ad arces,
visaque et intrata est altae mihi **curia** Troiae,
plenaque adhuc erat illa viris. interritus **egi**
quam mihi mandarat **communis Graecia causam**
accusoque Parin praedamque Helenamque reposco
et moveo Priamum Priamoque Antenora iunctum.

I was sent also as a bold ambassador to Ilium's
stronghold and visited and entered the senate-house
of lofty Troy. It was still full of heroes. Undaunted,
I pleaded the common cause which Greece had entrusted
to me, and I denounced Paris, demanded the
return of Helen and the booty, and I prevailed on
Priam and Antenor who sided with Priam.

Met. 13.196–201

Ulysses is sent to Troy as an *orator*, an ambassador here, but the second meaning of ‘advocate’ is also triggered by *egi...causam*.²⁷⁰ The *communis Graecia* for which he has come to plead falls into the same category of phrases as *publica commoda* and *utilitas populi*,²⁷¹ and the legal atmosphere is intensified by Ulysses’ use of *accuso*, with which he confronts Paris.²⁷² But the word that makes the strongest impact on the reader’s imagination is *curia*, the meeting place of the Roman Senate that has been transported to Troy. Henderson argues that Ovid’s use of *curia* here “prevents the reader from practising for long that willing suspension of disbelief which most epic poets are careful to foster.”²⁷³ With *curia*, Ovid begins to break down the wall between

²⁷⁰ Cf. *OLD* s.v. 1 and 2 respectively.

²⁷¹ Cf. Hopkinson (2000), ad 188.

²⁷² In a figurative sense; cf. *TLL* 1.0.350.15–59 (*non addito crimine*).

²⁷³ Henderson (1979), ad 3.111–114.

Ulysses and his Roman audience, which is completely torn down when Ulysses addresses his fictional internal audience of Greek chiefs as Roman *cives*. In the next 60 lines, Ulysses uses *cives* twice, once to refer to his fellow warriors and once to address his immediate audience:

at ausus erat reges incessere dictis
Thersites etiam, per me haut inpune, protervus.
erigor et trepidos **cives** exhortor in hostem
amissamque mea virtutem voce repono.

But Thersites dared, indeed, and chid the kings
with insubordinate words, but, thanks to me, not
without punishment! I arose and urged my
faint-hearted comrades against the enemy,
and by my words I restored their lost courage.

Met. 13.232–35

Much like Ulysses' use of words to change Agamemnon's mind, here he uses his eloquence to return *virtus* to the trembling citizens. His words again are able to change the mental and emotional state of those who hear them, powerfully demonstrating what Quintilian described above as *haec est vere dicendi facultas* (*Inst.* 12.10.64). With his second use of *cives*, Ulysses relies instead on visual evidence to make his point.

‘sunt et mihi **vulnera, cives**,
ipso pulchra loco; nec vanis credite verbis,
aspicite en!’ vestemque manu diduxit et ‘haec sunt
pectora semper’ ait ‘vestris exercita rebus.’

“I also have wounds, my comrades, noble for
for the very place of them. And trust no empty
words of mine for that. See here!” and he threw
open his garment with his hand; “here is my
breast which has ever suffered for your cause!”

Met. 13.262–65

The use of *cives* fleshes out the Roman setting of the *curia* as well as including Ovid's Roman readers among Ulysses' internal Greek audience (or, rather, exports Ulysses' Greek audience outside of the text), which Ovid pushes even further through Ulysses' gesture of revealing his

wounds. Matthew Leigh has noted that by drawing his garment open and revealing the wounds on his chest, Ulysses employs a strategy often used in the Roman political arena, where politicians would display their scars to the electorate, while canvassing for votes.²⁷⁴ Pavlock argues for a more figurative interpretation of the wounds: “By conceiving of chest wounds for Ulysses, Ovid reinterprets the indelible scar from the boar in Homer. Multiple rather than single, countering the punctured shield of the hero’s own rival, ambivalent even in their very existence, the wounds are emblematic of the inherently metamorphic nature of Ovid’s Ulysses.”²⁷⁵ In this connection, what is interesting to note is the physicality of Ulysses’ rhetoric here: while the boar scar in the *Odyssey* needed to be hidden, as it was the only physical sign of Odysseus’ identity, at this moment in *Met.* 13 he relies solely on physical evidence and discredits the ability of words to persuade his audience to believe him. It is also the second gesture he makes during his speech, and it contrasts starkly with the first, which was to wipe away a feigned tear. Ulysses is able to do what Ajax cannot, that is, win an argument based on deeds and physical evidence; he uses both language (*curia, cives*) and gestures both to transform his internal audience into Romans and to appeal to Ovid’s own Roman readers.²⁷⁶

Furthermore, sandwiched in between the two *cives* passages is perhaps Ovid’s most jarring importation of Roman language into Ulysses’ speech.

haud contentus eo petii tentoria Rhesi
 inque suis ipsum castris comitesque peremi
 atque ita captivo, victor votisque potitus
 ingredior curru laetos imitante **triumphos**.

But not content with this, I turned to Rhesus’
 tents and in his very camp I slew the captain

²⁷⁴ Leigh (1995).

²⁷⁵ Pavlock (2009), 123

²⁷⁶ Cf. Martin (1989), 120.

and his comrades too. And so, victorious
and with my prayers accomplished, I went
on my way in my captured chariot in a
manner of a joyful triumph.

Met. 13.249–52

Pavlock analyzes the triumphal imagery as follows:

By the image of a triumph, Ulysses begins to re-create himself to some extent as a Roman, seizing opportunities to invent anachronisms that his immediate audience can admire, if not fully comprehend. As he refashions himself by using language and an inventive imagination to transform reality, this hero reveals how much he resembles the poet of the *Metamorphoses*.²⁷⁷

Solodow notes additionally how jarring *triumphos* sounds: “Issuing from the mouth of the narrator himself, this comparison would have been unremarkable; from one of his characters, it is striking.”²⁷⁸ Also striking is Ulysses’ use of *triumphos* to describe his return to the Greek camp after the events of the Doloneia, which take place under the cover of darkness. The image of the triumph masks both the unheroic nature of Odysseus’ actions in that episode and the fact that Diomedes was his accomplice on the mission.²⁷⁹ In the Doloneia, Odysseus and Diomedes were sent to learn what they could about the Trojans’ plans: what they returned with instead were spoils taken from the Thracians whom they slaughtered in their sleep. Ulysses’ application of a vivid Roman term, which conjures grand images of processions, spoils, and conquest, fully demonstrates his ability to make himself and his actions seem like something they are not.

While Ulysses’ persuasive choice of words and argumentation wins over his internal

²⁷⁷ Pavlock (2009), 117.

²⁷⁸ Solodow (1988), 82. Here in the *Metamorphoses*, *triumphos* refers to the actual procession, but Solodow goes on to distinguish its usage: “In Virgil this is never the case; instead *triumphus* either is a metonym for ‘victory’ (2.578, 4.37, 11.54), or it appears appropriately in passages that, looking beyond the heroic age in which the poem is set, predict the future (6.626, 6.814, 8.714)” (83n22).

²⁷⁹ The subversive aspects of this nighttime mission are discussed by Buchan (2004), 117–20. Diomedes overrides Odysseus’ remark to Dolon, not to think about death (*Il.* 10.383) and kills him; although, see Stagakis (1987) on the inconsistency in Book 10, where Diomedes alone as well as Diomedes *and* Odysseus are identified as Dolon’s slayers.

audience, the external reader is left to make up his own mind about the verdict. The narrator offers only a brief remark on the outcome of the contest, after Ulysses' lengthy display, which both reinforces and undercuts the power of rhetoric: *Mota manus procerum est, et quid facundia posset / re patuit, fortisque viri tulit arma disertus* ("The company of chiefs was moved, and their decision proved the power of eloquence: to the eloquent man were given the brave man's arms," *Met.* 13.382–83). Hopkinson interprets the narrator's brief comment as a negative judgment of Ulysses' victory. As Hopkinson goes on to argue, this is the last, and most pointed, of the words-vs-deeds dichotomy drawn in particular by Ajax; importantly, though, "Ulysses' words are not merely words, but result in tangible success. His speech is the perfect illustration of his argument that the clever person is more able to make things happen."²⁸⁰ Ovid, however, does not overtly condone or condemn the chiefs' verdict, but the juxtaposition of the swiftness with which he describes Ajax's suicide and the length of the preceding debate offers some room to comment on the efficacy of words vs. deeds.²⁸¹ Just as in *Satire* 2.5, where Teiresias encourages Ulysses to use words to win over his mark, specifically calling him by name and speaking on his behalf in the forum, the way Ovid portrays Ulysses' success reveals how rhetoric can allow someone to inherit although he might appear undeserving. A metapoetic reading of line 383 (*fortisque viri tulit arma disertus*) allows us to see the poet (*disertus*) inherit the epic genre (*fortis viri arma*),²⁸² which Ovid has stressed, in particular in the *Amores*, he does not have

²⁸⁰ Ibid.

²⁸¹ Hopkinson (2000), ad loc.; he does not explain his interpretation, but it perhaps stems from the connotation of *disertus*, which acts substantively for Ulysses: "Although [*disertus*] is not a derogatory word, it is generally used to mean 'clever at speaking', 'an accomplished speaker': it does not have the dignity of such words as *orator* and *eloquentia*. Cf. Cic. *de Orat.* 1.94."

²⁸² See the discussion on *fors* in Chapter 2, 67. Although, cf. Ovid's use of *disertus* at *Tr.* 3.11.20–21: *solvat et in mores ora diserta meos. / in causa facili cuivis licet esse diserto* ("[There is someone] to move eloquent lips against my character! In an easy cause anybody may be eloquent"), where the simplicity of the argument allows one to *seem* eloquent, rather than one's innate eloquence helping him to win a difficult case.

the capabilities to pursue.²⁸³ Ovid does not in fact write in hexameters again but returns to the elegiac couplet in to the *Fasti* and his poetry from exile. The (un)suitability of hexameter poetry for Ovid is left open to further debate in *Metamorphoses* 13, but Juvenal picks up on the metapoetic potential of the power of eloquence as well as its ability to mask the truth.

If the Armor Fits

In *Satire* 11, Juvenal takes a literal, Ajax-like approach to the *Armorum Iudicium* and hints that the armor Ulysses argued for was maybe not such a good fit.

e caelo descendit γνῶθι σεαυτόν
figendum et memori tractandum pectore, sive
coniugium quaeras vel sacri in parte senatus
esse velis; neque enim lorica[m] poscit Achillis
Thersites, in qua se traducebat Ulixes;
ancipitem seu tu magno discrimine causam
protegere adfectas, te consule, dic tibi qui sis,
orator vehemens an Curtius et Matho buccae.

The saying “Know Yourself” comes from heaven. It should be fixed and pondered in the unforgetting heart, whether you’re looking for a wife or aiming for a place in the sacred Senate. Just think: Thersites doesn’t demand Achilles’ breastplate – the one Ulysses made such a fool of himself in. If you aspire to defend a difficult case of great importance, ask yourself the question, tell yourself what you are— a powerful orator, or a windbag like Curtius and Matho?

Sat. 11.27–34

In this poem, which is ultimately a dinner invitation addressed to a certain Persicus, Juvenal inserts the mythological *exemplum* of Ulysses and Thersites to reinforce the take-home message of γνῶθι σεαυτόν—“know your limits,” financially speaking.²⁸⁴ A rich man can afford lavish entertainment and tasty delicacies, while a man of modest means should serve food

²⁸³ See n. 304 and 305 below.

²⁸⁴ Courtney (1980), ad 27, remarks, “This is the only case in which Juvenal uses Greek words without contempt; for though this grand precept is applied to the sordid matter of one’s financial position, I do not detect any irony on Juvenal’s part.”

commensurate with his wealth, or lack thereof. The humor in Juvenal’s comparison of Thersites’ and Ulysses’ self-awareness lies in the physical circumstances of the situation. Thersites dares to reproach Agamemnon in *Iliad* 2, after which Odysseus puts the strict social hierarchy back in order, but he knew better than to throw his hat into the ring for Achilles’ armor.²⁸⁵ Odysseus, on the other hand, despite being described as short and broad-chested,²⁸⁶ decides to vie for the armor, relying exclusively on his social and military status. Juvenal pokes fun at Ulysses here, whom Achilles’ armor would in reality not have fit. The everyday-aspect of this scenario undercuts Odysseus’ lofty goal of acquiring material goods for the sake of honor, which is not only humorous, but also sheds a rather more gloomy and sinister light on Ovid’s version of the debate in *Met.* 13.

Following the anecdote of Thersites and Ulysses, Juvenal instructs Persicus to tell himself who he is (*dic tibi qui sis*, 33); in the case of the following legal example, there are only two options: a powerful speaker or a windbag. It is a gross simplification, but it reinforces Juvenal’s overall theme and forced dichotomy of rich patron vs. poor client, which is further reflected in the confident, yet deluded Odysseus vs. the poor, yet self-aware Thersites. There follows a short digression on moderation and being truthful about one’s means, both of which also lie at the foundation of Horace’s *Satire* 2.5, where Teiresias urges Ulysses to disregard both. In that poem and in *Met.* 13, Ulysses’ ability to persuade remains his primary attribute; in

²⁸⁵ Thersites is described at *Il.* 2.216–19 as: αἰσχιστος δὲ ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθε· / φορκὸς ἔην, χωλὸς δ’ ἕτερον πόδα· τὸ δέ οἱ ὤμω / κυρτῶ, ἐπὶ στῆθος συνοκωχότε· αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε / φοξὸς ἔην κεφαλῆν, ψεδνὴ δ’ ἐπενήνοθε λάχνη (“This was the ugliest man who came beneath Ilion. He was bandy-legged and went lame of one foot, with shoulders stooped and drawn together over his chest, and above this his skull went up to a point with the wool grown sparsely upon it”). In this passage, Odysseus’ ability to shut down Thersites and restore the social hierarchy using only his words is acknowledged to surpass other deeds he accomplished using speech (e.g. giving good counsel and establishing the battle array).

²⁸⁶ By Priam at *Il.* 3.193–94, μείων μὲν κεφαλῇ Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρείδαο, / εὐρύτερος δ’ ὄμοισιν ἰδὲ στέρνοισιν ἰδέσθαι (“...shorter in truth by a head than Atreus’ son Agamemnon, / but broader, it would seem, in the chest and across the shoulders”).

Juvenal’s poem, however, words must be supported by concrete proof. Both Odysseus and Thersites are acknowledged as fluent speakers,²⁸⁷ and in *Iliad* 2, Odysseus’ speech is only one line longer than Thersites’ (18 and 17 lines respectively). But for Juvenal, it comes down to the physical manifestation of one’s argument, which in this case is who will wear the armor better. The words spoken by the *orator vehemens* should likewise be true and not spoken just for the sake of speaking, such as the *buccae* Curtius and Matho would do.²⁸⁸ He makes the point explicit in lines 55–59:

experiere hodie numquid pulcherrima dictu,
 Persice, non praestem uita et moribus et re,
 si laudem siliquas occultus ganeo, pultes
 coram aliis dictem puero sed in aure placentas.

You’ll find out today, Persicus, whether or not I live up to this wonderful talk in actuality, in lifestyle and behavior—if I sing the praises of beans while being a glutton at heart, if I ask my slave for polenta in public but whisper “pastries” in his ear.

Sat. 11.56–59

Dictus is set in opposition to *vita*, *mores*, and *res*, which can mean “in reality” as well as “wealth.”²⁸⁹ In essence, actions speak more truthfully than words, and Ulysses perfectly encapsulates the satirist’s chief concern of saying one thing, while actually being, or doing, another. This passage brings Ulysses’ lack of self-awareness into clearer focus as well; he paid no regard to his physical limitations when entering the contest of arms and made his arguments purely for show. For someone who does not know his limitations, the habit of using persuasion

²⁸⁷ Odysseus’ rhetorical abilities need no introduction; Odysseus calls Thersites a clear speaker at *Il.* 2.246, λιγύς ἄγορητής, despite his also being reckless (ἀκριτυθε) and disorderly with his words (ὄς ἔπεα φρεσὶν ἦσιν ἄκοσμά τε πολλά τε εἶδη, *Il.* 2.213).

²⁸⁸ Horace uses *buccas* in *Sat.* 1.1.21, to refer to Jupiter’s puffed up cheeks. Gowers (2012), 58, summarizes: “Horace ridicules people who complain but would not take the change offered by a puffing, jovial Jupiter...they put up, he deduces, with miserable lives because of anxiety about their financial future. The discussion broadens out into a dialogue between various anonymous opponents (41–107), and the financial motive becomes the new focus of the poem.”

²⁸⁹ Cf. Chapter 2, 57, on Horace’s play on the multiple meanings of *res*.

for personal gain becomes dangerous and begins anew the cycle of deception, as Teiresias instructs at the end of *Satire 2.5*. Ovid's and Juvenal's portrayals of Ulysses as a persuasive yet programmatic, orator mark a shift in Roman poets' use of the Greek hero as a model for their own poetic programmes. Ulysses rather becomes a model from which poets strive to distance themselves, relying on their own poetic authority rather than on that with which Odysseus could formerly supply them.

Chapter 4

Stranger than Fiction: The (In)Credible Tales of the Wandering Odysseus

As we have seen from the beginning of this study, Odysseus is adept at crossing boundaries, whether they are historical, metaphorical, generic, personal, or physical. Because of the liminal space he often occupies by suppressing his identity, Odysseus' authenticity is frequently questioned, such as by Achilles in *Iliad* 9 and as we see in Horace, *Satire* 2.5, where Teiresias teaches Ulysses to cross the seemingly impermeable boundary of familial inheritance.²⁹⁰ Additionally, he is frequently held up by Roman poets as an *exemplum* of rather devious, but nonetheless markedly Roman, behavior that can be, and is perhaps meant to be, emulated. This is particularly exemplified by Livius Andronicus and Plautus, who facilitate the beginning of Odysseus' entry into the Latin literary tradition.²⁹¹ At that foundational moment Odysseus represents for Roman poets a figure of Greek poetic authority, whom Livius and Plautus invoke and adopt to lend support to their own poetic projects. These two poets were translating Greek originals into a new language as well as a new context, for which Odysseus provided the perfect link between the old and the new.

The desire to solidify a connection with the preeminent figure of Greek mythology while doing something novel with Greek material shifted over the centuries, however; in the exile poetry of Ovid and Juvenal's *Satire* 15, Odysseus' authority as a poet-like storyteller of his travels is undermined. Things both familiar and strange are intertwined in Odysseus' narrative of

²⁹⁰ Miller (2012), 312, notes, "It has long been recognized that Roman satire is founded on transgression, a crossing of borders, a violence directed in the first place toward others, but also toward the self as a sealed, autonomous, and self-contained unity;" cf. Winkler (1991), 24; Schlegel (2005), 4; and Keane (2006), 4, 45, and 49–64.

²⁹¹ For a fuller discussion of Ulysses in Livius Andronicus and Plautus, see Chapter 1.

his own adventures in the *Odyssey*, which helps his story to be credible, yet wondrous at the same time; the friction between the known and the unknown that Odysseus embodies is explored and exploited by Ovid and Juvenal ultimately to deconstruct the association between poet and hero that Livius Andronicus and Plautus forged in their work at the beginning of the Latin literary tradition.

Rather than depicting him as the preeminent trickster in the Trojan War or the penniless hero returning home, Ovid and Juvenal direct their attention more specifically to Odysseus the wandering storyteller. Wandering, traveling, or exploring in the ancient world connotes both positive and negative choices and lifestyles and is done by a multitude of people, including the itinerant sage, traveling historian, exile, or wandering philosopher.²⁹² As the prototypical wanderer, Odysseus explores foreign lands, reports his findings, and leaves traces of himself for posterity, but, unlike other wanderers, he is ultimately able to return home.²⁹³ His wandering, as we shall see below, was not always viewed positively, and because of their far reach into uncivilized regions, Odysseus' tales cannot often be verified.²⁹⁴ Romm notes that thus, "[The] narrator must, as a result, employ various schemes either to win belief or to deflect the scorn that accrues to liars."²⁹⁵ A poet's ability to tell both truths and lies in his poetry becomes more intimately tied to Odysseus as well as Rome in Ovid and Juvenal, which at once complicates as well as fortifies that initial connection established between Odysseus and Roman poets in the late third century BCE. For Ovid in exile and Juvenal reporting on foreign events, Odysseus the

²⁹² See Montiglio (2005) for an in-depth discussion of each type of wandering in the ancient world.

²⁹³ Although, see Heubeck-Hoekstra, ad 11.121–37, for discussion of and bibliography on Teiresias' prophecy of further wandering for Odysseus. Additionally, it is possible to interpret the geography of Odysseus' wanderings more literally, especially in light of Greek colonization in the western Mediterranean; see Malkin (1998).

²⁹⁴ Virgil and Ovid, however, each invent a companion of Odysseus who survived Polyphemus' cave and can corroborate the horrors he saw therein; cf. n. 37 in the Introduction.

²⁹⁵ Romm (1992), 184.

traveler provides a vehicle for exploring the limits of believability of a first-person narrative, where credibility becomes fraught in an effort to win over one's audience.

Ovid is Ulysses

Similar to Plautus, Livius Andronicus, Horace, and Ovid in *Met.* 13, Odysseus serves as a model for the poet in Ovid's exile poetry. But unlike the hero's earlier appearances as a mouthpiece of sorts, Ovid changes the relationship by explicitly linking himself to Odysseus, especially in *Tr.* 1.5 and *Pont.* 4.10. Elsewhere in the exile poetry, Ovid compares himself to Jason and Orpheus, among other mythological heroes,²⁹⁶ and it has been acknowledged that the first book of the *Tristia* is itself a mini-epic of sorts, following a plot similar to Odysseus' own journey.²⁹⁷ More than any other hero, however, Ovid consistently aligns himself with Ulysses.²⁹⁸ Helmut Rahn describes Ovid's frequent employment of this hero in particular, arguing that the "Odysseus role" serves as a kind of leitmotif that provides an inner unity to the books of exile poetry.²⁹⁹ Unity is indeed accomplished by picking up the Ulysses-theme every once in a while, like a thread, but Ulysses does more than simply help to stitch together Ovid's epistolary narrative from exile. By narrating his own exile in light of Ulysses' mythical trials and adventures, Ovid launches his personal situation into the realm of epic in an effort to elicit even greater pity for his relegation. Let us look at *Tr.* 1.5, Ovid's most extended comparison of

²⁹⁶ E.g. Jason at *Pont.* 1.4.23–46, and Orpheus at *Tr.* 4.1.17; cf. Williams (2002), 236, and Rahn (1958), 116, who lists a number of passages where Ovid identifies himself with Philoctetes.

²⁹⁷ See Hinds (2006), 423; Rahn (1958), 115–18; Claassen (1990), 66; Evans (1983), 40.

²⁹⁸ Ulysses plays a significant role elsewhere in Ovid's corpus as well, e.g. at *AA* 2.123–42, *Rem.* 263–90, and *Met.* 13, on which see Chapter 2; see also Davisson (1982), 32n13, who counts 11 poems from Ovid's exilic corpus in which the poet explicitly or implicitly compares himself to Ulysses. But cf. Bömer (1982), 199, who argues, "Ovid ist nicht Ulixes."

²⁹⁹ Rahn (1958), 116, "Die Odysseus-Rolle steht nicht auf einer Stufe mit den anderen von ihm genannten Heroen, die gelegentlich zum Vergleich auftauchen, sondern ist so etwas wie ein *Leitmotiv*, das zur inneren Einheit der Bücher aus der Verbannungszeit wesentlich beiträgt."

himself with Ulysses, to tease out exactly what Ulysses represents for Ovid and what he is meant to represent for Ovid's Roman readership.

Si vox infragilis, pectus mihi firmiss aere,
 pluraque cum linguis pluribus ora forent,
 non tamen idcirco complecterer omnia verbis,
 materia vires exsuperante meas.

pro duce Neritio docti mala nostra poetae
 scribite: Neritio nam mala plura tuli.
ille brevi spatio multis erravit in annis
 inter Dulichias Iliacasque domos: 60
nos freta sideribus totis distantia mensos
 sors tulit in Geticos Sarmaticosque sinus.
ille habuit lectamque manum sociosque fideles:
me profugum comites deseruere mei.
ille suam laetus patriam victorque petebat:
 a patria fugi victus et exul ego.
 nec mihi Dulichium domus est Ithacave Sameve,
 poena quibus non est grandis abesse locis,
 sed quae de septem totum circumspicit orbem
 montibus, imperii Roma deumque locus. 70
illi corpus erat durum patiensque laborum:
 invalidae vires ingenuaeque mihi.
ille erat adsidue saevis agitatus in armis:
 aduetus studiis mollibus ipse fui.
me deus oppressit, nullo mala nostra levante:
 bellatrix **illi** diva ferebat opem.
 cumque minor Iove sit tumidis qui regnat in undis,
illum Neptuni, me Iovis ira premit.
 adde, quod **illius** pars maxima ficta laborum est:
 ponitur in nostris fabula nulla malis. 80
 denique quaesitos tetigit tamen **ille** Penates,
 quaeque diu petiit, contigit arva tamen:
 at mihi perpetuo patria tellure carendum est,
 ni fuerit laesi mollior ira dei.

Tr. 1.5.53–84

If I had a tireless voice, lungs stronger than brass,
 and many mouths with many tongues, not even
 so could I embrace all of my sufferings in words,
 for the theme surpasses my strength. O learned
 poets, write of my evils instead of the Neritian
 hero's! for I have borne more than the Neritian.
 He wandered over but a narrow space in many
 years—between the homes of Dulichium and
 Ilium; fate brought us, after traversing seas
 whole constellations apart, to the bays of the
 Getae and Sarmatians. He had a chosen band of
 true companions; I in my flight have been
 abandoned by my comrades. He was seeking his
 native land in joy and victory; I have fled mine,
 vanquished and an exile. My home is not
 Dulichium or Ithaca or Samos, places from
 which absence is no great punishment, but Rome,
 that gazes about from her seven hills upon the
 whole world—Rome, the place of empire and the
 gods. He had a frame sturdy and enduring of
 toil; I have but the frail strength of one gently
 nurtured. He had been constantly engaged in
 fierce warfare; I have been used to softer
 pursuits. I was crushed by a god and nobody
 lightened my sorrows; to him the goddess of war
 brought aid. And though the king of the swelling
 waves is inferior to Jove, he was oppressed by
 Neptune's wrath, I by that of Jove. Moreover,
 the largest part of his labors is fiction; in my
 woes no myth resides. And finally—he reached
 the home of his quest, attaining the fields he had
 long sought. But I must be forever deprived of
 my native land, unless the wrath of the injured
 god be softened.

This is a lengthy synkrisis, the immediate effect of which is that of a relatively evenly matched duel. The parity between the two men quickly disappears, however, as Ovid raises the stakes after nearly each couplet. The first blows are exchanged in a more straightforward manner—Ulysses traveled in a confined area among familiar places (*brevi spatio ... inter Dulichias Iliacasque domos*, 59–60), while Ovid was relegated to a distant, foreign land (*freta sideribus*

totis distantia, 61). Ovid then continues to escalate the consequences of each comparison: Ulysses had his companions, but Ovid was abandoned by his; Ulysses' body was conditioned to endure hard work, whereas Ovid's is suited for gentler tasks; Ulysses was tormented by Neptune, while Ovid suffered the wrath of the more powerful god, Jove.³⁰⁰ The *amplificatio* of the synkrisis reaches its climax in lines 79–80: *adde, quod illius pars maxima ficta laborum: / ponitur in nostris fabula nulla malis*. Ulysses' trials are not true; Ovid's are so real that the most enduring hero of Greek mythology cannot provide an adequate template for expressing the poet's deep suffering.³⁰¹

Ovid reinforces the epic number and incredibility of his experiences through the *recusatio* that initiates this extended comparison with Ulysses.

Si vox in fragilis, pectus mihi firmius aere,
 pluraque cum linguis pluribus ora forent,
 non tamen idcirco complecterer omnia verbis,
 materia vires exsuperante meas.
 pro duce Neritio docti mala nostra poetae
 scribite: Neritio nam mala plura tuli.

Tr. 1.5.53–58

Lines 53–54 have a rich intertextual history, beginning with *Il.* 2.489–90 and the catalogue of ships. In Latin, reworkings of the Homeric *topos* were done by Ennius, Virgil, and Ovid himself throughout his corpus.³⁰² The three instances of *plura* in this passage, applied first to *ora* and

³⁰⁰ Ovid invokes Ulysses, Neptune, and Jove again at *Tr.* 3.11.61–62: *crede mihi, felix, nobis collatus, Ulixes, / Neptuniquae minor quam Iovis ira fuit* (“I assure you, fortunate Ulysses, if you should be compared with me, Neptune’s anger is less than Jove’s was”). Cf. Drucker (1977), 87–113, for discussion of Ovid’s comparison of himself and Ulysses in the context of his relationship with Augustus.

³⁰¹ Cf. Graf (2002), 114; Williams (2002), 236; Davisson (1993), 224–37; Segal (1992), 10–12; and Rahn (1958), 118.

³⁰² *Il.* 2.489–90 οὐδ’ εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ’ εἶεν, / φωνὴ δ’ ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δὲ μοι ἦτορ ἐνείη (“...not if I had ten tongues and ten mouths, not if I had / a voice never to be broken and a heart of bronze within me”); cf. Ennius, *Ann.* fr. 547–48; Virg. *G.* 2.43–44 = *Aen.* 6.625–26; Ov. *Ars* 1.436, *Met.* 8.533–35, *Fasti* 2.119. On this *topos* more generally, see Hinds (1998), 34–47; see Luck (1977), ad *Tr.* 1.5.53–56, for further citations of *materia* and *vires* in the exile poetry.

linguae and then to the poet's *mala*, render the increasing amounts in Homer (ten), Ennius (ten), Virgil (one hundred),³⁰³ and Ovid himself (one hundred in the *Met.*, one thousand in the *Fasti*) insignificant in comparison. Furthermore, Ovid's application of this epic imagery to his own life, rather than in a polite refusal to relate, for example, the great deeds of a distinguished Roman,³⁰⁴ promotes the nature and events of his exile, deeming them worthy of being the subject of an epic. By weaving epic imagery, language, and characters into the tragic and subjective form of elegy, Ovid simultaneously elevates the generic status of his exile poetry while staying within elegy's generic boundaries. Ovid casts himself as the elegiac hero, who surpasses the longest-enduring epic hero in pain and suffering, thereby co-opting for himself as the elegiac narrator the poetic authority granted Odysseus in the hexameter *Odyssey*. The mingling of generic descriptors in this comparison not only recalls and underscores Ovid's initial call to poetry by Amor,³⁰⁵ but it also allows Ovid to compete with Odysseus on the poet's own terms. In particular Ovid's *invalidae vires ingenuaeque*, especially when juxtaposed with Odysseus' *corpus durum patiensque laborum* in lines 71–72, further support the *recusatio* that begins at line 53, where the epic *materia* that constitutes his exile far exceeds his ability (*vires*) to narrate it sufficiently.

The amalgam of elegiac form and epic content is additionally revealed by the fact that

³⁰³ Cf. Thomas (1988), ad *G.* 2.42–4, on the difference between Virgil's rendering and Homer.

³⁰⁴ E.g. Horace declines to write of epic material in his lyric poetry in *Odes* 1.6, 2.1, 2.12, and 4.2; see esp. Mayer (2012), 96–97. Ovid claims at *Am.* 1.1.1–2 that Cupid prevented him from writing an epic, which owes much to the prologue of Callimachus' *Aetia*; cf. McKeown (1989), 7–11.

³⁰⁵ E.g. at *Am.* 1.1.2, where Ovid's epic content suits the meter of dactylic hexameter (*materia conveniente modis*), and in lines 17–20, where he describes the change in tone of his work because of the elegiac meter: *cum bene surrexit versu nova pagina primo, / attenuat nervos proximus ille meos. / nec mihi materia est numeris levioribus apta, / aut puer aut longas compta puella comas.* ("My first, fierce line: how well that virgin verse once served me—/ Until the simpering second one unnerved me! / But I don't have the matter for those lighter stresses—/ No girl—or boy—with long and comely tresses," translated by Krisak and Ruden). Cf. his farewell to the elegiac couplet at *Am.* 3.15.19 (*imbelles elegi, genialis Musa, valete*).

nowhere in this poem does Ovid call his epic model by name; rather at the beginning of the synkrisis he refers to Ulysses twice in two lines as the Neritian (both times in the ablative, *Neritio*). After line 58, Ovid uses various forms of the pronoun *ille* to distinguish between himself and Ulysses. The anonymity follows Ovid’s practice in the *Tristia* of omitting names, but it also aligns with the opening of the *Odyssey*, where the hero is first introduced by an adjective.³⁰⁶ *Neritius*, though, is perhaps an unusual choice of epithet; Ovid is the only Latin author to use it to describe Ulysses himself.³⁰⁷ In the *Odyssey*, when Odysseus finally reveals himself to Alcinous, he refers to the mountain Neritus that clearly stands out from Ithaca’s rocky topography (ἐν δ’ ὄρος αὐτῆ / Νήριτον εἰνοσίφυλλον ἀριπρεπὲς “There is a mountain there / that stands tall, leaf-trembling Neritos,” *Od.* 9.21–22).³⁰⁸ Similarly at *Aen.* 3.270, Aeneas recounts how they avoided Odysseus’ homeland and lists the same place-names as Odysseus at *Od.* 9.24 (Δουλίχιόν τε Σάμη τε καὶ ὑλήεσσα Ζάκυνθος), but here, Neritus is not so explicitly named as a mountain on Ithaca.

iam medio apparet fluctu nemorosa Zacynthos
 Dulichiumque Sameque et Neritos ardua saxis.
 effugimus scopulos Ithacae, Laertia regna,
 et terram altricem saevi exsecramur Ulixi.

Now among the waves we see the wooded
 Zacynthus and Dulichium and Same
 and steep-cliffed Neritos. We shun the shoals
 of Ithaca, Laertes’ land, and curse
 the earth that once had nursed the fierce Ulysses.

Aen. 3.270–73

³⁰⁶ As well as elsewhere in the *Odyssey*; Peradotto (1990), 101–102, cites as an example the 53-line conversation in Book 5 between Hermes and Calypso about Zeus’ will concerning Odysseus, in which the hero’s name is not stated once. Cf. Bowie (2013), ad 14.122–23, on the use of κείνον to refer to the absent Odysseus; and Bonifazi (2010), 107–10, on the different forces (e.g. farness in time or space) of κείνος in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

³⁰⁷ At *Fasti* 4.69, Ulysses is *dux Neritius*; elsewhere, Ovid uses it to refer to Ithaca (*Met.* 13.712) or Ulysses’ ships (*Rem.* 264, *Met.* 14.563).

³⁰⁸ It also appears as a place-name at *Od.* 13.352 and *Il.* 2.632.

Virgil includes a clear rendering of Homer’s wooded (ὕλησσα) Zacynthos with *nemorosa*, but his inclusion and description of *Neritos* is rather complicated.³⁰⁹ Horsfall notes that in the periplous at *Aen.* 3.270–93 “Virgil ... glides through the treacherous waters of Ionian topography with scant regard for the litoral truth,”³¹⁰ but it is Aeneas who describes the topography in these lines, adding another layer to Virgil’s disregard for topographical accuracy. In this way, by making ambiguous the nature of *Neritos*, either island or mountain, Virgil creates a subtle association of the name, regardless of the type of topographical feature, with Odysseus and distances Aeneas, if only slightly, from becoming too familiar with Odysseus’ literary and geographical journey. Ovid’s use of this ambiguous landmark in lieu of Odysseus’ name reinforces the local nature of Odysseus’ significance as well as reflecting the duality inherent in Odysseus’ own nature.

Folded into the specific local quality of *Neritius* could also be seen a clever rendering of Odysseus’ primary Greek epithet πολύτροπος.³¹¹ As an adjective, νήριτος means ‘numberless, countless,’³¹² which plays upon Odysseus’ ‘many’ turns as well as stands in opposition to the *mala plura* (line 58) that Ovid himself has suffered. *Neritius* also fills out the short catalogue of islands in Ulysses’ domain, including Dulichium, Ithaca, and Samos, which are followed by two lines describing Rome.

nec mihi Dulichium domus est Ithacave Samosve,
 poena quibus non est grandis abesse locis,
 sed quae de septem totum circumspicit orbem
 montibus, imperii Roma deumque locus.

³⁰⁹ See Horsfall (2006), ad 3.271, for full discussion of the interpretations of *Neritos* as an island or a mountain.

³¹⁰ Horsfall (2006), ad 270–93.

³¹¹ Another interpretation is given by Luck (1977), ad 57f., who calls *Neritius* “das metrisch bequeme Adjektiv.”

³¹² *LSJ* s.v. νήριτος; e.g. at Hes. *Op.* 511. See Heubeck-Hoekstra, ad 9.22, for discussion of the linguistic debate about νήριτος, and ad 9.21–27 for the ancient difficulties of reconciling the place-names given in Homer with the actual geography of the Mediterranean.

My home is not Dulichium or Ithaca or Samos, places
from which absence is no great punishment, but Rome,
that gazes about from her seven hills upon the whole world,
—Rome, the place of empire and the gods.

Tr. 1.5.67–70

These two lines describing Rome overwhelm the one line needed for Ovid to list the three places associated with Ulysses' realm, and the contrast is underscored by interlocked forms of *locus*: the plural *locis* in line 68 and the singular *locus*, Rome, in line 70. Through the narrowly defined adjective *Neritius*, Ulysses is also characterized as a local hero, whose significance is relegated to a small group of islands. Ovid, rather, hails from the capital of the world (*totum circumspicit orbem*), trumping Ulysses' local designation and emphasizing his own significance through his connection to Rome. Ovid also belittles the importance of Ulysses' realm by claiming that it would be no great punishment to be away from it (*poena quibus non est grandis abesse locis*, 68). This recalls and plays on the opening scene of the *Odyssey*, in which Athena describes Odysseus sitting on Calypso's island and weeping for his homeland and family.³¹³

In this early poem from Ovid's exilic *corpus*, he makes an explicit comparison between himself and Ulysses, establishing a dramatic backdrop for his story of suffering, abandonment, and solitude. But Ovid already prefaces that his exile is a parallel odyssey of sorts at *Tr.*

1.1.105–14, especially 113–14.

cum tamen in nostrum fueris penetrare receptus,
contigerisque tuam, scrinia curva, domum,
aspicies illic positos ex ordine fratres,
quos studium cunctos evigilavit idem.
cetera turba palam titulos ostendet apertos,
et sua detecta nomina fronte geret;
tres procul obscura latitantes parte videbis;

³¹³ At *Od.* 1.57–59, where Calypso tries to persuade Odysseus to forget his homeland, but he, while yearning to see his home, wishes to die: θέλγει, ὅπως Ἰθάκης ἐπιλήσεται· αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεύς, / ἴεμενος καὶ καπνὸν ἀποθρώσκοντα νοῆσαι / ἧς γαίης, θανέειν ἰμείρεται. (“She works to charm him to forget Ithaka; and yet Odysseus, / straining to get sight of the very smoke uprising / from his own country, longs to die”).

sic quoque, quod nemo nescit, amare docent.
**hos tu vel fugias, vel, si satis oris habebis,
Oedipodas facito Telegonosque voces.**

But when you find refuge in my sanctuary, reaching
your own home, the round book-cases, you will
behold there brothers arranged in order—brothers
whom the same craftsmanship produced with toil
and waking. The rest of the band will display their
titles openly, bearing their names on their exposed
edges, but three at some distance will strive to hide
themselves in a dark place, as you will notice—even
so, as everybody knows, they teach how to love.
These you should either avoid or, if you have the
assurance, give them the names of Oedipus or Telegonus.

Tr. 1.1.105–14

In this first poem of his first book of *Tristia*, Ovid addresses his collection of poems as he sends it on its way to Rome. The book is to go find a safe spot on the poet's bookshelves, but it is to avoid the three books of the *Ars Amatoria*. Hinds remarks on Ovid's instructions to call those books "Oedipus" and "Telegonus": "Oedipus and Telegonus, the commentators explain, were parricides...The father whom Telegonus killed was Ulysses; and the case of these new Telegoni is interestingly parallel. The parent whom *they* have destroyed is one who in the subsequent poems of *Tristia*, this book of voyaging, will align himself with one mythological character above all others: viz. the Neritian hero, Ulysses."³¹⁴ Here Ovid explicitly avoids naming Ulysses or making a direct comparison of himself with the hero: instead, he first references Ulysses in the exile poetry by alluding to his death at the hands of his son. Ovid equates the moment of his exile with his death throughout the *Trista* and *Ex Ponto*,³¹⁵ and so this initial alignment of Ovid's exile with the death of Ulysses injects a sense of hopelessness for return immediately at the outset of the *Tristia*. From this point on, then, comparison with or

³¹⁴ Hinds (2006), 423; see also n. 25 above.

³¹⁵ E.g. at *Pont.* 1.5.85–86 and 3.4.75–76.

invocation of Ulysses makes Ovid's situation seem all the more pitiable and irrevocable; Ulysses, at least, returned home to Ithaca even after his second period of wandering, but Ovid will have no second chances. This moment of "death" at the outset of the *Tristia* additionally places Ovid in limbo, literally as he is now living on the fringes of the Roman empire, which are neither Rome nor completely barbarian in nature,³¹⁶ and figuratively as he speaks of himself as dead and yet still hopes to return to Rome. He tells the odyssey of his exile as if permanently stationed at the Phaeacians' palace, but rather than the civilized, blissful, and orderly world of Scheria that Odysseus found himself in, Ovid has found no warm welcome at Tomis where he has no choice but to stay.³¹⁷ Indeed the scene in *Odyssey* 9, when Odysseus begins his narrative for the Phaeacians, becomes the springboard for Ovid's next invocation of Ulysses in the first lines of the autobiographical poem, *Tr.* 4.10.

***Tristia* 4.10**

In this poem, Ovid tells his life story, beginning with his birth at Sulmo and including evasive reference to the *error* that caused his exile (lines 89–90). The poem opens with a bold self-identification, which is reminiscent of Odysseus' own self-identification to the Phaeacians in *Odyssey* 9.

Ille ego qui fuerim, tenerorum lusor amorum,
quem legis, ut noris, accipe posteritas.
Sulmo mihi patria est, gelidis uberrimus undis,
milia qui novies distat ab Vrbe decem.

That you may know who I was, I that playful poet
of tender love whom you read, hear my words,

³¹⁶ Ovid describes it in detail at *Tr.* 3.10, 4.4, and *Pont.* 3.1.11–24; for discussion of these descriptions as hyperbolic, see Tissol (2014), 13–17. Cf. Claassen (1987–88) on the historic truth vs. poetic truth in Ovid's amatory and exile poetry.

³¹⁷ Odysseus is given the opportunity to remain with the Phaeacians permanently by marrying Nausicaa, but he declines (*Od.* 7.308–33).

you of posterity. Sulmo is my native place, a
land rich in ice-cold streams, three times thirty
miles from the city.

Tr. 4.10.1–4

The emphatic declaration *ille ego* is followed immediately by a relative clause;³¹⁸ in the next line Ovid references his current and future reputation, and he then names his homeland, including a topographical adjective and a reference-point for Sulmo’s location. Odysseus introduces himself to Alcinous similarly:

εἶμ’ Ὀδυσσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν
ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καί μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει.
ναιετάω δ’ Ἰθάκην εὐδείελον ...
ἄμφι δὲ νῆσοι
πολλὰ ναιετάουσι μάλα σχεδὸν ἀλλήλησι.

I am Odysseus son of Laertes, known before
all men for the study of crafty designs, and
my fame goes up to the heavens.
I am at home in sunny Ithaca ...
and there are islands settled around it,
lying very close to one another.

Od. 9.19–23

Odysseus gives both his name and patronymic, followed by a relative clause that tells what he is famous for, and finally his home island complete with an adjective and information on its surroundings.³¹⁹ Ovid, true to his practice in the *Tristia*, however, does not reveal his own name, but identifies himself as *ille lusor*.³²⁰ The *ille* looks back to *Tr.* 1.5 and Ovid’s frequent

³¹⁸ On *ille ego*, see Luck (1977), ad *Tr.* 4.10.1.; cf. *Tr.* 4.5.12. Rahn (1958), 116, makes a brief comparison of *Tr.* 4.10.1 with *Od.* 9.19–20.

³¹⁹ Cf. the discussion of Chrysalus’ self-identification as Ulysses in Plautus’ *Bacchides* in Chapter 1, 26–32, and Horace’s play on δόλοισιν with the adjective *dolosus* in *Sat.* 2.5, discussed in Chapter 2, 46ff.

³²⁰ On Ovid’s reluctance to name himself at the beginning of *Pont.* 4.10, see below and Davisson (1982), 30. He also refers to himself as *lusor* in his epitaph in *Tr.* 3.3.73–76: *hic ego qui iaceo tenerorum lusor amorum / ingenio perii Naso poeta meo / at tibi qui transis ne sit grave si quid amasti / dicere Nasonis molliter ossa cubent* (“I, who lie here, with tender loves once played, / Naso, the poet, who perished by his own talent. / But you, o lover, do not consider it a burden as you pass by / to say: ‘May the bones of Naso lie softly!’”), and again at *Tr.* 5.1.21–22: *sed dedimus poenas, Scythicique in finibus Histri / ille pharetrati lusor Amoris abest* (“But I have paid the penalty, for in the lands of the Scythian Hister he who played with quiver-bearing Love is an exile”).

application of it in place of Ulysses' name. The deictic adjective also helps Ovid to maintain a mysterious, anonymous pose at the beginning of this poem, much as there is in the *incipit* of the *Odyssey*; everyone knows who the protagonist is by the end of the first line, but Odysseus is not named until line 21.

Ovid's Odyssean proclamation at the start of the poem is supported and expanded in lines 101–10, where he neatly summarizes how he faced the beginning of his exile.

quid referam comitumque nefas famulosque nocentes?
ipsa multa **tuli** non leviora fuga.
indignata malis mens est succumbere seque
praestitit invictam viribus usa suis;
oblitusque aevi, ductaeque per otia vitae,
insolita cepi temporis arma manu;
**totque tuli terra casus pelagoque quot inter
occultum stellae conspicuumque polum.
tacta mihi tandem longis erroribus acto
iuncta pharetratis Sarmatis ora Getis.**

Why tell of the comrades' crime, of the
servants who injured me? Much did I bear
not lighter than the exile itself. Yet my soul,
disdaining to give way to misfortune, proved
itself unconquerable, relying on its own powers.
Forgetting my age and a life passed in ease I seized
with unaccustomed hand the arms that time supplied:
on sea and land I bore misfortunes as many as are
the stars that lie between the hidden and the visible
pole. Driven through long wanderings at length
I reached the shore that unites the Sarmatians with
the quiver-bearing Getae.

Tr. 4.10.101–10

Just as in *Tristia* 1.5, Ovid provides a nearly point-for-point comparison with Odysseus' story, but in this poem there is no mention of the Greek hero. Ovid has in a way supplanted him as the heroic wandering storyteller, representing himself, as Hardie describes it, "as the original Greek wandering hero, Ulysses, but a Ulysses in reverse, travelling from west to east, and away from,

not in the direction of, home. Ovid’s exile is an *Odyssey* without an end.”³²¹ Ovid makes it absolutely clear in *Tr.* 1.5 that their journeys are not at all parallel; his narrative is more tragic, more epic, more real, and therefore more difficult to put into words. He advances this claim here in *Tr.* 4.10 by completely omitting Ulysses’ name and any adjectives or pronouns referencing him. Additionally, the *praeteritio* in line 101, *quid referam comitumque nefas famulosque nocentes?*, which strongly recalls Odysseus’ circumstances in the *Odyssey*, remains surprisingly brief. The objects of *referam*, *comitum nefas* and *famulos nocentes*, do not receive any elaboration; Ovid instead moves on to talk about himself. But we are still perhaps encouraged to imagine the companions’ crime and harmful slaves of the *Odyssey*, both of which threatened, but did not ultimately prevent, Odysseus’ homecoming. Ovid here then reminds us that he will not be telling the *Odyssey*, but rather his own narrative, which is far more difficult to put into words, and therefore compelling, than what is told in the *Odyssey*. In the following lines he emphasizes his ability to endure and the strength of his spirit (*mens*), which is a more confident and powerful assertion than what he made in *Tr.* 1.5.74 (*adsuetus studiis mollibus ipse fui*).

While he still does not name Ulysses, Ovid again echoes odyssean suffering in this poem in lines 107–10, where he sustains (*tuli*) countless misfortunes (*casus*) on both land and sea, and finally, after a long period of wandering, arrives on the Sarmatian and Getic shores.³²² Despite these obstacles for Ovid, he “endured” twice in these lines, using *tuli*, which, through its cognate relationship with *τάλασσαι* and its aural similarity to *τάλω*, triggers an image of Odysseus summoning his strength to endure.³²³ Also behind Ovid’s statements lie similar expressions

³²¹ Hardie (2000), 21.

³²² Cf. also in Ovid’s exile poetry *Tr.* 3.2.7, 3.11.59, 5.3.12; *Pont.* 2.7.30.

³²³ Cf. *Od.* 20.18, Τέτλαθι δὴ, κραδίη, καὶ κόντερον ἄλλο ποτ’ ἔτλης; and *Hor. Sat.* 2.5.21, *et quondam maiora tuli*. See p. 54 in Chapter 2 for discussion of both of these lines; for the etymological connection, see Chantraine (1968) s.v. *τάλασσαι* F. Additionally, *φέρω* can also mean ‘endure’, ‘suffer’, e.g. with *λυγρὰ* at *Od.* 18.135; see

uttered by both Odysseus and Aeneas. At *Od.* 17.284–85, Odysseus himself says, κακὰ πολλὰ πέπονθα / κύμασι καὶ πολέμῳ (“I suffered many evils on sea and in war”); Aeneas suffers similarly at *Aen.* 1.3-4 and 598–99: *multum ille et terris iactatus et alto / vi superum, saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram* and *nos ... nos, reliquias Danaum, terraeque marisque / omnibus exhaustos iam casibus* (“Across the lands and waters he was battered / beneath the violence of the High Ones, for / the savage Juno’s unforgetting anger ... us...a remnant left by Greeks, harassed / by all disasters known on land and sea”). With both Odysseus and Aeneas in the background of this passage, the poet’s plight seems even more epic in scale, and yet at the same time more pathetic and ultimately doomed. The toil and suffering of Odysseus and Aeneas ultimately proved justified, as each reached his intended destination; Aeneas successfully reached the site of Rome’s future foundation and Odysseus returned to his homestead. Ovid, on the other hand, arrives on the shore of the far-away and hostile Sarmatians, where trial of patience has just begun. Much later in his exilic corpus, Ovid again calls upon Ulysses’ story as a template for his own as well as to reinforce for his readers that his exile is “an Odyssey without an end.”

***Ex Ponto* 4.10**

In book 4 of the *Ex Ponto* Ovid offers another extended synkrisis with Odysseus, but this time, the comparison is broader and covers the dangers Ulysses and Ovid encounter outside of their homelands. Again, however, Ulysses’ trials are made to seem light and easy when set up next to Ovid’s very real and dangerous barbarian surroundings.

Haec mihi Cimmerico bis tertia ducitur aestas
litore pellitos inter agenda Getas:
ecquos tu silices, ecquod, carissime, ferrum

Now is the sixth summer wearing away which I
must pass on the Cimmeric shore among the
skin-clad Getae. Can you compare any flint,

LSJ s.v. φέρω A.III.

duritiae confers, Albinovane, meae?
 gutta cavat lapidem, consumitur anulus usu,
 atteritur pressa vomer aduncus humo.
 Tempus edax igitur praeter nos omnia perdet:
 cessat duritia mors quoque uicta mea.

Exemplum est animi nimium patientis Ulixes
 iactatus dubio per duo lustra mari, 10
 tempora solliciti sed non tamen omnia fati
 pertulit et placidae saepe fuere morae.
 An grave sex annis pulchram fovisse Calypso
 aequoreaeque fuit concubuisse deae?
 Excipit Hippotades qui dat pro munere ventos,
 curuet ut impulsos utilis aura sinus;
 nec bene cantantis labor est audire puellas,
 nec degustanti lotos amara fuit:
 hos ego qui patriae faciant obliviam sucos 20
 parte meae uitae, si modo dentur, emam.
 Nec tu contuleris urbem Laestrygonos umquam
 gentibus obliqua quas obit Hister aqua:
 nec vincet Cyclops saevum feritate Piacchen,
 qui quota terroris pars solet esse mei.
 Scylla feris trunco quod latret ab inguine monstribus,
 Heniochae nautis plus nocuere rates.
 Nec potes infestis conferre Charybdis Achaeis,
 ter licet epotum ter vomat illa fretum,
 qui, quamquam dextra regione licentius errant,
 securum latus hoc non tamen esse sinunt.
 Pont. 4.10.1–30

Albinovanus, any iron to my endurance? Drops of water hollow out a stone, a ring is worn thin by use, the hooked plough is rubbed away by the soil's pressure. So devouring time destroys all things but me: even death keeps aloof defeated by my endurance. The type of a heart suffering to excess is Ulysses, who was tossed for ten years on the perilous sea. Yet not all his hours were hours of troubled fate, for oft came intervals of peace. Or was it a hardship to fondle for six years the fair Calypso and share the couch of a goddess of the sea? Hippotes' son harbored him and gave him the winds, that a favoring breeze might fill and drive his sails. And it's not a sorrow to hear maidens singing beautifully, nor was the lotus bitter to the one who tasted it. Such juices, which cause forgetfulness of one's native land, I would purchase, if only they were offered, at the price of half my life. Nor could you compare the city of the Laestrygonian with the tribes which the Hister touches in its winding course. Cyclops will not surpass in cruelty Piacches—and what mere fraction of my dread is he wont to be! Though Scylla's misshapen loins may send forth the barkings of cruel monsters, the Heniochian ships have done more harm to mariners. You cannot compare Charybdis, though she three times drinks in, three times spews forth the flood, with the hostile Achaei, though they roam with larger license in the eastern lands, yet allow not this shore to be safe.

Rather than evoking pity or amplifying the degree of his suffering, as in *Tr.* 1.5, in this poem Ovid focuses on his ability to endure, which, metaphorically speaking, is what poets strive for.³²⁴ Ovid's endurance has come a long way since *Tr.* 4.10; neither flint nor iron can compare to the poet's strength, which has even overcome time and death (*Tempus edax igitur praeter nos omnia perdet: / cessat duritia mors quoque uicta mea*, 7–8).

To put greater emphasis on his ability to survive among the Getae, Ovid brings in Ulysses as a foil; while Ulysses was tossed about for ten years, he nonetheless experienced several pleasant delays (*placidae saepe fuere morae*, 12). The excess sarcastically implied by *exemplum*

³²⁴ As expressed by Horace at *Odes* 3.30.3–5 and Ovid at *Met.* 15.872.

animi nimium patientis (his spirit suffered *too* much, 9) here is therefore pointed and stands in contrast to the dichotomy between mind and body that Ovid has made elsewhere with respect to himself and Ulysses. Despite having a body that was made to endure labor (e.g. at *Tr.* 1.5.71–72, *corpus erat durum patiensque laborum*), Odysseus did not actually need to call upon all of that physical strength to make it through his ten years of wandering. Ovid, however, despite being physically weaker (*invalidae vires ingenuaeque*, *Tr.* 1.5.72), claims a spirit still unconquered by death after six years in exile (*Pont.* 4.10.8).

Not only does the content of the synkrisis in this poem differ from *Tr.* 1.5, but Ovid’s manner of drawing the comparison has also been tweaked. In *Tr.* 1.5, Ovid constantly juxtaposes his situation with that of his mythical *exemplum* using simply pronouns, whereas in *Pont.* 4.10, the poet tells his addressee Albinovanus, as well as his readers, directly to “compare” (using *conferre*, as well as *vincet* in line 23 and *plus* in line 26) his current situation with Ulysses’ adventures. The comparison of his trials at this point in his exile is also fitting, as it was after seven years on Calypso’s island that Odysseus finally began the last leg of his journey home. The hopelessness of Ovid’s plight is therefore more acute in the *Ex Ponto*, and the ultimate goal of invoking Ulysses has also evolved from that in *Tr.* 1.5. In the earlier poem, Ovid still holds on to a shred of hope that Augustus’ anger will relent and he will be allowed to return home: *at mihi perpetuo patria tellure carendum est, / ni fuerit laesi mollior ira dei* (“But I must forever be deprived of my native land, unless the wrath of the injured god be softened,” *Tr.* 1.5.83–84). But after six years in Tomis that hope has faded; Ovid here turns his focus to his current situation among the Getae and Sarmatians, rather than how he got there. And the dangers the poet faces among the barbarians prove to be no less epic than what he went through at the beginning of his exile.

Ovid, just as he did in *Tr.* 1.5, sets himself up to win the synkrisis with Ulysses, who, the poet argues, had a number of pleasurable stops on his way home, such as staying with Aeolus and Calypso and hearing the Sirens' beautiful song. The transition between Ovid's list of these enjoyable interruptions comes at line 18 with the Lotus-Eaters. While eating the lotus caused three of Odysseus' crew to forget their homecoming (νόστου λαθέσθαι, *Od.* 9.97), Odysseus himself did not partake of them. At *Pont.* 4.10.19–20, Ovid expresses his desire to taste the lotus flowers and his willingness to give half his life for the chance to forget his homeland.³²⁵ This is a far cry from the Ovid who has been hoping desperately to return to Rome and vividly imagines the city, such as he did in *Tr.* 1.5.³²⁶ We might interpret Ovid's desire here in light of Alfred Heubeck's commentary on the Lotus-eaters in *Od.* 9. Heubeck argues that this episode stems from a folk-tale, "in which tasting a certain magic food makes return impossible for one who has crossed the boundary of the world of men; the strange world may be the realm of fabulous beings or, more commonly, the kingdom of the dead."³²⁷ By eating the lotus, Ovid would be wholly resigning himself to his exile and in a way enacting the figurative death his exile represents.

The gravity of this wish and the sarcasm brought in by the *exemplum* of Ulysses come together to reiterate the harsh reality of Ovid's circumstances, which are far more dangerous than any of Ulysses' other adventures, including the Laestrygonians, the Cyclops, and Scylla and Charybdis. Ovid ends the synkrisis with Ulysses with an accusation that his addressee, Albinovanus, hardly believes what he hears about Tomis: *qui veniunt istinc, vix vos ea credere dicunt; / quam miser est, qui fert asperiora fide. / crede tamen* ("Those who come from your land report that you scarce believe all this. How wretched is he who endures what is too harsh for

³²⁵ Cf. Davisson (1982), 33.

³²⁶ E.g. in *Tr.* 1.1 and *Pont.* 2.8.9–20.

³²⁷ Heubeck-Hoekstra, 18.

credence! Yet believe you must,” *Pont.* 4.10.35–37).³²⁸ Ovid on the one hand uses the incredible stories of Ulysses’ monsters as a point of comparison for just how horrible his surroundings are, but in doing so, he both strives to emphasize the reality of his situation while simultaneously extolling his exile as worthy of epic discourse.³²⁹ The line between reality and myth that Ovid drew in *Tr.* 1.5 is blurred by his conflation and comparison of himself with Ulysses, as he declares himself a more epic and more tragic hero.³³⁰ Ovid holds up Ulysses as a model for his own suffering only to reject the mythological *exemplum* in favor of his own reality and use him as a foil for the poet’s personal, and therefore true, account of his experiences.³³¹ The subjectivity inherent in any first-person narration is what makes Ulysses such a powerful vehicle for comparison with Ovid’s own circumstances. The first-person narrator brings together both a personal bias and a kernel of truth that are difficult to untangle; after Ovid, Juvenal picks up on exactly this theme and plays on the complications of subjectivity and a poetic narrator, taking advantage of Ulysses’ Homeric past as an internal actor and narrator to great comedic effect.

Juvenal’s Ulysses

In *Satire* 15, Juvenal also calls upon Ulysses and similarly employs him to delve into the gap between appearance and reality in poetry as well as to poke holes in the credibility of poetic narrators. In this poem, Juvenal introduces Ulysses to underscore his own incredulity at the

³²⁸ See Davisson (1982) for her interpretation that connects the *synkrisis* with Ovid’s following explanation of why the Sarmatian sea freezes.

³²⁹ See Tissol (2014), 8–13, for a greater discussion of the rhetorical function of hyperbole in Ovid’s exile poetry.

³³⁰ See Hall (2013), 105, for discussion of Ovid’s comparison of himself to figures from Euripides’ *Iphigenia in Tauris*; cf. Ingleheart (2010), 219–21.

³³¹ Cf. Davisson (1982), 40–41, on Ovid’s claim of independence from the literary tradition and generic norms in this poem.

horror of cannibalism that occurred between two Egyptian towns. But because this barbaric and sacrilegious crime happened at a verifiable time (*nuper consule Iunco*, 27) and location (*super calidae...moenia Copti*, 28),³³² Juvenal's narrative becomes all the more outrageous and indicative of the decline of humankind when put in comparison with Ulysses' uncorroborated adventures.

lanatis animalibus abstinet omnis
 mensa, nefas illic fetum iugulare capellae:
 carnibus humanis vesci licet. attonito cum
 tale super cenam facinus narraret Ulixes
 Alcinoos, bilem aut risum fortasse quibusdam
 moverat ut mendax aretalogus. 'in mare nemo
 hunc abicit saeva dignum veraque Charybdi,
 fingentem inmanis Laestrygonas et Cyclopas?
 nam citius Scyllam vel concurrentia saxa
 Cyaneis plenos et tempestatibus utres
 crediderim aut tenui percussum verbere Circes
 et cum remigibus grunnisse Elpenora porcis.
 tam vacui capitis populum Phaeaca putavit?'
 sic aliquis merito nondum ebrius et minimum qui
 de Corcyraea temetum duxerat urna;
 solus enim haec Ithacus nullo sub teste canebat.

Their tables abstain completely from woolly animals, and there it's a sin to slaughter a goat's young. But feeding on human flesh is allowed. When Ulysses told the story of a crime like this over dinner to an astonished Alcinoos, he provoked anger or perhaps laughter in some of his listeners—they thought him a lying raconteur. "Won't someone chuck this guy into the sea? It's a real, cruel Charybdis that he deserves, for inventing these monstrous Laestrygonians and Cyclopes. I'll tell you, I'd sooner believe in his Scylla, or his clashing Cyanean rocks, or his skins full of storms, or his Elpenor grunting with his fellow oarsmen turned pigs being struck by Circe's wand. Did he think that the people of Phaeacia were so empty-headed?" That's what someone might have said, quite rightly, someone still sober, who'd drunk very little liquor from the Corcyrean jar. After all, the Ithacan was reciting his story on his own, without corroboration.

Sat. 15.11–26

The overarching theme of this poem is anger, but it is also about Juvenal and his ability to tell a

³³² Iuncus entered the consulship on 1 October 127 CE, and the location is Coptus (Keft), which is on the Nile in Upper Egypt; see Courtney (1980), ad 15.27.

story convincingly in order to earn something, if only his reader's attention. Despite offering a time and location for his story, Juvenal does not acknowledge a source for his story—neither gossip, nor historical record, nor his own eye-witness account.³³³ Elsewhere in the poem he cites other examples of cannibalism, but none of those was a result of confusing hunger with anger such as here (which may also serve as another example of “knowing yourself”).³³⁴ There is the parallel story of the Vascones, which begins *ut fama est* (93); the siege of Saguntum provides a worse, yet still pardonable example of cannibalism (113–14); and the sacrifice (but not consumption) of humans to the Taurian Diana at lines 116–18 is a third instance. This last example of the Taurian Diana, as Juvenal acknowledges, stems not from history, but rather the poetic tradition, specifically the *Iphigenia in Tauris* by Euripides: *quippe illa nefandi Taurica sacri / inventrix homines, ut iam quae carmina tradunt / digna fide credas, tantum immolat* (“After all, the Taurian inventor of that ghastly rite, assuming for now that poetic tradition can be reliably believed, does no more than sacrifice humans”). The fact that Juvenal opts for a poetic example of human sacrifice (and not even cannibalism), rather than another historical example, throws into relief the question of the veracity of his own account, also composed in a poem. Furthermore, Juvenal introduces his own story by describing the Phaeacians' disbelief at Ulysses' account of cannibalism and other horrifying events, both to create a foil for his corroborated account and, similarly to Ovid, to elevate his tale through hyperbole and comparison with the storytelling hero par excellence. The manner in which Juvenal introduces the anonymous Phaeacian's commentary also serves to set Ulysses, and by extension Juvenal himself, apart from each speaker's respective audience. *Sic aliquis* in line 24 describes

³³³ On the unreliable speaking voice that is characteristic of satire, and on the contradictions of the Juvenalian speaker in particular, see Roche (2012), 201–204.

³³⁴ See discussion of *Juv. Sat.* 11 in Chapter 3.

“someone” of the Phaeacians, but may encompass Ulysses’ (and Juvenal’s) audience as a whole, functioning in the same way as a *tis*-speech in Homer.³³⁵ By lumping together the Phaeacians with his Roman audience in the anonymous and unmodified *aliquis*, Juvenal maps the skepticism of the sober Phaeacian onto his audience, rendering them even more open to reading and believing his poetic account against that of Odysseus’ in the *Odyssey*.

But contrary to the judgment of the anonymous Phaeacian at the beginning of this poem, in the *Odyssey* Alcinous and Eumaeus both praise Odysseus as a wanderer whose stories may actually be believed.³³⁶ At *Od.* 11.332 Odysseus breaks off his story after the catalogue of women he encounters in the Underworld, but Arete, the Phaeacians, and Alcinous want to hear more. The king promises Odysseus conveyance home and a complete gift (δωτινήν τελέσω, 352), if he continues his story. Odysseus responds: εἴ με καὶ εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν ἀνώγοιτ’ αὐτόθι μίμνειν / πομπὴν τ’ ὀρτύνοιτε καὶ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα διδοῖτε, / καὶ κε τὸ βουλοίμην, καὶ κεν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη, / πλειοτέρη σὺν χειρὶ φίλην ἐς πατρίδ’ ἰκέσθαι (“If you urged me to stay here even for the length of a year, and still sped my conveyance home and gave me glorious presents, that would be what I wished, there would be much advantage in coming back with a fuller hand to my own dear country,” *Od.* 11.356–59).³³⁷ This prompts Alcinous to reply and assure Odysseus that he does not think Odysseus is lying for profit.

ὦ Ὀδυσσεῦ, τὸ μὲν οὐ τί σ’ εἴσκομεν εἰσορόωντες

³³⁵ Thank you to David Elmer for bringing this comparison to my attention; see Elmer (2012), 26–37, on *tis*-speeches in Homer, and specifically on the *tis*-speech in *Iliad* 2, which is a collective approval of Odysseus’ beration of Thersites and restoration of the social order. In this passage, the Greeks praise Odysseus for keeping Thersites, a “thrower of words,” out of the assembly (νῦν δὲ τόδε μέγ’ ἄριστον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔρεξεν, / ὅς τὸν λωβητῆρα ἐπεσβόλον ἔσχ’ ἀγοράων, *Il.* 2.274–75). On the “one/many” theme and the “splitting of the law” by Odysseus here vs. in the Doloneia, see Buchan (2004), 113–22 (cf. n. 279 above). For the blurring of external and internal audiences in Roman satire, see the discussion in Roche (2012), 213–14.

³³⁶ For a general discussion of the unreliability of a wanderer’s story, see Montiglio (2005), 91–96; cf. *Od.* 14.119–20.

³³⁷ On this passage and the fine line between bard and beggar, see Segal (1994), 142–63.

ἠπεροπῆα τ' ἔμεν καὶ ἐπικλοπον, οἷά τε πολλοὺς
βόσκει γαῖα μέλαινα πολυσπερέας ἀνθρώπους
ψεύδεα τ' ἀρτύνοντας, ὅθεν κέ τις οὐδὲ ἴδοιτο·
σοὶ δ' ἔπι μὲν μορφή ἐπέων, ἔνι δὲ φρένες ἐσθλαί·
μῦθον δ' ὡς ὅτ' ἀοιδὸς ἐπισταμένως κατέλεξας,
πάντων Ἀργείων σέο τ' αὐτοῦ κήδεα λυγρά.

Odysseus, we as we look upon you do not imagine
that you are a deceptive or thievish man, the sort that the black earth
breeds in great numbers, people who wander widely, making up
lying stories, from which no one could learn anything. You have
a grace upon your words, and there is sound sense within them,
and expertly, as a singer would do, you have told the story
of the dismal sorrows befallen yourself and all of the Argives.

Od. 11.363–69

Alcinous comments on both the aesthetics (μορφή ἐπέων) and content (ἔνι δὲ φρένες) of Odysseus' story, aligning the pleasing sound of Odysseus' words with the truth of the narrative. Arete also remarks on Odysseus' appearance to the Phaeacians: Φαίηκες, πῶς ὕμμιν ἀνὴρ ὅδε φαίνεται εἶναι / εἶδός τε μέγεθός τε ἰδὲ φρένας ἔνδον εἴσας; ("Phaeacians, how does this man seem to you for looks, and stature, and for the balanced mind within him?" 336–37). Odysseus' manner of storytelling helps him to appear greater in stature, and Alcinous notes how Odysseus does not have the appearance of a liar, which helps his words to be believed. In the eyes of the Phaeacians then, Odysseus' noble external aspect is believed to reflect a "balanced" inner nature and vice versa.

This connection between the internal and external is broken to a degree in Book 17 of the *Odyssey*, where Eumaeus makes a similar evaluation of Odysseus' story-telling ability; the swineherd describes how Odysseus, now disguised as the beggar, told his tales of woe, just like a bard.

ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀοιδὸν ἀνὴρ ποτιδέρκεται, ὅς τε θεῶν ἔξ
ἀείδη δεδαῶς ἔπε' ἱμεροεντα βροτοῖσι,
τοῦ δ' ἄμοτον μεμάασιν ἀκουέμεν, ὅπποτ' ἀείδη,
ὡς ἐμὲ κείνος ἔθελγε παρήμενος ἐν μεγάροισι.

But as when a man looks to a singer, who has been given
from the gods the skill with which he sings for delight of mortals,
and they are impassioned and strain to hear it when he sings to them,
so he enchanted me in the halls as he sat beside me.

Od. 17.518–25

In both passages, the speakers liken Odysseus to a poet because, as Montiglio notes, they “have been charmed by his narrative, albeit in different ways.”³³⁸ Montiglio argues that for Eumaeus, Odysseus’ stories are emotionally true, as he can relate to what it feels like to suffer and wander. Alcinous, on the other hand, finds Odysseus’ manner of storytelling elegant and the adventures “beautifully told and factually true.”³³⁹ In both instances, each listener finds something in Odysseus’ stories to believe in. That is not universally the case, however. At Pindar, *Nemean* 7.20–23, and Lycophron, *Alexandra* 763–65, Odysseus’ adventures as he tells them to the Phaeacians are considered exaggerated or even false.³⁴⁰

ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον’ ἔλπομαι
λόγον Ὀδυσσέος ἢ πάθαν
διὰ τὸν ἄδυεπῆ γενέσθ’ Ὀμηρον·

ἐπεὶ ψεύδεσὶ οἱ ποτανᾶ <τε> μαχανᾶ
σεμνὸν ἔπεστί τι· σοφία
δὲ κλέπτει παράγοισα μύθοις.

I believe that Odysseus’ story has become greater than his
actual suffering because of Homer’s sweet verse, for upon
his fictions and soaring craft rests great majesty, and his
skill deceives with misleading tales.

Nem. 7.20–23

Pindar’s judgment here is aimed more at Homer than Odysseus, but as Bury notes, “[Pindar] conceived the poet of the *Odyssey* as a sort of ‘sophist,’ one who deceives his readers by cunning

³³⁸ Montiglio (2005), 95.

³³⁹ *Ibid.*; see also n. 12–14 on the same page for discussion and bibliography on these two Odyssean passages.

³⁴⁰ Cf. Fraenkel (1945), 233n12.

words, the friend of the crafty Odysseus.”³⁴¹ The inflation of Odysseus’ suffering becomes an example of the misuse of a poet’s skill and inspiration. When Eumaeus and Alcinous compare Odysseus to a poet (i.e. Homer), his stories gain credibility; conversely, however, when Homer is compared to Odysseus, such as by Pindar, Homer loses authority.

Odysseus’ tales are deemed similarly inflated by Cassandra in Lycophron’s *Alexandra*:

Νῆσον δ’ εἰς Κρόνω στυγουμένην
Ἄρπην περάσας, μεζέων κρεανόμον,
ἄχλαινος, ἴκτης, πημάτων λυγρῶν κόπις,
τὸν μυθοπλάστην ἐξυλακτήσει γόον,
ἀρὰς τετικῶς τοῦ τυφλωθέντος δάκους.

And crossing to the island abhorred by Cronus—the isle
of the Sickle that severed his privy parts—he a cloakless
suppliant, babbling of awful sufferings, shall yelp out his
fictitious tale of woe, paying the curse of the monster
whom he blinded.

761–65

Lycophron’s characterization of Odysseus is wholly negative; he is first described as cloakless, which suggests that he might be inclined to speak and act in order to get what he needs, just as Alcinous assures Odysseus is not the case.³⁴² Odysseus is further described as a κόπις, a ‘prater’ or ‘liar’, which he is also called by the Chorus at Euripides, *Hecuba* 132, after Odysseus has stepped in to tip the balance in the debate to sacrifice Polyxena.³⁴³ In the following line, the fact that he “barks out” his fictitious lament dehumanizes the act of lying as well as renders Odysseus’ lying tales that much more dangerous, coming from an animal. Additionally, this characterization of Odysseus is spoken by Cassandra, and so it is perhaps not surprising that she

³⁴¹ Bury (1965), 117.

³⁴² Although, Odysseus willingly makes up stories in return for a cloak from Eumaeus (*Od.* 14.468–506).

³⁴³ Eur. *Hec.* 131–33, σπουδαὶ δὲ λόγων κατατεινομένων / ἦσαν ἴσαν πως, πρὶν ὁ ποικιλόφρων / κόπις ἠδὲ λόγος δημοχριστῆς / Λαερτιάδης πείθει στρατιάν (“The warmth of the debate on either side was about equal until that wily knave, that honey-tongued demagogue Odysseus, urged the army...”). The Chorus are relating the news to Hecuba that the Greeks have decided to sacrifice Polyxena to Achilles.

would be hateful toward the engineer of the Trojan Horse, but as a prophetess, the truth behind her words begs consideration. She too, just like Odysseus, embodies a mixture of truth and lies; however, the words she speaks, though true, are nonetheless fated to be thought false. Cassandra helps to reveal here the complexity of both the narrator's and the audience's subjectivity, mastery of which is central to the art of persuasion.

Irene de Jong, in her analysis of the subjective style of Odysseus' narrative and his motivation for sharing his adventures with the Phaeacians, views his personal laments more positively. She argues:

Odysseus' subjective style is one of the rhetorical devices which he employs to make clear to his audience, the Phaeacians, that he deserves the *πομπή* they have just promised him (in 7.317–28; 8.31–33, 544–45, 556) ... Odysseus makes sure that his narrative contains many instances of his famous intelligence and makes clear how his present plight is due largely to the folly of his companions and the malevolence of certain gods. Although I do not agree with those who say that Odysseus' story is wholly invented, it is as well to be aware of its subjective and rhetorical nature.³⁴⁴

While Cassandra's absolute disbelief in Odysseus' suffering in the *Alexandra* might be extreme, de Jong's argument for subjectivity as a rhetorical device suits Juvenal's purpose in *Satire* 15 as well.³⁴⁵ Using Ulysses' grossly subjective narrative (according to the anonymous Phaeacian) as a backdrop, Juvenal embarks on his own historically placeable account and invokes the spectacle of the tragic stage at lines 27–31.³⁴⁶

Nos miranda quidem sed nuper consule Iunco
gesta super calidae referemus moenia Copti,
nos volgi scelus et cunctis graviora coturnis;
nam scelus, a Pyrrha quamquam omnia syrmata volvas,

³⁴⁴ De Jong (1992), 11; cf. Chapter 2 and Montiglio (2005), 92, on Odysseus, as well as wanderers lying for the sake of profit more generally.

³⁴⁵ Cf. Braund (1996), 49, on Juv. 4.34–36, "Again, we need to remember that satire is a dramatic form and that the satirist's first aim is to persuade his audience and not to give a realistic account of Roman life."

³⁴⁶ Keane (2006), 15; for further discussion of drama and satire, see *ibid.*, 13–41, esp. 28–29.

nullus apud tragicos populus facit. accipe nostro
dira quod exemplum feritas produxerit aevo.

I will now relate strange deeds done of late in the consulship of Iuncus,
beyond the walls of broiling Coptus; a crime of the common herd,
worse than any crime of the tragedians; for though you turn over all
the tales of long-robed Tragedy from the days of Pyrrha onwards,
you will find there no crime committed by an entire people.
But hear what an example of ruthless barbarism has been displayed
in these days of ours.

Sat. 15.27–31

Juvenal again employs hyperbolic comparison between real, contemporary events and crimes played out on the tragic stage. The mythological content of both Homer and drama helps Juvenal to demonstrate how far mankind has regressed.³⁴⁷ Additionally, Juvenal draws attention to the difference between the past and present throughout the poem,³⁴⁸ but in this passage he alludes to the use of historical events as *exempla* to guide present behavior. In his day and age, even if one looked through earlier stories, an *exemplum* of the worst of human actions comes from not history, but the present (*nostro aevo*). Furthermore, Juvenal combines the consular date of this event with the fact that it happened outside of Rome itself. Similarly to, yet evolving from Ovid's and Odysseus' manner of storytelling, Juvenal's narrative of cannibalism succeeds in captivating the reader's attention because of its excessive violence, distance from the known center of the world, and place in the historical record.

Whether or not this atrocious crime happened between the Ombi and Tentyra in Egypt during the consulship of Iuncus, Juvenal succeeds in strengthening the power of his poetic authority by both using and rejecting Ulysses as his model. Ovid too lends weight to his own account of exile through comparison with and outdoing of Odysseus. Because both of these poets tell of suffering in their own voice, their accounts are imagined to be closer to the truth.

³⁴⁷ Juvenal reiterates the decline of mankind in his digression at lines 62–72.

³⁴⁸ Cf. Courtney (1980), 590–91.

Interestingly, Heubeck describes a contrary tactic in the *Apologoi*, where the stories are so fantastic that Homer could not narrate them in his own voice and have them be believed, “but if they were recounted by a character in the poem who had himself experienced them, then these fabulous events were in a sense brought back into the known world and could be incorporated into the epic.”³⁴⁹ In the case of Ovid, the poet himself experienced what he narrates, which completely collapses the roles of poet and epic hero and elevates the veracity of his tales far beyond Odysseus’. Juvenal takes a slightly different tack by narrating events that he has not seen himself, but he nonetheless succeeds in winning over his readers by collapsing them with the Phaeacians and using them to dismiss Ulysses as a credible narrator. This final dismissal achieves the Roman poet’s besting of Odysseus as an authority figure as well as goes one step beyond Ovid and completely separates the Roman poet/narrator from his Greek model. The merger of Roman poet and Odysseus that Livius Andronicus and Plautus created comes to be deconstructed at last by Juvenal, where the poet claims to stand on his own, but he can still not do it completely without Odysseus there to help.

³⁴⁹ Heubeck-West, 16.

Conclusion

Just as Teiresias prophesied, Odysseus continued to wander after reaching Ithaca, traveling all the way from Livius Andronicus to Juvenal. His journey through Roman literature was no less adventurous and no less full of disguises and deception than the *Odyssey*, and it has revealed how Roman authors viewed and positioned themselves in the Greek and Roman literary traditions. Odysseus proved to be an ideal location for Roman poets to negotiate questions of literary inheritance, poetic authority, and generic boundaries that they continued to face long after Livius Andronicus “invented” a Roman literary tradition. By focusing on and distilling the deceptive aspects of Odysseus’ character and past, Roman authors could themselves straddle the boundary between Greek and Roman literature, tying themselves to an established literary authority while simultaneously carving out their own path. On the surface, what looks like Roman poetry—such as Livius’ epic in Saturnians, Plautus’ “new” comedies, Horace’s original satires, and Ovid’s elegiac epic of exile—is, deep down, intimately bound to a Greek origin story.

That Odysseus himself acts as a poet in the *Odyssey* also provides Roman authors with a mask of sorts through which they can tap into the poetic authority of Homer. This is the case, at least, for Livius Andronicus and Plautus, who are firmly at the beginning of the Latin literary tradition and in need of a foundation on which to base their Latin poetic endeavors. For Horace and Ovid, Odysseus as a mouthpiece for the poet is more problematic; the persuasive power of rhetoric, and poetry, is not always used for the most noble of goals. The moral ambiguity inherent in many of Odysseus’ actions and words, which is explored in *Sat.* 2.5 and *Met.* 13, is shut down in Ovid’s exile poetry as well as by Juvenal; they generalize Odysseus and his tales as

exaggerated or false in an effort to establish their own poetic voice as authoritative, rejecting the poetic authority embodied by Odysseus only two centuries earlier.

This duplicitous nature of Odysseus served as a model either to be embraced or rejected and through which Roman authors depicted the literary challenges they faced, especially of doing something new while managing the burden and expectations of the Greek literary tradition that they inherited. Odysseus, despite also being known as the “Ithacan” or “Neritian,” and in this way nominally linked to the geography of Greece, nonetheless broke free from that association by traveling past the boundaries of the known world and establishing other, permanent connections in the western Mediterranean. The door then was opened for him to become an almost universal hero, much like Herakles and even Homer himself,³⁵⁰ to whom many could lay claim as the birthplace or other site of significance. In the literary history of Odysseus, it was the Romans’ translation of Odysseus into a figure who fits quite naturally into life at Rome that set the stage for later reimaginings of the Greek hero and truly demonstrated Odysseus’ infinite capacity to adapt.³⁵¹

³⁵⁰ Cf. Tac. *Germ.* 3.3, where Tacitus reports that both Herakles and Ulysses made it as far as Germany and left lasting markers of their presence (for Herakles it is a war cry, for Odysseus a town and an altar).

³⁵¹ See, for example, Smarr (1991), 141–51, on Dante’s Ulysses, which may be inspired by Ovid’s own comparison of himself with the Greek hero.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of ancient texts and authors are those used in *LSJ* and *OLD*. The following abbreviations are also used.

CIL = 1863—. *Corpus inscriptionum Latinorum*. Berlin.

EDL = de Vaan, M. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. *Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series*, vol. 7. Leiden.

FrGrH = Jacoby, F. 1923–1958. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Leiden.

Heubeck-West = Heubeck, A., S. West, and J. B. Hainsworth. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Vol. I: Introduction and Books I–VIII*. Oxford. (Originally published together with Heubeck-Hoekstra and Russo-Heubeck in Italian as *Omero: Odissea*, 1986–1988, Milan.)

Heubeck-Hoekstra = Heubeck, A. and A. Hoekstra. 1989. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Vol II: Books IX–XVI*. Oxford.

LSJ = Liddel, H. G. and R. Scott. 1940. 9th edn. Rev. H. Jones and R. McKenzie, with supplemental revd. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford.

OLD = Glare, P. G. W. 1968–1982. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford.

Russo-Heubeck = Russo, J., M. Fernández-Galiano, and A. Heubeck. 1989. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Vol. III: Books XVII–XXIV*. Oxford.

TLL = 1900—. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Leipzig.

VE = 2014. Thomas, R. F. and J. Ziolkowski, eds. *The Virgil Encyclopedia*. 3 vols. Malden, MA.

Works Cited

- Alexander, S. 1999. *The Complete Odes and Satires of Horace*. Princeton.
- Andreae, B. 1982. *Odysseus. Archäologie des europäischen Menschenbildes*. Frankfurt.
- Athanassakis, A. N. 2004. *Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days, Shield*. 2nd edn. Baltimore.
- Austin, N. 1972. "Name Magic in the *Odyssey*." *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 5: 1–19.
- Austin, R. G. 1959. "Virgil and the Wooden Horse." *JRS* 49: 16–25.
- , 1964. *P. Vergili Maronis. Aeneidos. Liber Secundus*. Oxford.
- , 1971. *P. Vergili Maronis. Aeneidos. Liber Primus*. Oxford.
- Babbi, A. M. and F. Zardini, eds. 2000. *Ulisse da Omero a Pascal Quignard. Convegno internazionale Verona, 25-27 maggio 2000*. Verona.
- Bain, D. 1979. "Plautus vortit barbare: Plautus, *Bacchides* 526–61 and Menander, *Dis exapaton* 102–12." In D. West and T. Woodman, eds. *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, 17–34. Cambridge.
- Ball, R. J. 1988. "The Popularity of Homer's *Odyssey* in Greek and Latin Literature." In L. Hadlich and J. D. Ellsworth, eds. *East Meets West: Homage to Edgar C. Knowlton, Jr.*, 1–10. Honolulu.
- Barchiesi, A. 2001. *Speaking Volumes*. Trans. M. Fox and S. Marchesi. London.
- Barnouw, J. 2004. *Odysseus, Hero of Practical Intelligence*. Lanham, MD.
- Barsby, J. 1986. *Plautus, Bacchides*. Oak Park, IL.

- Beard, M. 2007. *The Roman Triumph*. Cambridge, MA.
- Berger, A. 1953. *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, n.s. 43.2. Philadelphia.
- Bergren, A. L. T. 1983. "Odyssean temporality: many (re) turns." In C. A. Rubino and C. W. Shelmerdine, eds. *Approaches to Homer*, 38–73. Austin, TX.
- Berres, T. 1993. "Vergil und Homer. Ein Beitrag zur Entmythologisierung des Verhältnisses." *Gymnasium* 100: 342–69.
- Blänsdorf, J. 1995. *Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum post W. Morel et K. Büchner*. 3rd edn. Leipzig.
- Bloom, H., ed. 1991. *Odysseus/Ulysses*. New York.
- Boitani, P. 1994. *The Shadow of Ulysses: Figures of a Myth*. Trans. A. Weston. Oxford.
- Boitani, P. and R. Ambrosini, eds. 1998. *Ulisse: archeologia dell'uomo moderno*. Rome.
- Bömer, F. 1951. *Rom und Troia: Untersuchungen zur Frühgeschichte Roms*. Baden-Baden.
- 1982. *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen, Buch XII–XIII. Kommentar*. Heidelberg.
- Bonifazi, A. 2010. "Anaphoric pronouns αὐτός and κείνος in Homer: a cognitive-pragmatic approach." In I. Putzu et al., eds. *La morfologia del greco tra tipologia e diacronia*, 97–114. Milan.
- Bonner, S. F. 1977. *Education in Ancient Rome*. Berkeley.
- Borovkij, J. 1976. *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Libri*. Leipzig.
- Bowie, A. M. 2013. *Homer. Odyssey Books XIII and XIV*. Cambridge.
- Braund, S. 1996. *The Roman Satirists and their Masks*. London.
- Braund, S. and J. Osgood, eds. 2012. *A Companion to Persius and Juvenal*. Oxford.
- Brommer, F. 1983. *Odysseus. Die Taten und Leiden des Helden in antiker Kunst und Literatur*. Darmstadt.
- Brugnoli, G. 1960. *C. Suetoni Tranquilli praeter Caesarum libros reliquiae*. Leipzig.
- Buchan, M. 2004. *The Limits of Heroism*. Ann Arbor.

- Buffière, F. 1973. *Les mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque*. Paris.
- Burgess, J. S. 2001. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore.
- . 2009. *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles*. Baltimore.
- Burrows, C. 2013. *Shakespeare and Classical Antiquity*. Oxford.
- Bury, J. B. 1965. *The Nemean Odes of Pindar*. Amsterdam.
- Caizzi, F. D. 1966. *Antisthenis fragmenta*. Milan.
- Calvino, I. 1986 [1981]. "The Odysseys in the *Odyssey*." In *The Uses of Literature*, 135–45. Trans. P. Creagh. New York.
- Caplan, H. 1954. *[Cicero] Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Cambridge, MA.
- Champlin, E. 1989. "Creditor Vulgo Testamenta Hominum Speculum Esse Morum: Why the Romans Made Wills." *CP* 84, 3: 198-215.
- . 1991. *Final Judgments: Duty and Emotion in Roman Wills 200 BC – AD 250*. Berkeley, CA.
- Chantraine, P. 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*. 2 vols. Paris.
- Citati, P. 2002. *La mente colorata. Ulisse e l'Odissea*. Milan.
- Citroni, M. 2013. "Horace's *Epistle* 2.1, Cicero, Varro, and the Ancient Debate about the Origins and Development of Latin Poetry." In J. Farrell and D. Nelis, eds. *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*, 180–204. Oxford.
- Claassen, J.-M. 1987–1988. "Ovid's Poems from Exile: The Creation of a Myth and the Triumph of Poetry." *Antike und Abendland* 33–34: 158–69.
- . 1990. "Ovid's Poetic Pontus." *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*, vol. 6: 65–94.
- Clark, A. C. 1905–1918. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes*. 6 vols. Oxford.
- Clarke, H. 1981. *Homer's Readers: A Historical Introduction to the Iliad and the Odyssey*. Newark, NJ.
- Clausen, W. V. 1992. *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis Saturae*. Rev. edn. Oxford.
- . 2002. *Vergil's Aeneid: Decorum, Allusion, and Ideology*. Munich and Leipzig.

- Coffey, M. 1976. *Roman Satire*. London.
- Coleman, R. 1971. "Structure and Intention in the *Metamorphoses*." *CQ*, n.s. 21: 461–477.
- Collart, J. 1954. *Varron De lingua Latina livre V*. Paris.
- Connors, C. 2005. "Epic Allusion in Roman Satire." In Freudenburg, 123–45.
- Conte, G. B. 1994. *Latin Literature: A History*. Trans. J. B. Solodow. Baltimore.
- Cook, E. 1999. "'Active' and 'Passive' Heroics in the 'Odyssey'." *CW* 93: 149–167.
- Costantino, D. 2007. *Ulisse e l'altro. Itinerari della Differenza nell'Odissea*. Milan.
- Courtney, E. 1980. *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*. London.
- . 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford.
- Crane, G. 1987. "The *Odyssey* and the Conventions of the Heroic Quest." *CA* 6: 11–37.
- Danese, R. M. 2002. "Modelli letterari e modelli culturali del teatro plautino." In C. Questa and R. Raffaelli, eds. *Due seminari plautini: la tradizione del testo; I modelli*, 133–53. Urbino.
- Davisson, M. H. T. 1982. "*Duritia* and Creativity in Exile: *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.10." *CA* 1: 28–42.
- . 1993. "*Quid moror exemplis?* Mythological *exempla* in Ovid's pre-exilic poems and the elegies from exile." *Phoenix* 47: 213–237.
- de Caro, A. 2006. *Cuncta dabant reditus: la riscrittura di Ulisse e dell'Odissea nell'elegia latina*. Palermo.
- de Jong, I. J. F. 1992. "The Subjective Style in Odysseus' Wanderings." *CQ*, n.s. 42: 1–11.
- Detienne, M. and J.-P. Vernant. 1978. *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*. Trans. J. Lloyd. Atlantic Highlands, NJ.
- Dimock, G. 1962. "The Name of Odysseus." In G. Steiner and R. Fagles, eds. *Homer: A Collection of Critical Essays*, 106–21. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Doty, W. G. 1993. "A Lifetime of Trouble-Making: Hermes as Trickster." In W. J. Hynes and W. G. Doty, eds. *Mythical Trickster Figures*, 46–65. Tuscaloosa, AL.
- Drucker, M. 1977. *Der verbannte Dichter und der Kaiser-Gott: Studien zu Ovids späten Elegien*.

- Ph.D. diss. Heidelberg.
- Duc, T. 1994. "Postulat ut capiat, quae non intellegit, arma (Ov., Met. XIII, 295): un discours programmatique?" *Latomus* 53: 126–131.
- Dyck, A. R. 1996. *A Commentary of Cicero, De Officiis*. Ann Arbor.
- Eden, P. T. 1975. *A Commentary on Virgil: Aeneid VIII*. Leiden.
- Ellsworth, J. D. 1980. "Ovid's *Iliad* (Met. 12.1–13.622)." *Prudentia* 12: 23–29.
- Elmer, D. F. 2012. "Building Community Across the Battle-Lines. The Truce in *Iliad* 3 and 4." In J. Wilker, ed. *Maintaining Peace and Interstate Stability in Archaic and Classical Greece*, 25–48. Mainz.
- Ernout, A. and A. Meillet. 1979. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. 4th edn. Paris.
- Evans, H. 1983. *Publica Carmina: Ovid's Books from Exile*. Lincoln, NE.
- Fantham, E. 2009. "Rhetoric and Ovid's Poetry." In P. Knox, ed. *A Companion to Ovid*, 26–44. Malden, MA.
- Farrell, J. 2004. "Roman Homer." In R. Fowler, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, 254–71. Cambridge.
- Fedeli, P. 1994. *Q. Orazio Flacco. Le Opere II: le Satire*. Rome.
- Fiske, G. C. 1920. *Lucilius and Horace*. Madison, WI.
- Fletcher, K. F. B. 2006. "Vergil's Italian Diomedes." *AJP* 127: 219–259.
- Fowler, D. P. 1990. "Deviant Focalization in Virgil's *Aeneid*." *PCPS* 36: 42–63.
- Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford.
- , 2007. *Plautine Elements in Plautus*. Tr. T. Drevikovskiy and F. Muecke. Oxford. (Originally published in German as *Plautinisches im Plautus*, 1922, Berlin.)
- Freudenburg, K. 2001. *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*. Cambridge.
- , ed. 2005. *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*. Cambridge.
- Fuchs, G., ed. 1994. *Lange Irrfahrt-große Heimkehr. Odysseus als Archetyp-zur Aktualität des Mythos*. Frankfurt.
- Gabba, E. 1991. *Dionysius and The History of Ancient Rome*. Berkeley.

- Galinsky, G. K. 1969a. "Troiae qui primus ab oris ...' (*Aen.* I, 1)." *Latomus* 28(1): 3–18.
- . 1969b. "The Triumph Theme in Augustan Elegy." *Wiener Studien* 82: 75–107.
- . 1972. *The Herakles Theme: The Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century*. Oxford.
- . 1981. "Vergil's Romanitas and his Adaptation of Greek Heroes," *ANRW* 31.2: 985–1010.
- Garvie, A. F. 1994. *Homer. Odyssey. Books VI–VIII*. Cambridge.
- Goldberg, S. M. 1995. *Epic in Republican Rome*. Oxford.
- Gowers, E. 1993. *The Loaded Table*. Oxford.
- . 2005. "The Restless Companion: Horace, *Satires* 1 and 2." In Freudenburg, 48–61.
- . 2012. *Horace: Satires Book I*. Cambridge.
- Graf, F. 2002. "Myth in Ovid." In Hardie, 108–21.
- Gratwick, A. S. 1993. *Plautus. Menaechmi*. Oxford.
- Greco, M. 1998. *M. T. Cicerone De Inventione*. Galatina.
- Greene, T. M. 1982. *The Light in Troy*. New Haven, CT.
- Gross, N. P. 2000. "Allusion and Rhetorical Wit in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 13." *Scholia*, n.s. 9: 54–65.
- Gruen, E. S. 1990. *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy*. Leiden.
- . 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca, NY.
- Håkanson, L. 1989. *L. Annaeus Seneca Maior Oratorum et Rhetorum sententiae, divisiones, colores*. Leipzig.
- Hall, E. 2008. *The Return of Ulysses: A Cultural History of Homer's Odyssey*. Baltimore.
- . 2013. *Adventures with Iphigenia in Tauris*. Oxford.
- Hall, J. B. 1995. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristia*. Leipzig.
- Halporn, J. 1993. "Roman comedy and Greek models." In R. Scodel, ed. *Theatre and Society in*

- the Classical World*, 191–213. Ann Arbor.
- Hardie, P. 1985. “*Imago mundi*: Cosmological and Ideological Aspects of the Shield of Achilles.” *JHS* 105: 11–31.
- , 2000. *Ovid: A poet of transition? The Fourteenth Todd Memorial Lecture delivered in the University of Sydney 11 November 1999*. Sydney.
- , ed. 2002. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*. Cambridge.
- Hartog, F. 2001. *Memories of Odysseus*. Trans. J. Lloyd. Edinburgh.
- Henderson, A. A. R. 1979. *Ovid Metamorphoses III, with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary*. Bristol.
- Higham, T. F. 1958. “Ovid and Rhetoric.” In N. I. Herescu, ed. *Ovidiana*, 32–48. Paris.
- Hill, D. E. 2000. *Ovid Metamorphoses XIII–XV and indexes*. Warminster, UK.
- Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
- , 2006. “Booking the Return Trip: Ovid and *Tristia* 1.” In P. Knox, ed. *Oxford Readings in Ovid*, 415–40. Oxford.
- Hofmann, H. 1999. “Odysseus: von Homer bis zu James Joyce.” In H. Hofmann, ed. *Antike Mythen in der europäischen Tradition*, 27–67. Tübingen.
- Hooley, D. 2007. *Roman Satire*. Malden, MA.
- Hopkinson, N. 2000. *Ovid, Metamorphoses, book XIII*. Cambridge.
- Horsfall, N. 2006. *Virgil, Aeneid 3. A Commentary*. Leiden.
- , 2008. *Virgil, Aeneid 2. A Commentary*. Leiden.
- Huyck, J. R. 1991. *A Commentary on Ovid's Armorum Iudicum, “Metamorphoses” 12.612–13.398*. Ph.D. diss. Harvard University.
- Hynes, W. J. and Doty, W. G., eds. *Mythical Trickster Figures*. Tuscaloosa, AL
- Ingleheart, J. 2010. “I’m a Celebrity, Get Me Out of Here.” In I. Gildenhard and M. Revermann, eds. *Beyond the Fifth Century: Interactions with Greek Tragedy from the Fourth Century BCE to the Middle Ages*, 219–248. Berlin.
- Jocelyn, H. D. 1969. “Chrysalus and the Fall of Troy (Plautus, *Bacchides* 925–978).” *HSCP* 73: 135–152.

- Jones, F. 2007. *Juvenal and the Satiric Genre*. London.
- Jouanno, C. 2013. *Ulysse: Odyssee d'un personnage d'Homère à Joyce*. Paris.
- Keane, C. 2006. *Figuring Genre in Roman Satire*. Oxford.
- Kennedy, G. 1994. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton.
- Kenney, E. J. 1969. "Ovid and the Law." *Yale Classical Studies* 21: 243–263.
- , 1995. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris*. Oxford.
- Kiessling, A. and R. Heinze. 1957. *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Satiren*. 6th edn. Berlin.
- Knauer, G. N. 1964. *Die Aeneis und Homer*. Göttingen.
- Knoche, U. 1975. *Roman Satire*. Trans. E. S. Ramage. Bloomington, IL.
- Krisak, L. and S. Ruden, trans. 2014. *Ovid's Erotic Poems: "Amores" and "Ars Amatoria."* Philadelphia.
- Labate, M. 1980. "Ulisse, Eurialo, e le Armi di Achille (Ov. *Met.* XIII, 98 sgg)." *Atene e Roma* 25: 28–32.
- , 2009. "Horatian *Sermo* and Genres of Literature." In K. Freduenburg, ed. *Horace: Satires and Epistles*, 102–21. Oxford.
- Lamberton, R. 1986. *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*. Berkeley.
- Lamberton, R. and J. J. Keaney, eds. 1992. *Homer's Ancient Readers. The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes*. Princeton.
- Lambin, G. 2005. *L'Alexandra de Lycophron*. Rennes.
- Last, H. 1934. "The Social Policy of Augustus" in S. Cook, F. Adcock, and M. Charlesworth, eds. *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. X. Cambridge: 425-64. (Reprinted 1952).
- Leigh, M. 1995. "Wounding and Popular Rhetoric at Rome." *BICS* 40: 195–216.
- , 2004. *Comedy and the Rise of Rome*. Oxford.
- LeJay, P. 1911. *Oeuvres d'Horace: Satires*. Paris.

- Leo, F. 1895–1896. *Plauti comoediae*. 2 vols. Berlin.
- Létoublon, F. 2003. “Patience, mon coeur! Geduld mein Herze.” *GAIA* 7: 321–46.
- Lindsay, H. 2009. *Adoption in the Roman World*. Cambridge.
- Lorenzetti, E. 2001. “L' *Armorum Iudicium* di Ovidio Appunti sulla Tradizione Epica nelle *Metamorfosi*.” *Annali della Facolta di Lettere e Filosofia* 34: 221–47.
- Louden, B. 1999. *The Odyssey. Structure, Narration, and Meaning*. Baltimore.
- Luck, G. 1977. *P. Ovidius Naso, Tristia*. 2 vols. Heidelberg.
- Luther, A., ed. 2005. *Odyssee-Rezeptionen*. Frankfurt.
- Mackie, C. J. 1988. *The Characterisation of Aeneas*. Edinburgh.
- Malcovati, E. 1965. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Brutus*. Fasc. 4. Leipzig.
- Malkin, I. 1998. *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity*. Berkeley.
- Mankin, D. 1995. *Horace. Epodes*. Cambridge.
- . 2011. *Cicero, De oratore, book III*. Cambridge.
- Mansbach, A. R. 1982. *Captatio. Myth and Reality*. PhD diss. Princeton.
- Marincola, J. 2007. “Odysseus and the Historians.” *Syllecta classica* 18: 1–79.
- Mariotti, S. 1986. *Livio Andronico e la traduzione artistica*. Urbino.
- Martin, R. P. 1989. *The Language of Heroes. Speech and Performance in the Iliad*. Ithaca, NY.
- Martonara, M. 1926. *Ulisse nella letteratura latina*. Palermo.
- Mayer, R. 1994. *Horace, Epistles, book I*. Cambridge.
- . 2012. *Horace, Odes, book I*. Cambridge.
- McElduff, S. 2013. *Roman Theories of Translation*. New York.
- McKeown, J. C. 1989. *Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes. Vol. II. A Commentary on Book One*. Leeds.
- . 1998. *Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes. Vol. III. A*

Commentary on Book Two. Leeds.

- Miller, P. A. 2012. "Imperial Satire as Saturnalia." In Braund and Osgood, 312–33.
- Montiglio, S. 2005. *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture*. Chicago.
- , 2011. *From Hero to Villain: Odysseus in Ancient Thought*. Ann Arbor.
- Morel, W. 1927. *Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum*. Leipzig.
- Muecke, F. 1993. *Horace, Satires II*. Warminster.
- Myers, K. S. 2009. *Ovid, Metamorphoses, book XIV*. Cambridge.
- Mynors, R. A. B. 1958. *C. Valerii Catullii Carmina*. Oxford.
- , 1969. *P. Vergili Maronis opera*. Oxford.
- , 1990. *Virgil, Georgics*. Oxford.
- Nadeau, Y. 2013. *Dog Bites Caesar! A Reading of Juvenal's Satire 5 (with Horace's Satires I.5; II.5; II.6; Epistles I.1.; I.16; I.17)*. *Collections Latomus* 342. Brussels.
- Newman, J. K. 1967. *The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry*. Brussels.
- Nicosia, S., ed. 2003. *Ulisse nel tempo. La metafora infinita*. Venice.
- Ogilvie, R. M. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy. Books 1–5*. Oxford.
- Oliensis, E. 1991. "Canidia, Canicula, and the decorum of Horace's *Epodes*." *Arethusa* 24–25: 107–38.
- , 1998. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge.
- Osgood, J. 2012. "Introduction: Persius and Juvenal as Satiric Successors." In Braund and Osgood, 1–16.
- Otis, B. 1970. *Ovid as an Epic Poet*. 2nd edn. Cambridge.
- Otto, A. 1890. *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*. Leipzig.
- Palmer, A. 1891. *Satires of Horace*. London.
- Panayotakis, C. 2009. "Petronius and the Roman Literary Tradition." In J. Prag and I. Repath, eds. *Petronius. A Handbook*, 48–64. Malden, MA.

- Papaioannou, S. 2007. *Redesigning Achilles: 'Recycling' the Epic Cycle in the 'Little Iliad' (Ovid, Metamorphoses 12.1–13.622)*. *Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte*, Band 89. Berlin.
- Pavlock, B. 2009. *The Image of the Poet in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Madison, WI.
- Peradotto, J. 1990. *Man in the Middle Voice: Name and Narration in the Odyssey*. Princeton.
- Pernot, L. 2005. *Rhetoric in Antiquity*. Trans. W. E. Higgins. Washington, DC.
- Perutelli, A. 2005. "Ulisse in Cicerone." In E. Narducci, ed. *Eloquenza e astuzie della persuasione in Cicerone*, 5–22. Florence.
- . 2006. *Ulisse nella cultura Romana*. Florence.
- Phillips, E. D. 1953. "Odysseus in Italy." *JHS* 73: 53–67.
- Prince, S. 1999. "Ajax, Odysseus, and the Act of Self-Representation." *Ancient Philosophy* 19: 55–64.
- Pucci, P. 1982. "The proem of the *Odyssey*." *Arethusa* 15: 39–62.
- . 1987. *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad*. Ithaca, NY.
- Rahn, H. 1958. "Ovids elegische Epistel." *Antike und Abendland* 7: 105–20.
- Richmond, J. A. 1990. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Ex Ponto libri quattuor*. Leipzig.
- Roberts, M. 1984. "Horace *Satires* 2.5: Restrained Indignation." *AJP* 105: 426–33.
- Roche, P. 2012. "Self-Representation and Performativity." In Braund and Osgood, 190–216.
- Romm, J. 1992. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought*. Princeton.
- Rosen, R. 2007. *Making Mockery: The Poetics of Ancient Satire*. Oxford.
- Ruckdeschel, F. 1910. *Archaismen und Vulgarismen in der Sprache des Horaz*. Munich.
- Rudd, N. 1966. *The Satires of Horace*. Cambridge.
- Rutherford, R. 2007. "Poetics and Literary Criticism." In S. Harrison, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, 248–261. Cambridge.
- Sallmann, K. 1970. "Satirische Technik in Horaz' Erbschleichersatire." *Hermes* 98: 178–203.

- Sandys, J. E. 1910. *A Companion to Latin Studies*. Cambridge.
- Schiesaro, A. 2002. "Ovid and the Professional Discourses of Scholarship, Religion, Rhetoric." In Hardie, 62–76.
- Schlegel, C. 2005. *Satire and the Threat of Speech: Horace's Satires Book I*. Madison, WI.
- Schmidt, E. G. 1983. "Achilleus–Odysseus–Aeneas: Zur Typologie des Vergilischen Helden." *Listy filologické / Folia philologica* 106.1: 24–28.
- Schwinge, E. R. 1993. *Die Odyssee–nach den Odysseen. Betrachtungen zu ihrer individuellen Physiognomie*. Hamburg.
- Sciarrino, E. 2006. "The Introduction of Epic in Rome: Cultural Thefts and Social Contests." *Arethusa* 39: 449–469.
- Scuotto, E. 2009. *Il viaggio di Ulisse in Campania. Tra mitologia, tradizioni popolari e geografia dei luoghi*. Rome.
- Segal, C. 1992. "Bard and Audience in Homer." In Lamberton and Keaney, 5–29.
- 1994. *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the Odyssey*. Ithaca, NY.
- Segal, E. 1987. *Roman Laughter: The Comedy of Plautus*. Oxford.
- Setaioli, A. 1995. "Ulisse nell'Eneide." In M. R. Cittadini, ed. *Presenze classiche nelle letterature occidentali il mito dall'età antica all'età moderna e contemporanea*, 167–86. Perugia.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. 1985. *Q. Horati Flacci opera*. Stuttgart.
- Sharrock, A. 2009. *Reading Roman Comedy: Poetics and Playfulness in Plautus and Terence*. Cambridge.
- Sier, K. 1996. "Aias' und Odysseus' Streit um die Waffen des Achilleus: Mythisches Exempel und Philosophie der Sprache bei Antisthenes." In C. Mueller-Goldingen and K. Sier, eds. *AHNAIKA: Festschrift für Carl Werner Müller*, 53–80. Stuttgart and Leipzig.
- Sihler, A. L. 1995. *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Oxford.
- Skaife Jensen, M. 1997. "The Fall of Troy in Plautus' *Bacchides*." *C&M* 48: 315–23.
- Skutsch, O. 1985. *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford.
- Slater, N. 1985. *Plautus in Performance: The Theatre of the Mind*. Princeton.

- Slings, S. R. 2003. *Plantois Rempublicam*. Oxford.
- Smarr, J. L. 1991. "Poets of Love and Exile." In M. U. Sowell, ed. *Dante and Ovid. Essays in Intertextuality*, 139–151. Binghamton, UK.
- Smith, R. A. 1997. *Poetic Allusion and Poetic Embrace in Ovid and Virgil*. Ann Arbor.
- Smith, S. C. 1999. "Remembering the Enemy: Narrative, Focalization, and Vergil's Portrait of Achilles." *TAPA* 129: 225–62.
- Solmsen, F. 1986. "Aeneas Founded Rome with Odysseus." *HSCP* 90: 93–110.
- Solodow, J. 1988. *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Chapel Hill, NC.
- Stagakis, G. 1987. "Dolon, Odysseus and Diomedes in the 'Doloneia.'" *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 130: 193–204.
- Stanford, W. B. 1952. "The Homeric Etymology of the Name Odysseus." *CP* 47: 209–213.
- , 1963. *The Ulysses Theme*. 2nd edn. Oxford.
- Stephens, W. C. 1958. "Two Stoic Heroes in the *Metamorphoses*: Hercules and Ulysses." In N. I. Herescu, ed. *Ovidiana*, 273–82. Paris.
- Suerbaum, W. 1968. *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter: Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius*. Hildesheim.
- Taplin, O. 1999. "The Shield of Achilles within the *Iliad*." In I. J. F. de Jong, ed. *Homer: Critical Assessments*, 179–200. New York.
- Tarrant, R. J. 1985. *Seneca's Thyestes*. Atlanta.
- , 1995a. "Greek and Roman in Seneca's Tragedies." *HSCP* 97: 215–230.
- , 1995b. "Ovid and the Failure of Rhetoric." In D. Innes, H. Hine, and C. Pelling, eds. *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, 63–74. Oxford.
- Tarrant, R. J. 2004. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses*. Oxford.
- Thomas, R. F. 1988. *Virgil, Georgics I-II*. Cambridge.
- Tissol, G. 2014. *Ovid, Epistulae ex Ponto, book I*. Cambridge.
- Tolkiehn, J. 1991. *Omero e la poesia latina*. Italian trans. M. Scaffai. Bologna.

- Traina, A. 1970. *Vortit barbare: Le traduzioni poetiche da Livio Andronico a Cicerone*. Rome.
- van Rooy, C. A. 1965. *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory*. Leiden.
- van Thiel, H. 1991. *Homeri Odyssea*. Hildesheim.
- Watson, L. 2003. *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*. Oxford.
- Watt, W. S. 1958. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae. Vol. III*. Oxford.
- West, M. L. 1966. *Hesiod, Theogony*. Oxford.
- . 1998–2000. *Homeri Iliad*. 2 vols. Stuttgart.
- . 2012. *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics*. Oxford.
- Wilkins, A. S. 1902. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Rhetorica. Vol. 1*. Oxford.
- Wilkinson, L. P. 1955. *Ovid Recalled*. Cambridge.
- . 1963. *Golden Latin Artistry*. Bristol, UK.
- Williams, D. 1980. "Ajax, Odysseus and the Arms of Achilles." *Antike Kunst* 23: 137–45.
- Williams, F. 1978. *Callimachus, Hymn to Apollo. A Commentary*. Oxford.
- Williams, G. 2002. "Ovid's Exile Poetry: *Tristia, Epistulae ex Ponto* and *Ibis*." In Hardie, 233–45.
- Williams, R. D. 1962. *P. Vergili Maronis. Aeneidos. Liber Tertius*. Oxford.
- Winkler, M. M. 1991. "Satire and the Grotesque in Juvenal, Arcimboldo, and Goya." *Antike und Abendland* 37: 22–42.
- Winterbottom, M. 1970. *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis oratoriae libri duodecim*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- . 1994. *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Officiis*. Oxford.
- Woods, H. A. 2012. *Hunting Literary Legacies: Captatio in Roman Satire*. PhD diss. University of Minnesota.
- Zampese, L. 2003. *Ulisse: il ritorno e il viaggio. Un mito universale tra passato e presente*. Florence.
- Zumwalt, N. 1977. "Fama Subversa': Theme and Structure in Ovid's 'Metamorphoses' 12."

CSCA 10: 209–22.

Zwierlein, O. 1986. *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae*. Oxford.